

Hawley, Hill of Colorado, Hoar, Ingalls, Lapham,	Logan, McMillan, Mahone, Maxey, Miller of N. Y.,	Mitchell, Morgan, Morrill, Pugh, Saulsbury,	Saunders, Sawyer, Sherman, Walker, Windom.
--	--	---	--

NAYS—20.

Bayard, Beck, Butler, Call, Davis of W. Va.,	Farley, George, Gorman, Groome, Hampton,	Harris, Jackson, Johnston, Jonas, Miller of Cal.,	Pendleton, Ransom, Vest, Voorhees, Williams.
--	--	---	--

ABSENT—24.

Blair, Camden, Cameron of Pa., Cockrell, Edmunds, Fair,	Ferry, Frye, Grover, Hale, Hill of Georgia, Jones of Florida,	Jones of Nevada, Kellogg, Lamar, McDill, McPherson, Platt,	Plumb, Rollins, Sewell, Slater, Vance, Van Wyck.
--	--	---	---

So the bill was postponed indefinitely.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

On motion of Mr. ROLLINS, it was

*Ordered*, That the papers in the case of Alfred E. Jaynes be withdrawn from the files of the Senate.

AMENDMENT TO AN APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. BUTLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

NATIONAL BANKING ASSOCIATIONS.

Mr. ALLISON. I move to take up the bill (H. R. No. 4167) to enable national banking associations to extend their corporate existence.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Iowa moves to take up the bill in regard to national banks.

The motion was agreed to; there being on a division—ayes 32, noes 12.

Mr. SAWYER. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at five o'clock and fifty minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, June 15, 1882.

The House met at eleven o'clock a. m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. F. D. POWER.

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. CARPENTER. I ask unanimous consent at this time to present for present consideration the resolution which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The resolution will be read, subject to objection. The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the bill (H. R. No. 6158) to aid in the support of common schools, reported from the Committee on Education and Labor, be made the special order for Thursday, the 22d day of June instant, immediately after the morning hour, and to continue from day to day until the same is disposed of; not to antagonize general appropriation and revenue bills.

Mr. HOLMAN. I demand the regular order.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. RICE, of Missouri. My colleague, Mr. VAN HORN, is quite unwell this morning. I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that he be excused for this day.

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO PRINT.

Mr. RICE, of Missouri. I have a further request to make on behalf of my colleague, [Mr. VAN HORN.] That gentleman is deeply interested in the pending bill for improvements on rivers and harbors and had intended to address the House thereon to-day. I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to print in the RECORD some remarks on that bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears no objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri. But the Chair is under the impression that general leave has been given to print remarks on the river and harbor bill.

Mr. COX, of New York. I think general leave was not given. Only two requests were granted. I hope the leave will be made general.

The SPEAKER. It is the impression of the Chair that it has been made general; but the Chair will look into the matter.

IMPROVEMENT OF OHIO RIVER.

Mr. HOLMAN. I call for the regular order.

Mr. STOCKSLAGER. I hope my colleague will withhold the demand for the regular order until I ask unanimous consent to withdraw a bill from the files of the House.

Mr. HOLMAN. I will not object to that.

Mr. STOCKSLAGER. I ask unanimous consent to withdraw from

the files of the House the bill (H. R. No. 6108) for the improvement of the Ohio River.

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. HOLMAN. I now insist on the regular order.

Mr. HOOKER. I hope the gentleman from Indiana will withhold the call for the regular order for a moment. I want to call up a bill from the Speaker's table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair cannot recognize gentlemen to call up bills if the regular order is insisted on; and the Chair understands it is.

Mr. JOYCE addressed the Chair.

The SPEAKER. When the regular order is called for the Chair can only recognize gentlemen on privileged matters. The regular order is the morning hour for the call of committees for reports.

Mr. PAGE. I move that the morning hour be dispensed with.

The motion was agreed to—two-thirds voting in favor thereof.

Several members called for the regular order.

Mr. PAGE. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of re-suming the consideration of the river and harbor bill.

Mr. HOOKER. I appeal to the gentleman from California to yield to me for a few moments.

Mr. PAGE. If I am allowed, I will do so.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California cannot yield when other gentlemen are calling for the regular order.

Mr. HOOKER. Who calls for it?

The SPEAKER. More than one gentleman.

Mr. PAGE. I insist on my motion.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to state that in the absence of the Speaker from the chair during any portion of this day's session the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HASKELL] will preside.

The question being taken on Mr. PAGE's motion, it was agreed to.

RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATION BILL.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, (Mr. BURROWS, of Michigan, in the chair,) and resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. No. 6242) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole for the further consideration of the river and harbor appropriation bill. The gentleman from California [Mr. PAGE] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. PAGE. I will detain the committee but for a few moments in order that I may in as brief a manner as possible explain some of the provisions of the bill now under consideration, known as the river and harbor bill. It has been said by a great many gentlemen upon this floor that this is a very large bill. That is true, Mr. Chairman. It is a large bill. It involves the expenditure, if it passes both Houses and becomes a law, of seventeen million three hundred and odd thousand dollars. And it is proper that as chairman of the Committee on Commerce I should explain briefly the reasons why this bill is larger than former bills appropriating money for similar purposes have been.

Congress has for the last eighty years made annual appropriations for the improvement of rivers and harbors. In 1802 Congress for the first time passed a river and harbor appropriation bill, which appropriated \$30,000 for the improvement of the Delaware River. Since that time annual appropriations for these purposes have been made by Congress, varying in amount up from \$30,000 in 1802 to \$12,000,000 in 1881. In 1879 Congress passed a law authorizing the President of the United States to select seven commissioners, known as the Mississippi River commission. These commissioners were to be selected, three from the Army Engineer Corps, one from the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and three from civil life. It was their duty, under this law, to make an examination of the Mississippi River, and report a plan for its improvement to the Congress of the United States. In the last Congress their report was adopted by this House and an appropriation was made of some two million and odd thousand dollars for the whole river; one million for the river below Cairo to the head of the passes. This was deemed insufficient by the Mississippi River commission, and consequently they made no headway in the improvement of this great river, but deferred it till now, when they expected Congress to make appropriations more commensurate with this great improvement; an improvement that has attracted the attention not only of the people directly interested, living along the banks of the Mississippi River, but of the people of the whole country.

I know of no enterprise that has been undertaken within the last quarter of a century that has attracted more attention than the improvement of this great water-way. Conventions have met at Saint Louis and Saint Joseph, and all over the country; conventions, not of politicians, but of the representatives of the people, have met and have resolved that it was the duty of Congress to make these large appropriations in order that this great improvement might be carried on. Our committee was in session in considering this bill for over four months. They listened to all the delegations that were sent here, representative men from different localities, and all interested in this great improvement. We heard arguments adduced by the represent-

atives of the conventions that assembled in Saint Louis in October last. We listened to representations and arguments made by boards of trade and chambers of commerce, and by representatives from all over this country. The Mississippi River commission was heard at great length before our committee, and it was unanimously resolved by the Committee on Commerce that liberal appropriations should be made this year to carry out this improvement. We do not give, it is true, all that was asked for, but we give all that the commission ask for below Cairo to the head of the passes, to wit, \$4,123.

I have made this statement to show that while this bill is large, it is the first river and harbor bill that has contained any appropriation commensurate with the importance of this great improvement, or for carrying on this great improvement as contemplated by the Mississippi River commission. In this connection I desire to say that this improvement has not only attracted the attention of the people of almost the entire country, but it was regarded as of so much importance that the President of the United States thought it incumbent upon him to send a special message to Congress calling attention to this great and needed improvement.

This bill appropriates \$17,342,875 on an estimate in round numbers of \$37,000,000. The river and harbor bill of 1881 appropriated \$11,547,800, upon an estimate of \$25,851,921. I take that as a comparison, because it was discussed in this House and passed by a very large majority by this body and by the Senate. I therefore propose to institute a comparison between the bill now under consideration and the river and harbor bill of last year, which, as has been suggested, was not put through the House under the gag-rule, but was discussed thoroughly on the floor of the House. As I have said, this bill on an estimate of \$37,000,000 appropriates \$17,342,000, and the river and harbor bill of last year on an estimate of \$25,851,921 appropriated \$11,547,800.

The river and harbor bill of 1881 contained an appropriation of \$2,772,000 only for the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers. The bill now under consideration contains an appropriation of \$6,663,000 for these two great rivers of the country, making an excess of appropriation for those two rivers by this bill over that of 1881 of nearly \$4,000,000.

This bill appropriates \$5,795,075 in excess of the bill of last year; but from that amount should be deducted \$3,864,000 given to the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers in excess of what was given last year, which leaves for the other works in the country \$1,931,000 more appropriated by this bill than by the bill of last year.

I shall propose to show that in the distribution of this money the Committee on Commerce attempted to be absolutely fair. They thought it incumbent upon them to read over carefully the reports of the local engineers in charge of the works, as well as the report of the Chief of the Engineer Bureau here in Washington. The committee went over those reports twice very carefully, and this is the only way in which your committee could determine where this money could be best expended.

Let me say here before I forget it that this committee did not consider itself responsible in any sense for these large appropriations. They are simply providing for the continuance of works already begun by a former Congress. But your committee believe that the money has been wisely expended, and that this large amount of money can be wisely expended this year.

We found the estimates of the Engineer Department to be about \$37,000,000 in round numbers. We carefully looked over all the items to ascertain from their reports where this money could be best expended. In my judgment we have distributed it in as fair a manner as any river and harbor bill ever distributed any money.

This excess has not been given, as some might suppose, to unimportant streams or to localities that did not need it. If members of the Committee of the Whole will bear with me for a few moments I will tell them where the amount has been distributed.

The harbor of Baltimore receives \$300,000 in excess of the amount appropriated for that purpose by the bill of last year. Why is this? It is in evidence that that harbor needs this amount; that it has become a necessity that it should be improved. It is certainly second in importance to no harbor in the United States. The report of the engineer is that there should be a certain amount of dredging done in order to give the proper facilities to commerce. It was represented to the committee that a small appropriation would simply be continuing in it the dredging necessary to be employed there and the dredges would be always in the way of the shipping, and the sooner the work can be done and the dredges are out of the way the better not only for the commerce of that harbor but for the country.

Providence River and Narraganset Bay, in the State of Rhode Island, receive \$65,000 in excess of what was given last year. Charleston Harbor, South Carolina, receives \$125,000 in excess of last year, and Savannah Harbor, Georgia, receives \$135,000 in excess of the amount appropriated by the river and harbor bill of last year.

And let me say, as I pass along, that perhaps no work appropriated for in this bill shows a greater necessity for money to be expended than the work on these two harbors in the South, as represented to the committee.

Galveston Harbor receives \$50,000 more than last year; Chicago Harbor \$50,000; Oakland Harbor, in the State of California, \$140,000; Buffalo Harbor \$25,000; Delaware Breakwater \$125,000, and other small harbors receive amounts ranging from \$20,000 upward over what was appropriated for the same purpose in the bill of last year.

And Lynn Harbor, in the State of Massachusetts, receives \$60,000 in excess of the amount appropriated last year.

In regard to the State of Texas, for instance, we found that that State was growing more rapidly than any other State in this Union. Railroads are being built there to an extent unprecedented before in the history of this country. We found that it was absolutely important that the bayous and bays along the Gulf of Mexico should be opened up to the commerce of the country.

In this connection I desire to say that to-day the wheat that is produced in Oregon and California finds its way by rail across the State of California through the Territories of Arizona and New Mexico, and across the State of Texas to the Gulf at Galveston, or continuing across Louisiana to New Orleans, where it is shipped to Liverpool cheaper than it can be sent around the Horn on a six months' voyage.

Now, we regard these things as important to the commerce of the country, that the wheat crop of California and Oregon, amounting to fifty and sixty million cents every year, can be sent to Europe now direct from California and Oregon across the continent and to the Gulf by rail rather than necessitating a six months' trip around the Horn.

As to the harbors which received an appropriation in excess of the amounts appropriated last year, this excess amounts to \$1,150,000. The principal rivers which receive an appropriation beyond that made last year are, Saginaw, Michigan, \$115,000; Hay Lake, \$200,000; Columbia River, \$200,000; Sacramento River, \$190,000; and Kentucky River, \$75,000; making in all \$1,930,000 given to these important works—not little rivers or harbors where there is no commerce, but the most important rivers and harbors of the country. And this bill, with its aggregate appropriation of \$17,300,000, carries, outside of the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers, appropriations of only a little over \$10,000,000; so that this bill so far as it affects the whole country is not larger in amount than that which passed a year ago. But the bill appropriates for these great natural water-ways of the country this additional amount of \$6,666,000, and I believe there is no member of this House who will not concede that this money can be properly expended on these great national highways. They are the only avenues by which competition can be created with the railroad transportation of the country. You have allowed the rivers and harbors of this country to remain too long unimproved; so that we have been absolutely in the hands of the railroad monopolies. It has been shown by testimony before our committee that wherever there is water transportation competing with the railroad routes of the country railroad freights are nearly 50 per cent. less than where there is no such competition.

Mr. Chairman, this bill deals very liberally with the Southern section of the country. We believe this liberality is called for by the improved condition of affairs in that section. During the war the Southern States received, of course, no appropriations; since the war they have not received their fair share of the appropriations for rivers and harbors; they have not received the proportion to which the commerce of those localities is justly entitled. We have sought in this bill to deal absolutely fairly in the distribution of this money, giving a proper amount to the various rivers and harbors that needed it. We have given this year about 45 per cent. of the estimates; that is all.

In this bill we have omitted thirty-five items which were contained in the river and harbor bill of last year for which at that time nearly \$400,000 were appropriated. We have added some new works, but they are very few. We have inserted in the bill a clause with reference to surveys which I think will be commended by every member on this floor.

It is found that every year there has been a basketful of petitions asking for surveys, and provisions for these surveys have been inserted in the river and harbor appropriation bills because they carried with them at the time no appropriation for any work of improvement. But it has been found that in almost every instance the making of a survey has been followed by an appropriation where the report of the engineers has justified it. In this bill we have provided that when applications for surveys are made the Chief of the Bureau of Engineers, before ordering a survey, shall cause an examination to be made by the local engineer, and if the local engineer reports it as an improvement to commerce that a survey should be made, with an estimate of the cost of the improvement, the chief of the bureau orders the survey made. But if the survey does not appear to be important, no such order is made. In my judgment, and in the judgment of the committee, this provision will relieve future Congresses—

Mr. BLOUNT. Is that a general provision of law, or does it relate merely to these appropriations?

Mr. PAGE. It is a provision in this river and harbor bill applying to the surveys here designated.

Mr. BLOUNT. It is not in the form of a permanent and general law?

Mr. PAGE. No, sir. Mr. Chairman, in the opinion of the committee, if this provision should be adopted it will prevent in a great many cases these applications for surveys of unimportant rivers for which appropriations have been asked in the past.

After the committee had carefully gone over this bill the first time we invited every member of the House to appear before us and give

his reasons, if he had any, why the appropriations for his State or district should be increased or reduced. In no instance, I believe, did one member appear before the committee protesting that the appropriation proposed by the committee was too large; on the contrary, in every instance where there was complaint it was because the appropriations were too small. We believed that the Representatives on this floor should have free access to the committee; and consequently after we had gone over the bill the first time every member, as I have said, was invited to appear before us and was granted all the time that we could possibly give him to present the facts in reference to the improvement of the rivers and harbors in his State or Congressional district. Many members—I believe at least three-fourths of the members of this House—availed themselves of this invitation and came before the committee, although a number did not, for we recognize the fact that there are many gentlemen on this floor who, so far as their own districts are concerned, have no interest in the improvement of rivers and harbors.

Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to occupy further at this time the attention of the committee, but will reserve the residue of my time until the close of the debate. I trust that the House, when it comes to consider the bill by sections, will join the committee in preventing any amendments being made to the bill. We want to pass the bill as it is. It has received the careful consideration of the committee, and I believe the committee were better competent to judge of the importance of this matter, and the necessity for these appropriations, and the proper distribution of this money, than the members who have not given it the study and thought which the committee have done. I trust, therefore, we will be able to pass the bill without any material amendment to it; and I will say in all frankness that I am acting under the instructions of the committee when I say I shall do all I can to prevent any amendment being made to the bill.

We know it is a large bill, but we believe the circumstances under which we are acting now and the condition of affairs in this country demand this appropriation should be made and this large amount of money should be given to these two great and important highways of commerce.

I yield the floor to my colleague on the committee, [Mr. HERR,] but reserve whatever time I may have left of my hour. How much time is there remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has thirty-five minutes of his time remaining.

Mr. PAGE. Very well; I reserve that time and will use it hereafter.

Mr. HERR. Mr. Chairman, in discussing the river and harbor appropriation bill I am aware of the embarrassing fact that it is a dry subject. I wish to state in the outset that there is an impression in the country, and one that is shared by some members in this House, that there is in some manner connected with every river and harbor bill a job; that they are gotten up on the principle of "you tickle me and I will tickle you." You hear such announcement made in this House by the few, and I am glad to say very few, men who oppose the improvement of our rivers and harbors, and the same thing is stated by a portion of the press of the country.

In the outset let me say, Mr. Chairman, that there is not one particle of truth in this insinuation or impression. I am ready to defend this bill, and to say that there is no measure before this House which is founded more completely and certainly upon safe and just business principles than the river and harbor bill now being considered.

I know we hear a great deal about what this State gets and what that State gets, but that has nothing to do with this bill. If these works which we seek to improve are not national works; if they do not walk over and go beyond all State lines, then this is not a proper bill at all. And, I repeat, the question of any State getting this much or that much has nothing to do with this bill; but I will speak on that point hereafter.

I wish to call the attention of the House first to the fact that the river and harbor bill has its origin in a peculiar feature which distinguishes barbarous nations from civilized nations.

The first thing that a nation attempts to do, or rather that individuals attempt to do when they form a community, is to build roads, to prepare ways of transportation, modes of communication with each other. When a people get together in a new country the very first thing they build is a highway, perhaps a corduroy road over some swamp; then comes the turnpike; next comes the railroad, and with that the improvement of all the great water-ways of the country. Therefore I say that nothing distinguishes a civilized nation from a barbarous nation more than its means of transportation, its facilities for communicating with the rest of mankind. Then let me say right here that every well-to-do farmer in the land, every prosperous business man, every township and county throughout our entire country, has, or should have, each year a bill for internal improvements, if you please, a river and harbor bill.

Now, this has its origin, if you will think for a moment, in the very necessities of life. The main problem which every savage is compelled to solve is how to get something to eat. That is about his only want; civilization adds to that other wants. Civilized man must have not only food but fuel, clothing, education. The real work of the great mass of mankind is to get bread, clothing, wherewithal to keep them warm, and to educate themselves and their

children the best they can. Hence it is that anything and everything which tends to cheapen food, fuel, and clothing, and to give that inter-commerce between people which leads so much to intellectual development, aids in the advancement of a true civilization. But I do not propose to philosophize much about this bill.

It is singular that whenever a river and harbor bill comes before the House we always have a few men in our midst, and notably my distinguished friend from New York, [Mr. COX,] who immediately have spasms, and we always expect to listen to the statements from my distinguished friend and others, first on the "macadamizing" of streams, and second on the improvement of "trout creeks."

I hope to show, Mr. Chairman, before I get through, so clearly that I trust every man here will be satisfied, that this bill is not made in the interest of "macadamizing" any streams. It is no easy task to frame a river and harbor bill that shall be perfect in all its parts. There are many interests which conflict; and I do not pretend to say there are not items in this bill which I did not vote to put there. There are a number of items in it which some one member or more of the committee voted against; but on the whole I say that it is as judiciously drawn, as fairly made up, as any bill possibly can be which has to deal with such vast and complicated interests, and which must be framed on such information only as is usually furnished in reference to the importance and public necessity of the various works provided for.

Had we made the bill as large as our brother members endeavored to have us make it, had we appropriated just the amount of money they sought to have us appropriate, and had we given the full amounts in the present bill which we were urged to give, the bill now before us would have been presented for your consideration covering an amount of \$40,000,000 at least, instead of the \$17,342,875 which it now contains. And, Mr. Chairman, let me add right here that so far as I know there is not a single member here who claims that a single stream in his locality and which he knows the most about has received a dollar in excess of its real needs.

Hardly a member or a delegation appeared before our committee who omitted to inform us that we had a full Treasury, that we had plenty of money, and that by reason of this full Treasury we could afford to make large appropriations for their particular stream or harbor. I do not sympathize with that class of statesmen who think that a full Treasury is a calamity. I have no sympathy whatever with the idea that this nation is going to be embarrassed because it can pay its debt too soon. I have myself before now been a good deal troubled and embarrassed because I could not pay mine when they were due. [Laughter.] But I never was bothered by being able to pay too soon, before they were due. While, therefore, this full Treasury is not an argument to justify a single lavish expenditure, as one member of this committee I say frankly that we as business men did take it into account to some extent in making up the amount of this bill. The bill undoubtedly would not have been as large as it now is if the Treasury had been empty. I believe that any business man, that any farmer, if he desired to improve his farm would do it more freely and liberally when he had a good crop, a full granary, or the money to pay with, than he would if he was unable to pay his grocery bill, and owed other bills besides that he could not meet. As business men, then, we did think that while, as I have said, it was no excuse for, nor would it justify the lavish expenditure of a single dollar, still a full Treasury was undoubtedly a reason why we could and should give for works that are proper a sufficient amount to carry them forward, and make an effort in the direction of completing many of these works of great public importance at this time while we have the means on hand with which we can do it. The country might be in such a condition that it would be improper to appropriate a dollar for the improvement of our rivers and harbors; but at this time your committee felt that the condition of the Treasury warranted necessary, if not liberal, appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, this bill was not drawn for the purpose of making any discrimination between sections; there is no partisanship in it, nor was it drawn by allowing everything that was sought to be appropriated or that was asked for by members. I have heard it claimed here upon the floor of this House that the Commerce Committee allows streams to be improved simply for the purpose of getting somebody's vote. I desire to say that such an idea was never entertained in our committee, and I know the committee will bear me out in the statement that the question was never mentioned by anybody during the preparation of the bill, nor was any question of sectionalism or partisanship connected with its preparation in any manner. On the contrary, the bill is almost the unanimous judgment of the committee, based solely upon the reports of the engineers, and such other reliable information as was furnished the committee. Why, sir, we threw out, as the chairman of the committee just a few moments ago said, of new works which were presented to us, thirty-seven in all. The amount estimated for these thirty-seven works was \$2,178,000. Of those appropriated for last year thirty-five were thrown out. The appropriation for these thirty-five last year amounted to \$391,000, and they asked this year for these same works \$951,000. Thus we rejected items amounting to \$3,129,400, and we put into this bill new works, forty in number, amounting to \$672,972.

Now, the total number of appropriations made in this bill is three hundred and fifty-one, and you gentlemen who have such scruples

about the improvement of small streams will please now to go with me through this bill and let us examine in detail some of the facts in connection with it. There are in the bill, as I have said, three hundred and fifty-one appropriations. Of this number there are sixty-one appropriations for sums less than \$5,000 each; they aggregate a total of \$167,900. Now, understand this; the amount appropriated for the streams that get less than \$5,000 each, aggregates only \$167,900—is less than 1 per cent. of the bill. Not 1 per cent. of this bill is given to those sixty-one items. If you include those at \$5,000 and under, there are one hundred and seven in the bill, almost one-third of the total number of appropriations, and they aggregate only \$337,000. All of the streams of \$5,000, and less, amount to only about 2 per cent. of this bill. Those that are under \$10,000 number one hundred and thirty-nine and aggregate \$631,900. Take those that are \$10,000, and under, and they aggregate only \$1,021,000. Now, compare this with the cities of Baltimore, Galveston, and Charleston, South Carolina. These three cities have in this bill \$1,050,000. That is to say, these three cities have \$23,000 more than the entire one hundred and eighty-seven works of \$10,000 and less.

What then becomes of all this talk about the appropriations for improving small streams? You will see that if there is anything that ails this bill it is not the little rivers and harbors, and no complaint of that character can justly be made. Figures and facts are stubborn things.

Again, Mr. Chairman, of the appropriations made by this bill which are \$20,000 and under there are two hundred and forty-one in all, aggregating \$2,046,900.

Why, the Mississippi River alone below Cairo gets twice as much money as these entire two hundred and forty-one rivers and harbors appropriated for in this bill. One hundred and ten items of the bill of \$25,000 and upward get \$15,295,975. There are in the bill seventeen items that aggregate over \$9,000,000; thirty-four items that aggregate \$11,250,000. Thus you see the "small streams" are not what have swelled this bill to its present proportions.

But right here I want to enter just a moment's plea for these little streams. Last year during the discussion of this bill I was very much interested and also entertained by the persistent attack on these little rivers made by my friend from Iowa, [Mr. UPDEGRAFF,] and by some other gentlemen on both sides of the House. Living, as I do, on a stream whose commerce is \$35,000,000 a year, it was natural that I should go into this investigation prejudiced against these small streams. But I say to this House frankly that my investigation of this subject and the study I have given it upon my committee has convinced me beyond all question that my opposition and feeling on that subject were wrong. Five thousand dollars given to some little stream will do a small community, away up in the mountains perhaps of Tennessee, or in the barren portions of Alabama, an immense amount of good. It is perhaps their only way of exit, their only outlet. And I say to you that \$5,000 is due to that community of struggling frontiersmen as much as \$450,000 is due to the great city of Baltimore. We have omitted, however, many of these small streams, simply when we could not find that they had commerce enough to make them of national importance.

It is a little singular why some members oppose this bill. If they do not happen to have in their district a navigable stream, then they are against the river and harbor bill. Well, now, did it ever occur to the members of this House that a country cannot be all stream—that it cannot be all harbor? And did it ever occur to you that we are compelled to improve a stream where it is instead of where it is not; and that the same thing is equally true of harbors? My friend here from Indiana, [Mr. BROWNE,] who perhaps opposes this bill, should understand that the reason why we did not appropriate money to improve Hell Gate in Indiana is because Hell Gate is not in Indiana. [Laughter.] The reason we put large appropriations in different States is because they have rivers in those States or rivers and harbors bordering upon them. The reason Michigan has more in this bill than Indiana is because Michigan has more than twenty times as much lake coast as Indiana.

And now I want the attention for a moment of my friend from New York, [Mr. COX,] who perhaps may follow me, because I want him to explain to this House the magnanimity of the opposition to this bill on the part of a certain class of men who represent certain portions of this country. And in order that I may do this intelligently I have looked up some of the things that have been done heretofore for some of the harbors and some of the rivers in this country. I find that the city of Boston had, up to 1879, one million and a half of money. And how is it with the city of New York, a city one of whose members has always presented in this House for eighteen years the most vigorous onslaughts on the river and harbor bill—for I think my friend boasted the other day that for eighteen long years, with no exception, year in and year out, he had brought to bear the power of his eloquence and the aid of his genius against this river and harbor bill, and he seemed to wonder that, notwithstanding his efforts, the bill kept growing larger. [Laughter.]

Now, what has New York had? Three million three thousand dollars, to improve its Harlem and East Rivers and to make it possible to get through Hell Gate to that great city with the large boats that float upon the ocean. The Hudson River, the great New York feeder, has had \$1,372,000. The city of Baltimore has had \$2,000,000 up to now; Buffalo, \$2,000,000; the Cape Fear River,

\$1,430,000; the Charleston Harbor, \$1,000,000; Cleveland, \$650,000; the Delaware Breakwater, \$2,300,000; that is for Philadelphia's benefit. The Delaware River, \$600,000; the Des Moines River—and I ask the attention of my friends from Iowa, who are now aching so because this bill does not give Iowa so much as she wants—the Des Moines Rapids has had \$3,500,000; Dunkirk, \$430,000; Erie, Pennsylvania, \$600,000; Fox River, Wisconsin, and Wisconsin River combined, \$2,000,000; Illinois River, \$640,000. The Great Kanawha River over \$1,000,000. Michigan City, the only port, perhaps, in the State of Indiana, \$680,000. Now, before I get through I shall show that we are in the habit of charging up to a State works that do not properly belong to her; that is the case with this one. Indiana is not interested in that improvement at Michigan City any more than other States; because it is made mostly for a harbor of refuge, which is built to protect the entire commerce of Lake Michigan. It is not for Indiana's benefit, but it is for the benefit of the nation. And what I want the statesmen here to understand is that they ought to rise above this State twaddle, and if a thing is for the good of this whole country they ought to support it, as members of this great national council. But, to proceed with these former appropriations, the Falls of Saint Anthony have had \$580,000; Mobile, Alabama, \$700,000; Oswego, New York, \$1,264,000; Red River, \$1,280,000; Rock Island Bridge and Rock Island River, \$2,000,000; Savannah River and Harbor, \$800,000.

Now, I must say that after this list of amounts for improvements that have been received by the large rivers and cities of this country, it comes with ill grace from any man from those sections to stand up here and object to \$5,000 or \$15,000 to improve, say the Tallapoosa River, down in Alabama, where my friend, Mr. WILLIAMS, lives, simply because that has not got as much commerce as these great harbors and rivers have. Is it not magnanimous for the gentleman from New York, after that city has had over \$3,000,000, to vote steadily against giving the smaller rivers and harbors of the South and West a single dollar?

As I have already said, \$5,000 may help a small stream and let its people out. It will not enable it to float the Great Eastern; it will not let in between its banks the great lake and ocean steamers. But it will enable it to float a side or stern-wheel steamer and a flat-boat, and make it possible for the people to have communication with the outside world, and render their habitation in the hills of that country endurable.

I wish to say now that in order to arrive at a fair understanding of this bill I have divided it into five sections. I only regret that I have not a map here so that I could illustrate to the House the exact manner in which this money is distributed over the country.

Before I give you the five divisions, let me state that this bill appropriates \$5,678,000 for the main trunk of the Mississippi River, for the principal stream; and \$990,000 for the main stream of the Missouri River.

I have taken the entire Mississippi Valley as one division. You understand what I mean. The Mississippi River and every stream that runs into it, or that runs into a stream which runs into it, constituting the great water shed of what is called the Mississippi Valley. This bill contains \$8,705,000 for the Mississippi River and its tributaries, the Mississippi Valley proper; over one-half of the amount appropriated by the bill. And if my strength permits, before I get through I desire to defend that appropriation of \$8,705,000 as best I can against the complaints of the press and of people, who in my judgment have never given the subject careful study.

The next division is the Atlantic coast and all the rivers that empty into the Atlantic. This bill contains appropriations amounting to \$3,783,000 for those streams and harbors on the Atlantic coast.

The Gulf of Mexico, exclusive of the Mississippi River, has \$1,452,000. That is for the Gulf coast, and the streams that empty into the Gulf, with the exception of the Mississippi River.

The great lakes, commencing at Duluth and ending at the Saint Lawrence River, with all the rivers that empty into them, have \$2,151,000. And the Pacific coast and all the rivers that empty into the Pacific have \$1,105,500. This mere statement shows how generally and equitably we have spread these appropriations over the entire country.

Now, after this statement you will see the utter nonsense of undertaking to discuss this bill upon the question of State lines—of what this State or that State receives in the bill. Take my own State of Michigan, because if there is a State whose members are generally charged with being in favor of a river and harbor bill, because they say all of us have "pork" in it, it is Michigan.

In this bill Michigan has \$740,000. What I mean by that is that the works in the bill marked to Michigan have an allowance of that amount. Out of that \$740,000 is, first, the harbor of refuge at Portage Lake, \$20,000; the harbor of refuge at Sand Beach, \$50,000; the harbor of refuge at Grand Marais, \$40,000; the ice-harbor of refuge at Belle River, \$5,000; the Detroit River, \$50,000; the Sault Ste. Marie River, the channel which connects Lake Superior with Lake Huron, \$200,000. That makes \$375,000, over one-half she has in this bill, that is not for Michigan any more than for any other State in the Union.

Those items are simply to prepare a great water-way from Chicago and Milwaukee, from Duluth and the headwaters of Lake Superior and Lake Michigan to the sea. It is simply to improve all those

rivers that happen to touch upon the borders of Michigan, and in which the State of Michigan has not one cent of interest more than any other State in that section of the country.

There has already been appropriated for the improvement of the Saint Clair flats, which is one portion of this great channel between the lakes, \$653,000; for the Sault Ste. Marie Canal, which enables vessels to get around the rapids going from Lake Superior to Lake Huron, \$3,215,000; the Detroit River, \$275,000; the harbor of refuge at Sand Beach, \$700,000.

In all over \$4,000,000 have been appropriated and charged to Michigan within the last few years simply for the benefit of the general commerce on these lakes, and to enable commerce on this great waterway to get to the ocean, and in which Michigan has no special interest whatever.

Do you gentlemen here know what that great water route is? Have you any conception of the amount of shipping and of the tonnage that passes through the Detroit River every year? It was stated by one gentleman before our committee—and I think I have been able to verify his statement from examination—that every year more tonnage passes by the city of Detroit, through the Detroit River, than enters into the great harbor of Liverpool, England; and the harbor of Liverpool is considered the great shipping depot of the world.

It is for that commerce that these appropriations have been made. And is there any man here bold enough to rise up and say that it is not in the interest of the whole country that that great waterway should be improved? Can any one claim that these amounts should in any sense be charged to my State? That leaves in this bill for Michigan proper only \$365,000. Now, when you take into account the fact that Michigan has 1,600 miles of lake coast, I submit that the amount she receives is very moderate. There is another singular thing about the opposition to this bill. It always comes from gentlemen who would have us believe that they are really great friends of internal improvements, but that the trouble is with some features of the present bill. The singular thing is that they always have this trouble over the bill being discussed—that they are always in favor of some bill that is not reported.

We met in the committee in the preparation of this bill with another singular claim. Men who came before us claimed that they were entitled to this or that large appropriation because forsooth large collections of revenue were made in their vicinity. Now, have you thought of it? What is the basis that should rule the Committee on Commerce in making appropriations? Certainly not the collection of customs.

The city of New York alone collected \$138,908,000 of the \$198,000,000 of customs collected last year. The city of New York did not pay it, and she is not entitled therefore to four-fifths, nay seven-eighths, of all the money appropriated in the river and harbor bill. That has nothing to do with it; it only shows the amount of commerce that the place has.

Boston collected \$21,000,000 and over, Philadelphia \$10,000,000, San Francisco nearly \$6,000,000, Baltimore over \$3,000,000, New Orleans \$2,500,000, Chicago \$2,500,000, and Saint Louis over \$1,000,000. And nobody can for a moment claim that on that account these places are entitled to any more consideration, only so far as it shows the amount of commerce that floated into these towns.

It is just so with the internal revenue. When men came before us from Illinois or Indiana or Kentucky they wanted an appropriation according to the amount of whisky and tobacco they made or raised and sold.

Mr. BROWNE. As to whisky, that cannot be true in reference to Indiana.

Mr. HERR. From what do you make your \$7,000,000 of internal revenue—\$7,670,000—if not from whisky? Do you raise that much tobacco? Illinois alone collected revenue amounting to over \$25,000,000, almost \$26,000,000; Ohio, over \$19,000,000; New York, \$17,000,000; Kentucky, over \$8,000,000; Pennsylvania, \$7,600,000; Indiana, more than \$7,000,000; Missouri, \$6,000,000; Virginia, over \$6,000,000. Thus you have eight cities that collect seven-eighths of the customs duties of the country and eight States that collect \$98,000,000 out of \$135,000,000 of the internal revenue. But they do not pay it. This does not entitle them to have a proportional amount spent on the improvement of their streams and harbors if they happen to have any. These cities are simply toll-gates. New York City is simply a toll-gate on the great route that carries our imports to the people of this country. Who ever heard of a person running a turnpike and spending all the money right opposite the toll-gate and none on the rest of the road? [Laughter.] That is exactly what these gentlemen would claim who think that such collections entitle their cities or States to large sums in this bill.

The improvement of our rivers and harbors is a great national work. Let me repeat, the nation does not run by States. If it did my friend from Indiana would have had few letters circulated in his State, lo, these many years. There are only twelve States in the Union that pay in postage the expense of the mail transportation within their borders. The people of the rest of the States, as they tell us, have to put their hands in their pockets to pay these deficiencies. Indiana almost reached a paying basis last year, and is probably upon that basis this year. Five of these States that pay belong to little New England. I wish to say right here before

I forget it that one thing which distinguishes New England from the rest of this country is the fact that she attends to her internal improvements. Massachusetts—ay, all New England—has reason to be proud of the statesmen produced by that section in the past. Communities that can boast of Webster, John Quincy Adams, and men of that caliber, have reason to be proud of their civilization. But they also have reason to be proud of their beautiful roads, which enable a man to ride all over that country with such ease and elegance. That is simply another form of internal improvements.

But to return to this postage business. Suppose in running this Government we undertake to send letters to those States only that pay back in postage the amount expended within their borders; would that be fair? Certainly not. The reason New York pays so much postage is that she receives the letters from the entire west of this country, and she is compelled to write back in order to make out of the rest of the country the money that she so much loves to make.

Now, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, and five of the New England States (leaving out Vermont) were the only States that ever paid in postage the amount spent within their borders for mail expenses up to 1881. But should not the other States have their mails carried? Why, sir, I say there is no nobler work done by this great American Republic than when it sends its mail-carrier with his little mail-bag into the fastnesses of the mountains and up the streams of the West to carry messages of love and joy to those frontier men who are risking their lives to develop and reclaim that new country. [Applause.] So on these little streams. Let us take into account the whole country, and make our appropriations for the benefit of the whole country. And hereafter, as with the mails so with the improvements of our navigable streams, let no man talk about the amount this State or that State pays, nor the amount this State or that State receives; the only question should be, is the improvement needed, and is it within the borders of our growing nation? Let us cease this bickering about the States, and rise to higher, broader considerations in the investigation of these great national subjects.

Now, there happens to be a notion, I do not know how it originated, that the money appropriated in the river and harbor bill is thrown away. "A great steal!" you will hear people say. Where? Who steals it? What river is there that is not being well improved? Where is there one that the work is not well done? Is there a man on this floor who knows of any of this work being done by the Government that is not done carefully, judiciously, and economically? If there is, let him speak. In all my travels I have yet to see a single instance where the Government engineers are not carefully and laboriously expending the money of the people, so far as they can, on the improvement of these rivers and harbors. The Engineer Department is composed of the very ablest men in the Government service. There is always something to show for your money. It is not thrown away. Every harbor you improve shows the benefit for itself. Every stream that you clean out and prepare for commerce shows for itself how the money has been spent. There is not a dollar of this money that goes as perquisites to any man living. Probably 85 to 90 per cent. goes into muscle, into labor—is expended right in the country where it is raised. It does not impoverish a country to collect its revenues if the money collected is expended to improve the country that paid the taxes.

Mr. Chairman, has it ever occurred to you what is the matter with down-trodden Ireland? I wish I could get the attention of my two Irish friends, Mr. ROBINSON and Mr. COX. [Laughter.] What ails Ireland to-day? It is this: that all the money she can rake and scrape in any way is sent out of the country to pay rents to the landlords who live in England or on the Continent. If the money Ireland digs from her soil were expended among her own people, though some of her rents are high, she would not feel it as she does to-day. Ireland is being stripped simply because every dollar she can make is sent away, is not spent among her people who labor and earn it. Until this one difficulty is remedied you need look for no relief for that unfortunate people.

In this country we do not feel our immense pension list; we do not feel the money we pay out for our necessary public works. Why? Because the money is expended among the laboring classes and goes right back into the pockets of the men who have just paid it, and I have already said that no money is more carefully and judiciously expended than that which is paid out in improving the great highways of this country.

Another queer thing that met us on the committee was this: men would come before us and claim that they should have a large appropriation, owing to the size of their country; that the amount of territory in the vicinity should somehow affect the size of their allowance.

I remember one gentleman from Oregon, who wanted the Columbia River improved, commenced, as my friend GEORGE will recollect, by informing us that the stream he proposed to have improved, drained a country twelve times as large as Massachusetts. That waked brother CANDLER up instantly. [Laughter.] Why, do you not see Texas would have got about all the money there is in the Treasury, if we had gone on that basis. [Renewed laughter.] I made a curious calculation to see where such a rule would land us. If you should give Texas her proportion of a bill made upon the basis of the amount we have given Rhode Island, that is taking what Rhode Island has

got in this bill per square mile and giving to Texas the same amount persquare mile, she would have over \$31,000,000 in this bill, and Rhode Island, instead of getting \$151,000, which she gets now, if you only gave her according to her territory the same amount that Texas has per square mile, instead of \$151,000 she now gets, I say, would get only \$4,000. [Laughter.]

Your committee finally came to the conclusion in view of all these facts that the only rule to determine the amount of an appropriation was the tonnage that floats through the harbor in and out and over the river that you improve. We believe that to be the fairest test as to the importance of an improvement, and I cannot for my life now see why it is not. Of course the amount to be appropriated will depend largely upon the character of the work. The amount of commerce should settle the question as to beginning the improvement, and the amount to be given should be determined by the cost of the improvement.

I wish to say to the members of the House that I now come to the feature in this bill which gives the most trouble and occasions the most comment throughout the country, and that is the great question of improving the Mississippi River and its tributaries.

I wish to say, Mr. Chairman, that when I commenced working on this Committee on Commerce I was troubled over this Mississippi question. I sat here during the last Congress and listened to the debate on this great problem, and I am frank to say I did not succeed in mastering it, and now I enter upon an attempt to explain the provision of the bill in reference to the Mississippi, or rather the plan of improving the Mississippi, with a great deal of diffidence, because I am aware it is a question which can properly be handled only by experts, by men who have devoted their lives to that kind of study. In this attempt I claim no originality, and shall be more than pleased if I can use the exact expressions of those who explained the plan in our committee meetings.

Let me say in the beginning that I believe the trouble with the Mississippi Valley, I mean the valley of the Lower Mississippi, is this: it is not yet finished; I am speaking geologically—that country is not yet matured. The Mississippi River has not yet completed its channel. If you give nature time she will heal all those crevasses, so as to dig out a channel and leave that entire country dry and tillable. But to do this it would take ages, and what we propose to begin by this bill, and what the commission which has the matter in charge propose to do, is to hurry nature up in this work; to do for the river in a few years what nature would certainly do if you would give her ample time.

All I shall say in reference to this valley and this great work comes from a careful study of the reports and from listening to the engineers as they describe the work they propose to do.

The first thing to be understood in examining the Mississippi question is the kind of a river the Mississippi is. It is a sediment-bearing stream, a silt-bearing stream, if you please. The same laws which apply to a stream which carries an immense amount of sand and mud in its water will not apply to the clear-running stream that passes over a rocky bottom.

The engineers tell us there are three laws, and three only, necessary to be understood before you can get any proper conception of the plan of improvement of the Mississippi River. The first of these is that there exists an intimate relation between the velocity of a stream and the amount of sediment that it will carry. I hope my friend from Louisiana [Mr. GIBSON] will correct me if I make any mistake as I go along, as he is more familiar with this subject than I am; but I think I have it clear in my mind, although it is a problem which needs longer study than I have been able to give to it to enable me to state with complete accuracy all the laws and conditions that relate to it.

I say the first law is this, that there is a very close and intimate relation existing between the velocity of a stream and the amount of sediment it will carry, so that the more you increase the velocity the more sediment it will take along with it. Our own experience proves that; we know it in our little creeks and ditches on our farms. Take any stream and increase its velocity and it will always take up more sediment and dig out a deeper channel. That is the law I refer to. Now the converse would be true, that the moment you slacken the velocity of a stream it will give up its sediment and deposit it.

The next law is that the velocity of a stream depends upon the slope or upon the fall of its water; that is, if you increase the fall you increase the velocity and thereby increase the sediment-bearing property.

The third law is, that in opposition to this slope, to retard the progress of a stream, is the surface of the river bed—the friction, as it is called. Now, understand that it is a simple law which can easily be demonstrated that the greater the friction the less the velocity. For instance, if you take a tube with a diameter of one foot, and another which is four feet in diameter, the friction in the tube of four feet diameter will be four times greater than in the 1-foot tube; but the 4-foot tube will carry through it a volume of water sixteen times as large as the 1-foot tube. Consequently, while the friction in the 4-foot tube is four times greater than in the other, the discharge of water from the larger tube is sixteen times greater; so that in proportion to the discharge of water the friction is greatly lessened by increasing the size of the aperture or tube through which the water flows.

If this be true, and Captain Eads tells us that these three propositions embrace the entire philosophy of this great river, then our

course in reference to its improvement would be based upon simple philosophical laws. The bed of the Mississippi River is to a certain extent the one-half of a circle or circular tube. The more, then, you can increase the slope, for instance, by raising the head of the water at Cairo while the other end of the tube at the Gulf remains the same, the level of the ocean being always fixed, the greater will be the velocity of the water in the stream; and consequently the more water will be discharged. The more you can increase the quantity of water in the bed of the river, the less the friction will be to the amount of water, and let me show you why. I can illustrate it to a certain extent by showing you by this diagram a cross-section of the bed of the Mississippi. You will see that the friction of the river on its bed is indicated by the entire line commencing at the top of the water level on one side and following the bed of the river up to the opposite side at the top of the water. Now, when the river comes up so that you raise the water, say five feet, you have still the friction of the entire bed of the river as before. But you have all of the vast volume of water which is represented by five solid feet in depth clear across the stream with the small additional friction of only five feet on each bank. It does not have any effect at all on the rest of the river; that is to say, there is little additional friction on the bottom caused by the increased quantity of water. It is estimated that a rise of six feet in the Mississippi will double the amount of water that will flow through its channel. Consequently when you raise a river by a flood you not only add to the slope, giving it a deeper pitch, but you lessen the friction in proportion to the amount of water discharged, and thus you increase the velocity by this double power. And when you increase the velocity you increase the power of the river to cut its own channel and carry the sediment down the stream. I think that is a proposition which is perfectly plain as I have expressed it. This is a matter which has been the subject of experimental work on the river.

The passes at the mouth of the river illustrate the principle. There were three passes at the mouth of the river. One of these passes which was improved was twelve miles in length. How was it improved? In what way was the work done? Why, Mr. Eads, the engineer, made nature do it by fixing a few dams at certain points in the two outside passes and diverting the current of the river into the center of this channel he desired to deepen. He took two of the passes and threw small mattress dams across the bottom of them to check the current, and this caused a deposit beside these dams, filling up the river at that point so as to throw a larger volume of water into the channel of the unobstructed pass. He then placed mattresses or revetments to keep the water of the stream in the twelve-mile channel confined, and when a flood came the extra water was forced into this middle channel, and the laws of nature did the work. The water was increased in quantity; this gave an increased velocity, and it picked up the sediment from the bottom and carried it with it into the Gulf. In that way this channel was deepened. A channel which up to that time had been utterly impassable except for small vessels, now deepened by this scouring process of nature, has a depth of twenty-five and a half feet through its entire length. And this was accomplished by the simple principle that when water is confined to a narrow channel and its amount increased its friction is decreased and its velocity increased, and thus you enable it to take the sediment out of the way and deposit it at some point where the velocity of the current is checked.

Now comes the other question, why is it that opening a crevasse in the banks of a river shallows the channel of the river? Right here the two systems differ—the outlet system, which some people on this floor I have no doubt believe in, and the system of this commission. I am frank to say that at first this outlet system struck me favorably; but I honestly believe that if any man will carefully examine the report of the commission and the testimony of the engineers in this case, he will become thoroughly satisfied that the outlet system must necessarily be a failure. The moment you make a break in the Mississippi River or any other silt-bearing stream and allow the water to escape and spread over the country, at that very moment you check the current below. The moment you check the current below you diminish the power of the water to carry off the sediment; you stop the flow of the sediment and the channel begins at once gradually to fill up. This is as plain as any other great law of nature, and it is as necessary that there should be a swift current to keep the channel clear as that any other of the laws of nature shall have their fulfillment from natural causes. This result is inevitable; consequently every break or crevasse you make in the banks of such a river injures its channel, shallows it. But I shall come to that further on.

Now, if this theory be true, there are simply two things to be done for the certain improvement of this river: first, confine the channel of the river—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. McLANE. I desire to yield so much of my time to the gentleman from Michigan as will enable him to conclude his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. How much time does the gentleman from Maryland yield?

Mr. McLANE. As much time as the gentleman from Michigan needs.

Mr. HERR. I am very much obliged to the gentleman from Maryland. I was about saying there are two things necessary to do in

order to correct the Mississippi River if this philosophy be true: first, to prevent these overflows, this spreading out of the river, which must of necessity cause bars to form in the river from the stopping of the current; second, in some manner to correct the channel in wide places in the river. I mean by that to narrow up these wide places; that is, there are places where the river is a mile and a half wide, or two miles wide, even three miles. There, of course, the water necessarily spreads out. The moment it spreads out the deposit commences, and you have a large shallow lake there which destroys the velocity and works the mischief heretofore named. Well, they propose by sinking mattresses to correct these wide places, and thereby give a deep and thorough channel to the river through its whole length. That is, I think, all there is in this recommendation of the commission as I understand it.

Right here let me say this work is not entirely experimental. Just below Saint Louis, my friend from Missouri [Mr. CLARKE] knows, and all of us know who have lived near the banks of the Mississippi, that the Horsetail Bar was almost impassable at certain seasons of the year, not having more than three and a half or four feet of water at low stages of the river. The engineers tried a plan of improving that channel with alternate layers of stone and brush and work of that kind and it failed. They finally had their attention called to this method of simply checking the current. The engineer tells us in his report that he employed brush and piles. The water trickled through them; but this law commenced at once to work and wherever the current was retarded the deposit commenced forming; and in one year over sixteen solid feet of material in some places were deposited behind those mattresses and new banks were formed. And now he has corrected that channel and filled that river up by that simple process, so that there are acres and acres of willows growing where the water before stood, and the channel is confined to about twenty-five hundred feet wide and has a depth of from seven to fifteen feet through its entire length. I think I am correct; at least that is his statement. Simply by narrowing the channel the engineer enabled the laws of nature to exert themselves and the swift current picked up the mud and sand in the bottom of the river and dug out a channel for the needs of commerce.

Now, there we have a small stretch of this river that has had this thing tried and what this commission proposes to do is to commence the application of this same principle and extend it to all the shoal places through the entire length of the river. We are also informed that this same plan has been adopted on the River Po in Europe and that it has succeeded perfectly in correcting the channel of that river in giving deep water and in preventing disastrous overflows.

But we are met right here with the outlet doctrine, and my strength does not warrant me in attempting to refute that theory to any extent. We had presented to our committee, and every member on this floor has heard it discussed, the question whether, by letting the water out of the river at places along its course, you cannot stop these enormous floods. Now, the Corps of Engineers who have examined this matter are unanimous in their verdict that such a thing cannot be done. When that commission was formed, two at least of its members believed in the outlet system; but when they came to give it the thorough study which men give who have to act upon their own responsibility on great questions of this kind, they unanimously came to the conclusion that an outlet at Lake Borgne or anywhere else would not help the Mississippi River at all in preventing these floods, but would in the end injure the stream. What is the matter with the Mississippi? Why does it have these floods? That is no doubt a hard question to answer. It is not, however, because the water is dammed up at the mouth. There are some things I can state to you as not being true, though I may not be able to tell you all that is true about this difficult subject. How do I know that these floods are not produced because the water is dammed up at the mouth? Why? Because the water at New Orleans has not been as high during the recent flood by five inches as it has in past floods. And yet the flood above has been probably higher than any flood ever before known. That shows at once the trouble is not down at New Orleans. Why, the trouble is not anywhere in the Lower Mississippi. Where the banks are complete and the river is confined to its channel, nature has there performed her work, and the more water you turn into the river when its banks confine it the surer you are to keep its channel deep; that enables the water to bear its load of sediment untroubled to the sea. The waters that make the flood do not come from New Orleans; they come from away up the river. They come from the Ohio and Upper Mississippi and the Missouri Rivers.

The floods are worse than they used to be, and I think I know why that is. First, the clearing up of the country on the tributaries above sends the water down more rapidly than it came in former days. The crevasses, over one hundred and ninety miles of them, commence settling mud in the bottom of the river. At first it is not perceptible. The moment the crevasse takes place and the water rushes off in either direction the mud in the river commences piling up on account of the slowness of the current below the break, and that process keeps repeating itself for years. Now, if you take a tube two feet long and undertake to force water through it you can fill it to its full capacity, but if you make it sixteen feet long, though the tube is still the same size, you cannot get anything like the amount of water through that you can through this tube that is only two feet in length.

Why? On account of the friction of its sides lasting so much longer. This is a simple law well understood by all common observers.

Now, the friction of these shoals, these great beds of sand and silt, which have been deposited in the bottom of the Mississippi River, keeps increasing from year to year until the floods come down from above and when they strike these lengthened bars the water rises up and forces its way over the banks and all over the whole country. What this commission proposes to do is first to repair the crevasses, so as to confine the water in its channel, and then let the water pick up this sediment and carry it on to the ocean.

Right here we are met with the other most troublesome question, that is, the question of levees. That is the great bugbear in the Mississippi River improvement. Nowhere do you hear any one who is opposed to this system speak of it but what the first thing he says is, "Oh, you want to repair those levees, do you? You want to help those fellows out down there so that they can cultivate their land, do you?" Now, the theory of our bill is simply this: to do just so much as the interests of navigation require and no more; but do not forget that these engineers all claim that the closing up of these gaps in the levees is absolutely needed for the successful improvement of the river.

Before I go any further I want to call the attention of this House and the country to one fact. Is it quite sure that because an improvement helps somebody it should not therefore be made? Have you ever thought of that? If an improvement is necessary for the commerce of the country, the fact that it does some individual a little good is not any objection to it, is it?

I find that Toledo, Ohio, has had \$1,564,000 appropriated for its harbor; Boston, Massachusetts, has had \$1,500,000; New York City has had over \$3,000,000. I might go on and give the names of seventeen cities for which have been expended over \$16,000,000; I mean on the harbors of those cities. Now, every dollar of that went to benefit somebody's property in each one of those cities. There is not a city that has not had some advantage in a private way for its people from the expenditure of this public money in making it possible for the commerce of the world to enter its harbors. But you did not refuse the appropriations on that account. You can hardly erect a light-house that will not advance some one's private interests.

The question still comes back: do these levees aid in navigation? Men who claim that they do not generally state the proposition in this way; and it would seem to end this controversy if you do not think anything about it. I hear it stated all around me, and see it in the public press, "the levees cannot aid navigation, because when the river is high there is water enough any way and you do not need them; and when the river is low they do not touch the water, and they cannot help navigation then." That looks clear; that would seem to cover this case.

But the trouble is that when the river is high and goes washing out of its banks and spreading over the country it fills up the bed of the stream with sand and mud, so that when the water gets low there are troubles existing there that would not have existed had the water been confined within the borders of the river so as to carry on its sediment as it ought to have done to the deep waters of the sea. That is all there is of this problem. If the break in these levees be repaired, then the channel of the river can be corrected so as to give its waters that uniform, normal velocity which will give to navigation a deep and permanent course from Cairo to the Gulf.

The whole plan is simply to work by and through the great laws of nature, and with their aid to complete in a few years what nature would most certainly accomplish herself if let alone through the coming ages.

I call the attention of you gentlemen who are fearful about levees to this proposition, and would like you to answer it. If the philosophy of this commission is true, then levees are absolutely necessary for such a great work as this. The outlet system antagonizes this theory from the start. You cannot run the two plans together, and your committee adopted the one decided upon by this commission of able and experienced engineers.

I am astonished that whenever we undertake such a great internal improvement as this the first thing we hear is that it is unconstitutional; that the Government has not the constitutional power to do this kind of work.

Now, I do not claim to bring to the consideration of the constitutional question the astuteness of a technical lawyer, nor even the experience of a constitutional lawyer proper, as I think a man should do who claims to be a judge of constitutional law. But it looks singular to me, in looking over the history of the past, that almost everything that ever benefited this country has been done in spite of these constitutional croakers.

When we undertook to make that great Louisiana purchase, by which Jefferson added so much to his fame as a far-seeing statesman, the land groaned with arguments to prove the unconstitutionality of such an act. When we undertook to assert our rights upon the high seas in 1812 a party arose in this country who claimed that it was beyond the power of the Constitution to enter upon such a contest.

When we undertook the Mexican war also, the same thing was said. I never was much in love with that war, but it was argued all the same that it was unconstitutional. When it became necessary "to coerce a State" we had to do it in spite of the Constitution.

When we came to need greenbacks to pay our Army and to clothe

our boys at the front, my friend from New York, [Mr. COX,] who has spasms on the Constitution so easily, had them then. [Laughter.] "It is unconstitutional to issue that kind of money," he and others of his faith said.

When the yellow fever swept over this country and almost depopulated sections of it, and the American Congress undertook to rise up in its power and send help and healing to those suffering citizens of our Republic, that same constitutional trouble stood in the way. Many of you here before me now were in that contest, and remember how these same men were troubled in their very souls for fear that our Constitution was about to be violated. Somehow it is always pleaded when any great and good work is attempted.

I have come to conclude that this is the only true philosophy for a man to be governed by in his construction of the Constitution: from this on my rule is going to be that when the liberty of the person is involved, when the rights of property are at stake, then construe it strictly. When any great calamity is to be averted, when the life of the nation is at stake, when the good of an empire is to be secured, then construe it liberally.

Let me state it again. When any attempt is made to commit a wrong against the liberty or property of an individual, then I would compel them to find not only chapter and verse but "thus saith the Constitution" in clear, plain, unmistakable language. But when some great calamity to our country and its people is to be averted, when some great good is to be accomplished, then construe the Constitution liberally, ay, even read it between the lines if need be to accomplish the great work.

But again, let me ask what is the character of this commission that has this work in charge? Its members were selected simply for their ability and integrity; nothing else. They are men of large experience. What man will stand up here and say that they have any moneyed interest in this enterprise? They have no possible interest except to succeed, and consequently their decisions are entitled to the greatest credit. Their reputations are at stake. A failure of this plan will be considered their failure. How is it possible to give men stronger motives to lead them to strive for success? Our committee came, I think, to a sensible conclusion when they determined that our only safety consisted in following with faith, with implicit confidence, this body of men who had been so carefully and judiciously selected for this very work.

Again, what is this valley which we propose to improve and help out of its trouble? Until I prepared this bill I had no conception of the commerce of this country. I know you will bear with me a moment while I illustrate a few things pertaining to this enormous valley. In the first place it contains 14,000 miles of river—navigable rivers—which are now being improved by the Government. They intersect or border upon eighteen States and two Territories.

The population of this valley to-day is 30,000,000. As you look into the future you can see that it will be able to support 600,000,000 of inhabitants. Now, is not the experiment worth trying? I admit that it is an experiment; I admit that we may fail; but is it not worth trying? I find that there were dug and handled in the United States last year 66,000,000 tons of coal. Can you think of how much that is? If you were to run a railroad twice around the world this coal loaded upon cars would fill every car and make a solid train, on a double track clear around the globe. We had in the United States last year 250,000,000 tons of commerce. If you take the 102,000 miles of railroads in the United States, double track them all, load upon cars the commerce which we moved last year in this country, there would be a solid train over every line and every branch and side-track, going and coming, filling both tracks. You could not cross these tracks on a dirt road in the whole United States. These statements seem fabulous, but the immense tonnage of this land is more than fabulous. To provide for the transportation, the cheap transportation, of such a commerce requires that men should rise above the level of common humdrum thought, and if possible reach the heights of true philosophy, of real statesmanship.

It is to prepare for moving products of this kind that this bill is drawn. I find that the coal-fields of Pennsylvania are only 13,000 square miles; yet Pennsylvania alone furnished last year out of those 66,000,000 tons of coal 42,000,000. Now take the State of Illinois, which borders upon this great national highway. What could Illinois do? Illinois has 36,000 square miles of coal-fields; and in many places her coal is piled up so that it aggregates 100 feet in thickness. Now, take for a moment the other products of Illinois. She raised last year 325,000,000 bushels of corn, 51,000,000 bushels of wheat, 63,000,000 bushels of oats, 1,250,000 of barley, 3,000,000 bushels of rye, 13,000,000 bushels of potatoes. Illinois had 1,000,000 car-loads of products from those six or seven items alone last year, and she is only one State out of eighteen that border on this great national highway that goes to make up this great valley of the Mississippi.

Then take the iron of Alabama and Tennessee and Missouri and Kentucky, and the coal of every one of those States. Why, sir, the coal-fields of this valley alone aggregate 170,000 square miles. Take the timber from Kentucky, Mississippi, and that entire valley; the zinc of Tennessee and Missouri; the cotton and sugar from all these States; take all the varied products; and what we seek to do by this bill is simply to improve this great water-way, so as to secure cheap transportation for the working millions now in this great valley and for the increasing millions that are to come after us, cheap

transportation for the food and the fuel which God has spread with such profusion all over this continent.

But why wonder that men object to this great project? What great work was ever yet performed in this country that did not have its opposers? Think of it for one moment. I recollect when we commenced building railroads; and I say, notwithstanding the notions of my friend from Texas [Mr. REAGAN] in reference to those corporations, no one thing that ever happened to our country has done so much to civilize it, so much to carry peace and prosperity to all its borders, as the building of the railroads throughout this land. Yet we were told they could not be built.

Why, sir, I recollect the building of the Saint Louis bridge. I lived in Missouri when it was started; I was often in Saint Louis week in and week out during the years it was being built, and it was one of my pleasures to go and watch the progress of that immense work. Saint Louis was filled with would-be wise men then who told us that it could not be completed. Scattered all through the country were people who said it was a job that could not be done. And it was not a small work; do you know what it required? The men who built that bridge were obliged to sink the piers through seventy feet of sand and water to plant them on the solid rock below; they built the piers from the top on iron caissons and forced the air in through chambers so that you passed through one chamber into another to get to the place of real work. As the immense masonry work sunk lower and lower the pressure became intense where the work was being done. On one occasion, when one of those piers was nearly down, I saw men come out of those caissons bleeding at the mouth, the nose, and the ears from the pressure to which they had been subjected in completing their task. I once stood on the banks of that river and saw \$100,000 worth of work destroyed in twenty minutes by the caving in and breaking of one of the coffer-dams. Such things would have discouraged some men, but the men who had undertaken that work did not stop; they had courage and they went on exhibiting faith in themselves, confidence in their work, until they had completed it. So about the jetties; it was said that they could not be constructed, or rather that if constructed they would do no good. These same croakers insisted then that the object sought was beyond the power of man to reach, or at all events that the simple plan proposed by the engineer could never succeed. Yet in the face of all these predictions that work is a complete success to-day.

Why, I remember how many wise men told us we could never build a railroad across this continent, that the Sierras and the Rocky Mountains were never made to be scaled in that way, that nature never intended a railroad to go there, and that in undertaking to do so we were flying right in the face of the Almighty. That is what they said; but, nevertheless, the men of this country who do not back out on trifles went on, and to-day you ride as safely from here to San Francisco as you do to Baltimore.

I remember well when the Atlantic cable was first projected. Men told us it could never be laid, and the first attempt, you all will recollect, was a failure. If the men who oppose this system of leveeing the Mississippi and improving its channel had been in charge of that work then, it would have been abandoned at once. Do you not recollect with what airs they said, "I told you so?" There is nothing these men more delight in than to be able to exclaim, "just as I expected." "Did I not tell you it could never be done?" But the men who had it in charge had courage; they persevered in their work with a faith almost divine, and to-day you can sit in New York and whisper messages of love or joy, of sorrow or sadness, into the ear of your friend in London just as easily as if you both occupied the same chair. [Applause.]

Now, in view of all these facts, shall we give up this great work. I say no, a thousand times no. [Applause.]

A few more words, Mr. Chairman, and I am done. In attempting to control such a vast and changing stream, our committee well understood that we entered upon no light task, that the work before us is no child's play. Some of our members entertain strong fears that the task is beyond the powers of man—that we enter upon a work that mortal skill and ingenuity cannot perform. Still we were unanimous in our decision that we would make the attempt. In doing this we took counsel of our hopes instead of our fears. And now I would ask the members of this Congress to concur in our conclusion. Let us not shrink from this work because of its magnitude. We should not forget that we live in an age of great achievements. Grand enterprises, mammoth undertakings are exactly fitted to the mental peculiarities of our Anglo-Saxon race. Courage to grapple with the immense is one of the distinguishing features of the inhabitants of this Republic. Feebleness, timidity, faint-heartedness, do not become our day and generation. To dare and to do are the crowning glories of our American civilization. The necessities of the hour call for men who have brains to plan, who have faith in themselves, who have hands to execute. Fear of failure has no place in the great achievements of to-day. Like Cardinal Richelieu, we should know no such word as fail.

Mr. Chairman, we owe this work to future generations. We owe it to ourselves. There is nothing that more surely and securely cements together a great people than common business relations—community of commercial interests. I am sometimes called severe in my political notions, harsh in my statements as regards the polit-



ical actions of the South. Let that be as it may, one thing is certain, you will never find me wanting in my efforts to carry within her borders every form of material and mental prosperity. If it was within my power to-morrow I would open the vast wealth of her mineral deposits. I would tunnel her rich treasures of iron and coal and plant smelting-works on her hillsides and rolling-mills in her valleys. I would set her rivers to turning spindles and her falling waters to driving shuttles. I would reclaim her waste lands and restore her ruined plantations, and establish a free school in each of her scattered precincts, and I would do all this in the interest of public peace and political harmony. The fact is, there is nothing that more completely drowns the clamors and mutterings about the past than the din of busy hammers and the hum of running machinery. Community of interest creates fast friendships; joint commercial investments soon destroy past animosities.

No nation can long survive after it ceases to accomplish great ends. It is with the nation as with the individual. To rust out is only one form of slow but sure death. No man ever makes a greater mistake than when he retires from all active business. While he retains his faculties he should also see to it that he has something to think about, something to do. A nation has individuality, personality, and can only exist wisely, securely, when trying to accomplish some great work.

Recently, at the invitation of the French Association Scientifique, M. Renan, the great French historian and philosopher, delivered a lecture at the Sorbonne on the question "What is a Nation?" After treating the question with all that wealth of learning and simplicity of style for which he is so noted, he drew the following conclusion, which struck me as being so full of true philosophy and real wisdom that I repeat it. He said:

Man is the slave neither of his race, nor of his language, nor of his religion, nor of the course of rivers, nor of the direction of mountain chains. A great aggregation of men, healthy in mind and warm in heart, creates a moral conscience that is called a nation. It is not the soil any more than the race that makes a nation. The soil still furnishes the substratum—the field of struggle and labor; man furnishes the soul. Man is everything in the formation of that sacred thing called a nation. Nothing material is sufficient. A nation is a spiritual principle resulting from profound complications of history—a spiritual family, not a group determined by the configuration of the soil. A nation is a soul—a spiritual principle. Two things, which in truth form but one, constitute this soul, this spiritual principle—the possession in common of a rich legacy of souvenirs, and the desire to live together, the will to continue to profit by the inheritance received undivided. Man cannot be improvised. The nation, like the individual, is the outcome of a long past of efforts, of sacrifices, and of devotion. The worship of ancestors is, of all, the most legitimate; our ancestors have made us what we are. A heroic past, great men, glory, (I mean true glory,) this is the social capital on which a national idea is based. To have common glories in the past, a common will in the present—to have done great things together, to wish to do more—such is the essential condition of being a people. \* \* \* A nation, then, is a grand solidarity, constituted by the sentiment of sacrifices made and of those that one is disposed to make still.

Mr. Chairman, if this great French scholar be right, then surely no work can give life to our nation except such as requires courage, heroism, self-sacrifice. It would seem from his philosophy that the life of every great and good man is an epitome of the life of every great and good nation. Strength gathered from the noble examples of the past, aided by the energy springing from the holy ambitions of the present, is the real power of the individual and the nation.

Then let us enter upon this great internal improvement full of that hope which always comes from high resolves and firm determination. It may be that the first experiments will prove failures. Such has been the lot of very many of the great successes of the past. In such an event new plans must be devised. In doing this let us be hampered by no strained construction of our Constitution; let us be deterred by no unmanly fears of final failure; let us rather be governed by that principle of exegesis and animated by that hopeful courage which springs from the reflection that if err we must, if fail we must, it shall be on the side of humanity, while we are struggling to benefit our fellow-men who are being driven yearly from their homes with such loss of property and often with fearful loss of precious lives.

Yes, let us resolve that we will be masters of the situation. Up to this time no obstacle has been permitted long to stand in the way of the upward and onward march of this nation we all so much love. Let it hereafter be said that the crowning glory of the Forty-seventh Congress was this, that it fully inaugurated the plan that finally succeeded in taming the overflowing waters of the great Mississippi and chained it within its banks; that it compelled its swelling floods to obey the behests of commerce and to do the bidding of mankind, and that in doing this it reclaimed from disease, destruction, and death territory enough to make an empire and returned to their own homes people enough to make a State; and still more, that it made it possible for those people to live out their days surrounded by all the scenes of their childhood and on the spot where they were born. [Great applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland is entitled to the floor.

Mr. McLANE. I am indebted to the courtesy of the gentleman from New York for the floor—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Maryland desires to reserve the balance of his time.

Mr. McLANE. I would prefer to do so and follow the gentleman from New York. How much time is remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has twenty minutes.

Mr. McLANE. Then I ask unanimous consent to reserve that.

The CHAIRMAN. In the absence of objection the gentleman from Maryland will be allowed to reserve his time.

There was no objection.

Mr. COX, of New York. Mr. Chairman, I cannot join in the applause with which the sentiments uttered by the gentleman from Michigan have been hailed. His speech is one of marked ability. It abounds in shrewdness; it has great tact; it fits a member of the Committee on Commerce. I understand why the gentleman should have received the marked applause of the Republicans. I do not envy him the plaudits, for it is fitting that they should applaud the sentiments of M. Renan, of the Sorbonne. Is he not the skeptic—the historic and political antagonism of our faith? Are not his views those of the forum of rationalism? Has he not a higher law than human codes, to which the gentleman early dedicated himself? Unconsciously the other side applauds the thought which leads to the assassination of the Republic? Does it not lead in its last resort—to Guiteau?

#### FRENCH CENTRALIZATION.

When the gentleman from Michigan quotes from the distinguished French scholar in favor of treating the nation as a soul, as a spiritual essence, is he not marking out the distinguishing feature between the politics of that side of the House and that in which I was educated? There is a wide difference, sir, between the French system which recognizes only a primary government at Paris, with all the functions of the state there centered, such as Monsieur Renan champions in his abstract style, and the doctrine of Jefferson and Madison, as fixed in our constitutional order. The first is red, black, and central bastard Republicanism; the latter is our own moderation, such as Washington fought for and Lafayette defended.

If the gentleman from Michigan meant anything when he quoted from the French author he meant the same thing which he desired in Ohio before the war—the nullification of the Constitution to attain particular ends.

A great system of internal improvements, made by the centralized power of the Government in order to placate the populace, to prevent revolution and to give bread from the state to the people, is not in consonance with the genius of our system. It is the *food and circus* of the Roman-French idea of government. What is the feature peculiar in our system or that most clearly distinguishes our system from that of France? It is the organic written law, which restrains legislative will, caprice, soul, and sentiment. It is the restriction which we place upon such measures as this by our fundamental law. Hence, when the turbulent cheers saluted M. Renan's idea and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HORN] who quoted them, regardless or careless of their meaning and application, I knew that the old higher-law element survived, even in such a mercenary form as this internal-improvement extravagance.

The Federal Government assumes by this measure to control the States. It usurps the local power. It enters within the States by reason of such laws and systems; and by various modes of executing these improvements seeks to control the domain of the States. This is illustrated in this bill in its reference to the northern part (Minnesota) of the country. At the same time the bill gives local largesses to contractors and others for "works" exclusively local, and not within the purview of Congress, and never contemplated as Federal works.

#### INCREASED EXTRAVAGANCE.

I knew this bill would come in aggrandized largely in amount over past years.

The committee report a bill appropriating \$17,342,875. This is a very large bill. It was said that the last river and harbor bill was a large one, but when it was reported to the House in February, 1881, it provided for an appropriation of only \$10,179,800. In the Senate the total was raised to nearly \$12,000,000, and the appropriation finally decided upon and made was about \$11,526,000. Judging from the past, the bill now reported will provide for an appropriation of more than \$25,000,000 when it goes to the President for his approval.

The difference, \$7,163,075, between the sum reported now and the sum reported a year ago is not all accounted for by an increased appropriation for the Mississippi River. The amount given to the river in the last bill was about \$2,300,000, including \$1,000,000 to be expended by the commission. The amount this year thus far is about \$5,400,000, including miscellaneous work, so that the additions to be ascribed to the Mississippi amount to about \$3,000,000. There seems to be an increase of about \$4,000,000, therefore, in the amount devoted to other improvements. It is expected that an effort will be made in the Senate to add an appropriation of from \$1,000,000 to \$4,000,000 for the proposed Hennepin Canal.

Former bills have been bad enough. I was advised that this bill would come here with a great flourish of elocution. I was advised, too, that I was selected to be attacked as its opponent. Of that I cared little. To make it palatable to the House it was made to appropriate enough; to make it palatable to the majority, if not to two-thirds, it has been crowded with items. But, sir, I am a little dazed to understand why my friend from California, the chairman of the committee, [Mr. PAGE,] did not avoid general debate and pass the bill by suspension of the rules. He had 200 votes for it already; so it was whispered around the House—why he did not seek to pass it under a suspension of the rules. I rather guess, sir, that there was too much in the bill. Perhaps it is even now overweighted. The honorable gentleman [Mr. PAGE] advised us that his committee

would allow no amendments, yet we were advised by another gentleman that many adverse votes were given in committee against certain items; so that we have a unanimous vote with much dissent; and the committee is commanded not to allow a single amendment. This is deliberation!

A VETO SUGGESTED.

If, sir, we have come to this, had we not better abdicate as a committee? Let the Commerce Committee do all our duties. It irks me to be thus harnessed and driven. Oh, for one word from General Grant. He was not very particular in stopping extravagant appropriations. He had not my hate of mercenary politics, but he had the courage of his conviction to veto one of your internal-improvement bills for \$5,000,000. He killed it outright. He killed it because it was full of these petty streamlets among the mountains, whither the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HERR] would "bear the messages of peace and love and sorrow [laughter] by the appropriation of our surplus moneys." When the present bill is understood in all of its details, we may still have a President who will fix upon it the indelible stamp of his disapproval. If he should do so, he would be very formidable with the people of this country as his own successor.

Mr. DUNN. Will you vote for him if he vetoes the bill?

Mr. COX, of New York. I do not know what we may do two years from now, but I doubt whether my friend would vote for him if he approved a bill that contained an item of \$20,000,000 for the improvement of the Mississippi River.

Mr. DUNN. That is a large bid for an executive veto, but I think the President will decline it.

Mr. COX, of New York. I do not understand the remarks of my friend from Arkansas.

Mr. DUNN. I say the assurance of the gentleman from New York that he might support him is a large bid for a veto of this bill.

Mr. COX, of New York. My friend from Arkansas goes entirely out of his way to assume that I said I would do that. I said that no one could tell what might be done two years from now.

The gentleman thus indulges in a little personal snapperado upon me, which is not the way to debate a question of this kind—something like the method of the gentleman from Michigan, [Mr. HERR,] who anticipated the speech I was intending. I would not have made the speech I am going to make but for the unrest in advance exhibited by those who favor this bill. I never intended to take the line of thought the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HERR] suggested. I was going to dwell on something better than the geographical littlenesses of the measure. I had in my mind a lesson from my former Democratic teaching. The gentleman seems to think it a time to make personal reflections upon my inadequacy to cope with a bill of this mercenary quality.

HUMANITY AND THE CONSTITUTION.

It is thought to be a sign of humanity to describe ours as a nation with a large N—as a nation having a soul. I know that M. Renan's quotation is nothing but a paraphrase of Sir William Jones's wonderful definition of what "constitutes a state." There is nothing new in it. It is the transcendentalism of the Bagvāt Gheeta, which Sir William learned in India from the Brahmins. It is the essence of political metaphysics. But when we come to practical legislation the largest philanthropy is the established order. Humanity in its just sense is in maintaining the Constitution of our allegiance. This shall be my test and not M. Renan's and his solidarity.

The gentleman from Michigan thinks this is a humane measure. He goes so far as to say that he would follow by his vote for money the little rills that are the feeders of the large streams, and would vote appropriations also for those large streams. He illustrates his idea by our mail system. As our "mails carry peace and joy and love far up into the hills and make their habitations enduring," so he would carry the largesses of the nation in the improvement of the little rills. This is very beautiful. I would like to follow him with his messages of peace and love and joy and sorrow. [Laughter.] But I do not want to pay so much for it; I want to pay money out of the Treasury in a proper way, according to the needs of the Federal system, as established by the Constitution, and for Federal commerce under that Constitution.

He is considered a philanthropist who tickles the ears of our Southern members as to what great things he would do to help the Mississippi and the Southern streams. He would give sweet solace to the stricken Southern country by "tunnelling their mines, digging out their coal, mining for their iron, running their spindles and buzzsaws!" But when it comes to constituting a State after the best methods, so as to give the South the spirit of true enterprise under fair and equal conditions, and so as to give its people general and generous amnesty, all these material interests fade away before the very definition of the infidel, M. Renan, of the Sarbonne.

It is said that he is a philanthropist who makes one blade of grass grow where none grew before. I suppose he too is a philanthropist who makes one drop of water run where no water ran before. [Laughter.] The waste places on the earth are to be made fruitful and blossom by appropriations that are appropriated to this humanity.

I read the other day an account of the wells of Moses. They are not far from Cairo. There are three of them. These wells of Moses in the desert fitly represent the need and beauty of appropriations for improvement. Water is reached there at any point by digging. From

the high range of Ez Rahah, through the gently-sloping strata beneath the soil, the water would continue to pass on without coming to the surface but for the chalk shells of animalcules, whose imperiousness, through hydraulic pressure along the strata, forces the water up. Some enormous pools are thus formed, and palm bushes grow holding out their hands for more. In fact, this natural improvement forms water enough for two hundred camel loads at once. [Laughter.] It does not equal the Nile, but it will do as an illustration of what nature, when well directed, will do.

Now, sir, Moses was one of those lawgivers from whom this committee obtained its ideas. He made the water gush in a desert place. But he struck the rock in a time of great distress, and not for navigation purposes. If he had been here, I doubt whether he would have applauded M. Renan and the gentleman from Michigan. He made the water come forth, and after 4,000 years the little three wells of Moses are there yet. And what, Mr. Chairman, do you find they produce? Just as much water as you can carry on a few camels, and enough to sustain about a dozen scrub palms! That is not the internal improvement that comes from this sort of wasteful philanthropic appropriation of Renan-soul-nationality applied to the waste places of the earth.

CONSTITUTIONAL POWER.

Let us come down to the Constitution as properly interpreted. Where does the gentleman find his power to make bills for these small streams that he eulogizes? He finds it under the commerce power of the Constitution. Certainly there, if anywhere, it is to be found, but every one knows that the commerce power contained in the Constitution is a power as to interstate and foreign commerce—only that and nothing more. So the decisions run. So our Democrats have taught. So President Polk and President Pierce said in their veto messages on bills of this character.

Said President Polk, in his veto of August 3, 1846—

The Constitution has not, in my judgment, conferred upon the Federal Government the power to construct works of internal improvement within the States, or to appropriate money from the Treasury for that purpose. That this bill assumes for the Federal Government the right to exercise this power, cannot, I think, be doubted. The approved course of the Government and the deliberately-expressed judgment of the people have denied the existence of such a power in the Constitution.

The wisdom of the framers of the Constitution in withholding power over such objects from the General Government and leaving them to the local government of the States becomes more and more manifest with every year's experience of the operation of our system. In a country of limited extent, with few such objects of expenditure, (if the form of government permitted it,) the common treasure might be used for the improvement with much less inequality and injustice than in one of the vast extent which ours now presents in population and territory. The treasure of the world would hardly be equal to the improvement of every bay, inlet, creek, and river in our country which might be supposed to promote the agricultural, manufacturing, or commercial interests of a neighborhood.

President Pierce, in his veto message of December 30, 1854, after arguing the points of federal limitation cogently, said:

Every work should be in a separate bill, so that each one shall stand on its own independent merits.

Judge Story held, that the internal improvements should go not to local streams but to matters of general moment and general interest. The eighth section of the first article of the Constitution, to regulate commerce among the several States, is virtually abrogated by this bill, and the very authority under which our legislation is conducted is defied by a bill of this nature, inasmuch as it appropriates money for improvements of rivers located wholly within one particular State and of no Federal commerce or national importance.

I know very well, sir, there is a difference between that side and this, or between members who have peculiar interpretations of the Constitution. Not long ago I wrote a letter to the Jefferson Club at Newark, New Jersey. One sentiment of that letter was that one great cause of the prodigality and bargaining connected with our Treasury disbursements was our failure to recognize and apply the old canons of interpretation of the Constitution. I was called to account by a New York paper for that expression. The New York Tribune, which applauded my efforts against such bills as this, ridiculed my letter. But there never was a more fit illustration than this measure of the fact that a bad interpretation of our organic law leads to corruption and extravagance.

Gentlemen tell me, of course, that the Constitution of the United States allows certain internal improvements—commerce. I agree with them. My friend from Arkansas [Mr. DUNN] was too fast when he would arraign me for being regardless of a proper appropriation of money for certain grand objects. Or perhaps he did not mean to intimate that. I have always favored here, and still favor, appropriations for the Mississippi, for the lakes, for the larger rivers like the Mississippi, the Missouri, the Hudson, or the Ohio; for the Gulf coast, for the Pacific, for all those objects connected with tide-water as to which commerce has a large, foreign, and Federal quality.

My contest here has been limited to matters of this nature. It has been against oversloughing these fair, general, Federal, and just appropriations for our common commerce with matters connected with purely local commerce. There I stand to-day. As Ohio and New York made their canals and cared for their local improvements, so I would have other States care. Though I stand alone here and feel almost alone, and though I, because of my isolation, am of no more consequence than my friend from Arkansas would intimate, I will

stand on that old Democratic doctrine, even if I stand alone. I fail to find with me some of those champions of economy who, in other relations and on other topics, proclaim their desire for frugality and who have swept the honors of this Congress and the country by their devotion to their own peculiar economy.

Mr. DUNN. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him for a moment? I know he would do me no injustice. I did not think of intimating that he was of no consequence. On the contrary, I stated that his intimation of an intention to vote for a President was a very strong bid that might tempt a President.

Mr. COX, of New York. I thought the gentleman was speaking ironically. I will take it as a nice compliment. [Laughter.]

Mr. DUNN. I give him my assurance that I am incapable of underestimating his importance here.

Mr. COX, of New York. I do not claim any more importance than as one who studies discreetly my duty toward the Constitution and toward the Treasury.

A RULE TO DIVIDE THE SUBJECT.

Two months ago, as the House will bear me witness, I sought to avert a contest between these little streams "that carry peace and joy into the hills of the country" and the larger rivers and the lakes and the sea-coast which bear our general commerce between the States and to other countries. I proposed an amendment to the rules, which I will ask the Clerk to read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the seventh clause of Rule XI be amended by adding at the end of the paragraph the following:

"Provided, That in reporting bills making appropriations for the improvement of rivers and harbors, said Committee on Commerce shall make said report in two separate bills; the first to include all appropriations for improvements upon the sea, lake, and Gulf coasts and the rivers navigable through two or more States or parts of States; the second to include rivers of local or State commerce only."

Mr. COX, of New York. In offering that amendment to the rules I thought perhaps the Committee on Rules, made up of intelligent men, with our Speaker at the head, might possibly obviate the difficulty growing out of bills of this nature. I counted wrongly. The New York Evening Post said my proposition was too good to pass. It is true. The committee, as I shall show, took no notice of it. It never was brought before that committee for action, as I was informed by the Speaker. Why? For the reason that this committee did not dare direct the methods of this legislation so as to test the appropriations on their merit by classes or details. These bills are always brought in regardless of their own intrinsic value *per item*, but depending on the general and curious conglomeration of the whole lot in one bill.

I wished for the sake of the country and for the sake of the Congress, so often dishonored by these methods and measures, that the interests of the Mississippi River should have their own discussion. It deserved its own vote. It commanded it as New York does, by its conspicuous magnitude. I would be willing to vote, as a New York member, even a larger sum than that on this bill, not for the levee system, for that belongs to the States, and it has been so regarded, but for a thorough improvement of the great Mississippi River, to the end that that grand inland water-way might bear the commerce of the interior to the ocean, and beget honest competition in the interest of produce and commerce, East, West, North, and South.

APPROPRIATIONS, MISCELLANEOUSLY AND BY STATES.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HORN] argued that there was only about 2 per cent. of this bill for the benefit of small streams. This I doubt and deny. Some friend of mine near me remarked that 2 per cent. was exactly what Brother HUBBELL had levied on the small office-holders, pages, and laborers of this country for another purpose. [Laughter.] I do not know how the gentleman ciphers. I will show you exactly how this matter stands in this bill. Here are the miscellaneous appropriations of the bill:

Line of bill.	Miscellaneous.	Amount.
646	Ohio River.....	\$350,000
703	Mississippi River.....	300,000
735	Snag-boat, Upper Mississippi.....	25,000
740	Mississippi River.....	
	Des Moines Rapids to Saint Paul.....	250,000
755	Gauging Mississippi.....	5,000
764	Removing snags in—	
	Mississippi River.....	\$85,000
	Missouri River.....	65,000
	Arkansas River.....	35,000
		185,000
774	Missouri River, mouth to Sioux City.....	800,000
776	Missouri River, Sioux City to Fort Benton.....	100,000
778	Missouri River, survey.....	25,000
824	Surveys.....	100,000
923	Flume tests.....	8,000
928	Mississippi River, south of Cairo.....	4,123,000
	Cairo to mouth of Illinois River.....	600,000
	Illinois River to Des Moines Rapids.....	200,000
	Total.....	7,071,000

That makes \$7,071,000 of money appropriated for miscellaneous items—scattered all around.

Now let us see what are the items within State lines, not for general but for local commerce. To bring these under the Constitution requires a terrific torture of logic, economy, and philanthropy:

APPORTIONMENT IN STATES.	
Maine.....	\$130,000
New Hampshire.....	27,000
Vermont.....	18,500
Massachusetts*.....	239,500
Rhode Island.....	131,000
Connecticut.....	229,000
New York*.....	664,500
Pennsylvania*.....	464,000
Delaware.....	143,000
Maryland*.....	506,500
Virginia.....	257,750
Georgia.....	413,000
Florida.....	290,000
Alabama*.....	384,000
Texas*.....	888,000
Ohio.....	343,500
Indiana.....	170,000
Illinois.....	445,000
Michigan*.....	740,000
Wisconsin*.....	634,000
Iowa.....	37,500
Minnesota*.....	125,000
California*.....	613,000
Oregon*.....	458,500
Kentucky*.....	261,500
New Jersey*.....	293,975
West Virginia.....	210,000
North Carolina.....	197,950
South Carolina.....	333,250
Mississippi.....	61,000
Louisiana*.....	129,000
Arkansas.....	73,500
Kansas.....	10,000
Missouri.....	20,000
Tennessee.....	204,500
Montana Territory.....	10,000
Dakota Territory.....	30,000
Idaho Territory.....	5,000
Washington Territory.....	24,000
Total.....	10,243,775

\* Committee States.

That is the amount not "miscellaneous." I do not mean now to say that the gentlemen on the Committee on Commerce have been particularly careful of their own States. I said that once before, when my friend from Texas [Mr. REAGAN] was chairman, and I just barely missed a very good drubbing. I was called to account by the House for saying that these bill were a peculiar kind of raid on the Treasury. My words were taken down. I am now timid. I will measure my words a little more heedfully now. I have some fear of my Chinese friend from California, [Mr. PAGE.]

Nevertheless truth must be told though the heavens fall. These figures must come out, though every one of our escutcheons above us shoot from their spheres. Here they are. I call them committee States, as they represent the States represented on the Committee on Commerce, which reported this bill:

COMMITTEE STATES.	
Massachusetts.....	\$239,500
New York.....	664,500
Pennsylvania.....	464,000
Maryland.....	506,500
Alabama.....	384,000
Texas.....	888,000
Ohio.....	343,500
Michigan.....	740,000
Wisconsin.....	634,000
Minnesota.....	125,000
California.....	613,000
Oregon.....	458,500
Kentucky.....	261,500
New Jersey.....	293,975
Louisiana.....	129,000
Total.....	6,744,975

Now, that amount is appropriated for what I call the committee States. I mean no offense to the gentlemen on the committee. That amount is about three-fourths of all the appropriations outside of the miscellaneous appropriations to which I have referred; it is about 67 per cent.

Now, it may be a mere coincidence. I see my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. CANDLER] smiles. It may be a mere coincidence. My friend from California [Mr. PAGE] also smiles, because he feels that he has been so good to his State. So with my friend from Maryland behind me, [Mr. McLANE,] and my friend from Texas. All you gentlemen I regard as first-class local representatives; local, not general, not representatives of the United States so much as of your own State. You are the men (to use the language of the gentleman from Michigan) who would by appropriations to little rills bear love and peace and joy and sorrow [laughter] into the hills and among the mountains to make them endurable for life! You are the kind-hearted men so loving your own localities that I cannot for that applaud you enough.

You come in here with a report in which you say that—  
The bill deals liberally with all such works as will largely and generally facilitate the commerce of the nation, by opening up the great water-ways of the coun-

try to free navigation. The committee believe that at no time in the history of our Government have the people so unanimously demanded of Congress liberal appropriations for rivers and harbors: that at no time in its history has the United States Treasury been in such a condition as to warrant large expenditures in this direction for the public good.

WHAT IS LOG-ROLLING?

I deny it. Public opinion condemns all these schemes made up in this peculiar way. I have proofs before me that your bill is scandalous in the popular eye and thought. Some people go so far—I cannot—as to call it log-rolling. I will not call it by such an odious epithet; I do not know what it means; I never did roll logs. [Laughter.] One thing I will say: it looks very much like a combination of very clever men, getting together to get two-thirds of this work, to help themselves or their localities at the general expense. They are entitled to credit for their local craft; they will get credit for it, at home. Let them have the credit; I desire none of it; my constituents approve me for opposing such bills. They will probably come back re-elected, some of them, especially if the contractors happen to be friends of theirs. They will come back here without any trouble, because they will get their bill through without any trouble after having given something or enough outside to nearly every one so as to make success. They catch ambitious members in this way; it is the honey; it catches flies; a good thing sometimes, but who wants honey full of flies, or who would be a fly sacrificed even in a pot of honey?

I wish I knew what log-rolling meant. I was raised out West; I have been to a "raising" myself; but log-rolling is an art above my reach in my politics.

A friend of mine sang me in the cloak-room the other day this lyric illustration of log-rolling. I am tempted to give it. It is the song of an old negro at a faro bank. I hope the committee will not take any offense at my reciting it. It is not my language. Do not take it down. It belongs to one of our colored brethren. Sam Johnson was fighting faro and there was something wrong at the game. He broke forth in this poetic language:

Ole Sam Johnson am my name,  
If you don't give me some of dat, I'll break up your game!

[Laughter.]  
To which the dealer replied in the same sort of strain:

You stop dat singing de dam ole song,  
You are declared in from dis time on!

[Laughter.]  
I do not make the charge suggested by Mr. Johnson and his friends. It is made by a colored brother.

I do not see the gentleman from Michigan here. I would like to see him. I think he embraced too much in his speech. It is pretty hard to hold it, when you undertake to embrace so much in one speech. It is like the man who tried to carry his large fat wife across a muddy street. He set her down right in the middle of the mud, as he said to get a better hold of her. [Laughter.] A man who like my friend from Michigan undertakes to bring into a single speech the mail-carrier going into the little mountains on a rivulet with appropriations, with his messages of joy, and love, and peace to woman and child, and also undertakes to run the "silt" in the Mississippi River on moral-hydrostatic principles, embraces too much. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, I have looked over this bill and have failed to find one favorite stream. I do not mean the Kiskiminetas; that is gone to the "rearward and abyss of time." I pine for my favorite. Other streams also that used to be in these bills are gone. I repine. I do heartily commend my friend from California that he has by a provision at the end of this bill undertaken to stop some of these ridiculous surveys which ripened into such wasteful appropriations. I am glad that in his speech he reprobated the surveys of these little streams in the mountains where the mail-carrier and the appropriations for the rills bear peace, joy, and love, making life endurable!

But one stream, of unpronounceable delight, I have failed to find in this bill. It touched my heart with peculiar tenderness. It deserved an appropriation. I have some poetry about it. If the gentleman from Michigan were here I would make him sing it. [Laughter.] It speaks of messages of love and joy and sorrow. [Laughter.] I want the Clerk to read it, if he can. I think my friend, Judge HOLMAN, when he hears this song, will move to amend the bill by putting this stream in. [Laughter.]

The Clerk read as follows:

THE SKOODOOOWBSKOOK.

I.

O maid with the hair that is yellow,  
'Tis time that your home you forsook;  
Come over and live with a fellow  
By the beautiful Skoodooowbskook.

[Laughter.]

II.

And there where the grasses the brooks kiss,  
In the prettiest kind of a nook,  
Where the swift-running Skoodooowbskookais  
Pours into the Skoodooowbskook,

[Laughter.]

III.

Our lives like their streams shall commingle.  
For heaven no further we'll look;  
Then come—it is wrong to live single—  
O come to the Skoodooowbskook.

[Laughter.]

IV.

In this lovely terrestrial Eden  
I'll teach you to fish with a hook;  
The fishes are plenty, O maiden,  
In the crystalline Skoodooowbskook!

[Laughter.]

V.

Our food shall be trout from the waters,  
Which you to your sweet taste shall cook;  
Come, fairest of Uncle Sam's daughters,  
To the banks of the Skoodooowbskook.

[Laughter.]

Mr. COX, of New York. I am glad that Dr. Melhaffey, our clerk, has such a fine appreciation of poetry. He not only reads it with credit to himself but honor to the House and committee. [Laughter.] I fail to find that stream in this bill. It is an outrage on the Skoodooowbskook. [Laughter.] It is an outrage on the State of Maine, where I surmise it is situated. The gentleman from Maine, who honors me with his attention, [Mr. DINGLEY,] feels it enter his very heart.

I want it understood that while this bill includes many little inlets and push-pole creeks and oyster bays and fishing coves along the coasts from the State of Maine down all through, including New York and North Carolina, I fail to find the Skoodooowbskook. Only give this stream \$3,000 or \$5,000, and she will become a feeder. As a feeder she will furnish water for a river which will in time feed a larger stream. Thus we shall be able to send by our appropriation messages of joy and love and gladness and sorrow up into the hills which as a habitation for man are thus made endurable. [Laughter.]

INCREASED AND INCREASING WASTE OF MONEY.

I have before me in this pile of documents the engineers' reports. The gentlemen of the committee are supposed to have read these all in detail. I have glanced at and into them. They furnish a pretty commentary on bills of this nature. In a few years we have jumped up from \$3,000,000 to \$17,000,000, and before this bill passes the Senate the amount will be \$25,000,000. God knows what the aggregate will be hereafter, because these appropriations are only the beginning of other appropriations to come.

We began in 1869-'70 with \$3,947,900; in 1870-'71 we had \$4,407,500; in 1871-'72 we had \$5,588,000; in 1872-'73 we had \$5,193,000; in 1874-'75 we had \$6,643,000; in 1877-'78 we had \$7,000,000; in 1880-'81 over \$10,000,000.

Last year, according to the Book of Estimates, (page 148.) I find this record:

NOTE.—For works included in these estimates for harbors and rivers, \$11,069,900 were appropriated by the river and harbor act of March 3, 1881, and \$381,400 were appropriated by that act and by the sundry civil act of March 3, 1881, for works not now estimated for, which makes the amount appropriated for rivers and harbors by said acts \$11,451,300, exclusive of the indefinite appropriations for operating and care of the Louisville and Portland, Des Moines Rapids, Saint Mary's Falls, and the Saint Clair Flats Canals.

Glance at this Book of Estimates and you will see what I mean by the remark that when we begin there is no end to the moneys asked for. This book contains the appropriation of the last year in one column, and in another column are the appropriations to be made this year. Compare them, and you will see that when any work has been once begun it is hard to stop it. What starts at \$20,000 this year is \$100,000 the next, and so on. Portland last year had an entering-wedge of \$20,000, now it is \$110,000; New Haven \$60,000, is now \$200,000; Baltimore \$150,000, is now \$900,000; Charleston \$175,000, is now \$750,000; Cumberland Sound \$100,000, is now \$500,000; Chicago \$150,000, is now \$350,000; Michigan City, Indiana, \$45,000, is now \$170,000; Sabine Pass \$150,000, is now \$250,000; Merrimac \$9,000, is now \$18,000; Passaic \$50,000, is now \$110,000; James River \$60,000, is now \$130,000; Fear River, \$140,000, is now \$300,000; Yellowstone River \$20,000, is now \$100,000; Goose Rapids, Red River of the North \$20,000 is now \$100,000, and so on and on.

These cases show where they have grown by time so inordinately as to make this aggregate of \$17,000,000.

MORALITY AND HYDROSTATICS.

I was much interested in the moral and hydrostatic elements in the speech of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HORN] when he discussed this question of "silt" in the Mississippi River. I could feel the sediment running through his clever speech. [Laughter.] I could feel him grasping the mighty Mississippi, holding in solution past, present, and future empires, and certainly future deltas. It holds our agriculture and our Territories in solution. It took a man of nerve to wrestle with such a grand "solution." He gave us the most learned and thorough hydrostatic and moral disquisition on the Mississippi River that I ever heard in this House or expect to hear, except one.

Several MEMBERS. Give it to us.  
Mr. COX, of New York. And that I am going to give myself. [Laughter.] It comes from a Texas paper, and my friend Judge

REAGAN will at once know the editor by his ear-marks. [Great laughter.]

When it comes to eating up money without furnishing any practical equivalent, Galveston Bar is almost a rival to a four-horse daily paper in a one-horse town. The Government might keep on through the endless ages of eternity appropriating \$70,000 a year, and at the expiration of that term there would be just about the same depth of water as there always has been, which is about twelve feet, although it usually averages a foot or so more whenever a reporter goes out with some interested parties to inspect the bar, and the contractors furnish champagne, &c.

[Laughter.]

If the reporter enjoys himself very much, the depth of water on the bar has been known to increase to sixteen feet, but that is only on extraordinary occasions—

When a Congressman is along. [Great laughter.]

When the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HORN] was discussing how to narrow the channel of the Mississippi so as to make the stream swifter, so as to make the stream scour out more of the silt; when he argued that water when confined decreases its friction and increases its velocity and removes the sediment by a combination of moral and hydrostatic ideas brought from the Sarbonne; and when he quoted from Monsieur Renan, to prove the moral qualities of the "silt," I was overwhelmed with delight. I at once considered this solution of the question as ended. I knew that it was ended on the liquid idea of the distinguished editorial constituent of my friend from Texas. [Laughter.] Champagne and whisky furnish the solution.

Why, gentlemen, it is not water that raises appropriations so much. It is appropriations that raise water. More than that, it is whisky that makes the appropriations, through engineering festivities and contractors' courtesies. [Laughter.] The secret comes out that these editors and contractors get a surveyor along with them. Then they go out and find some rocks or sediment; then they find some trees overhanging a creek; then with a telescope, or some other glass, they see a flatboat stranded on a silt in the distance. Then at once they make a report; "here is a chance for a fresh employment and a Federal appropriation. Give us another drink!" [Great laughter.]

So the appropriation gently rises from \$11,000,000 last year to \$17,000,000 this year, and if we go on up to the end of the year 1900, there will be \$200,000,000 appropriated for little creeks and harbors to carry peace, love, and joy and sorrow [laughter] into the hills and mountains; for, sir, if you do not draw the line somewhere, you will have every rill, every dam, every stream, under constitutional conditions, appropriated for by this Federal Government. [Great laughter.]

#### PLAIN TALK ON "SILT."

I had a great notion, Mr. Chairman, to make an argument as to the Mississippi River and the "silt;" but I have it all reduced to writing by a very intelligent person, not being competent myself as an engineer, and I may, when we come to the end of the bill and we get over the terrible effects of the speech of my friend from Michigan [Mr. HORN]—I say I may have it read for the instruction of the House. [Laughter.] On second thought, as I have leave, I will insert it here:

Is it not an endless undertaking and in the end cost untold millions, and then fail of accomplishing the desired ends of confining the Mississippi River in its course in the seasons of freshets? Can levees stop the increase of silt settling on the river bottoms, and by this means constantly raising the river bottom and necessitate the raising of the levees to keep up with it by this silting; the bed of the river will in time be raised above the surrounding country?

In early times, when the river was allowed to spread out the adjoining lands during freshets, the silt raised the lands along with the bed of the river and helped to enrich the land, and by the growth of vegetation and decay of the same helped to raise the land along the rivers and keep pace with the increase on the river bottoms.

Whereas now by the levee system this is changed. Fifty years ago there was hardly an acre of plowed land west of the Mississippi River, whereas now almost the entire country along this great river and its tributaries is one great field of cultivated farms, and is being drained, which adds greatly to increase the floods. Fifty years ago this tract of the great West was wholly covered by grass, over which the water flowed on its way to the streams; now it flows over plowed land, greatly increasing the amount of silt, which is carried into the rivers, every little rivulet becoming a muddy stream, loaded with soil, on its way to the larger and sluggish streams, there to be deposited; and this state of things will increase from year to year as the settling up of the lands go on.

There will be no end to building and raising levees on the Mississippi, and while the Mississippi is being leveed the tributaries will soon come in for a share, as they will eventually have to be provided for if the levee system is to be continued.

Would it not be better for the whole country along these streams to construct mounds along these low bottom lands for places of safety upon which to locate buildings for their residences and shelter and protection for their stock during the freshets, and let the river flow over the lands and deposit its silt, and enrich them, and raise them yearly instead of allowing the silt to lay in the bottom of the river, and make it a necessity to increase the height of the levees constantly? With the great height of the levees the danger increases of breaks, and when a break occurs the rush of water through the break washes away the adjoining lands, ruining perhaps the entire plantation, whereas if the water is allowed to flow over the land as it rises there is no washing away of soil, but in place, when the water settles again, you have an addition to your soil to enrich it and add to its elevation.

These suggestions are from a workman who has observed the action of streams running through alluvial soils and having sluggish streams, and supplied from streams having rapid currents and running through a farming country.

#### AFTER THE SURPLUS.

There is a sort of crazy desire to appropriate money here for everything. This committee was conscious they would have to answer to the public for going after these \$150,000,000 in the Treasury. They apologized for it in their report. The burden of the speech of the

gentleman from Michigan was in that direction. So was the speech of my friend from California, [Mr. PAGE.] They knew it would be a good thing to say in the report that because there was a large surplus in the Treasury people would be content with a larger appropriation in a bill of this nature.

There is no such doctrine among honest people. If it be in existence, it is corrupting. To have a large surplus fund in the Treasury so that every job shall rush forward and take its armful of money for its own greed—this is not public sentiment. No such opinion justifies bills of this nature.

Besides, sir, this bill is not equal even in its exactions. It is unjust to portions of the Mississippi. Go to the head of this grand River. There the reservoirs are to be made, to gratify my friend from Minnesota who is on the committee, and to infringe the rights of the State as to its domain.

Then go to New Orleans where the jetties have cost a good deal. The extremes are cared for. What of the middle and most productive and commercial portions? I ask why did not this committee make the old appropriation for the Mississippi River lying near Saint Louis; between the river Illinois and the Ohio River, between the Illinois River and Cairo?

They make the appropriation for this portion, as for last year, \$600,000. They do not increase it. I do not see why you increase it at the headwaters of the Mississippi, or why you are so anxious to have the mouth or lower portions of the Mississippi improved so greatly and pay no increased attention to the river between these extremes, except that the committee personally desire to jump from the reservoirs in the north down to the jetties of the south, leaving that part of the Mississippi which has the most commerce with no increase over the appropriation of last year. That I suppose will be accounted for hereafter.

#### JOB ON ENGINEERING.

But, Mr. Chairman, I do not feel competent to discuss this Mississippi problem. I am simple enough to believe in one principle of engineering. I found it in the Book of Job. It applies to the Mississippi River. It is a good principle. It can be verified by good authority; and in this connection let me say that there is evidence of former canalization of the Mississippi west of that river in Arkansas and the Indian country. This has been discovered, and men who give attention to archaeological discoveries, tell me that in some prehistoric or other period the Mississippi River has been thus protected from overflow. How? Just as Job says: "By dividing the waters thereof." That same method mentioned in the Old Testament was practiced in the Orient, and that principle of engineering is yet practiced to some extent in and around Damascus even at the present day. It would in emergencies prevent the overflow of the waters by dividing them. And when that little idea may get into the brain of our engineers it may not be impossible that the Mississippi River will suffer less from overflows; or at least if it overflow, it will be like the overflow of the Nile which brings fructification and verdure to the land!

I began, Mr. Chairman, by saying that I would stand on the constitutional idea in all of my votes here as to the principle of helping our rivers and harbors. I want to say that if there has been any change in our political dialectics of a radical nature, which is disheartening, it is with respect to the construction of the laws as to these matters of improving rivers and harbors.

#### THE ABSORPTION OF STATES.

I take up William C. Bryant's History of the United States. The introduction is written by him. He was an old-time Democrat, but in late years a most independent, elegant, and accomplished Republican. In that introduction he lays down the doctrine which I wish the Republican party of to-day would practice. It is the only doctrine by which we can restore our Government to its old boundaries of Federal and State power. He says:

As compared with the state of opinion which prevailed before the war, it is manifest that a certain indifference to the distinction between the Federal power and that of the States has been creeping into our politics. Schemes for accumulating power in the Government at Washington, by making it the owner of our railroads, for administering telegraphic communication by Federal agency, for cutting canals between river and river, and for an extensive system of national education with a central bureau at Washington show this tendency.

These and kindred projects will certainly give ample occasion for protracted disputes on the floor of Congress and in the daily press. On one hand will be urged, and plausibly, the public convenience, and on the other the danger lest our Government of nicely-balanced powers should degenerate into a mere form and the proper functions of the States be absorbed in the central authority—a fate like that predicted by some astronomers for our solar system when the orbs that revolve about the sun, describing narrower and narrower circles, shall fall into the central luminary to be incorporated with it forever.

No more eloquent words of wisdom, Mr. Chairman, have ever been uttered in this House by a Republican or a Democrat than those which I have just quoted from the writings of Mr. Bryant. He says, referring to the same tendency:

The pendulum swings to the other extreme; but our growth shows that in the oak wrapped up in the acorn lay the peculiar form of government which distinguishes our Republic among the nations; and that from what may be called the accidental formation of these communities—small at first, distant from one another, and organized independently of each other—grew the composite structure of our national polity, which we regard as so important to our liberties.

Let any one who cares about the ethics of our politics, or the form and structure of our system, who believes in its stability and refine-

ment as it is thus demonstrated, take with this idea the language of the veto messages of our Democratic Presidents and the teachings of the Supreme Court on these themes, and he will confirm the statement of the poet-historian as to the aggrandizement of Federal power. He cannot, unless swayed by local or moneyed influences, give his sanction to a bill that outrages every principle of constitutional interpretation.

WHICH IS THE PARTY OF THE CONSTITUTION?

It was only the other day, Mr. Chairman, that a living statesman of New York, Horatio Seymour, was called to express his mature thought as to the condition of our politics in these peculiar relations. He laid down in an extract, which I will print in this connection, as the only remedy for the wrongs which are now being committed upon the Treasury, "a return to the wise and conservative ways of the Constitution." He refers to the extravagant tendency of our times; he says the Republican party of this country is wedded to its unconstitutional system and cannot disentangle itself. But he says also that while the Democratic party may be and have frequently been forgetful of the earlier teachings of the party as to the Constitution, yet it still has within itself the elements of repair and that the old Jefferson principle must hereafter be the conservative element to prevent these robberies of the Treasury by means of the wrong interpretation of the organic law. I append the extract:

There must be a remedy, and it is to be found not in the hands of any statesman, but in a return to the wise and conservative ways of the Constitution. For some years there has been a disposition to give power to Congress which is hurtful to the people and injurious to the morals of the legislators, which corrupts officials and tends to make the lobby supreme. Our Government has sought to show its conservatism by its wise distributions of political power—leaving to the control of the local authorities all questions which directly affect them as communities. It was the design of the men who framed the Constitution to keep political affairs under the guidance of those who have the deepest interest in their successful conduct.

The Constitution, in all its provisions, sought to keep political power from concentrating at one point, and an honest construction of its language and spirit would correct the abuses which have grown to such threatening proportions in the last twenty years. If I ever speak in public again—but I do not suppose I ever shall be able to do so—I would take up this subject and show our perils and their remedy. The Republican party is wedded to this unconstitutional system of centralization and cannot disentangle itself from the corrupt and confusing practices it draws in its train.

The influence of these centralizing methods comes right home to us in this State. They work disastrous results to the commerce of the country, to its farmers and to business prosperity. Cheap transportation sells our farm products in Europe and has lifted all kinds of business from the depression which existed some years ago. It is of the greatest consequence to us to send what we raise and make to foreign markets at a cheap rate. A very small difference in the cost of carrying will prevent our grains and provisions from going abroad. If the charges for transportation go back to where they were eight or ten years ago they will cut off all sales in a large way to European countries. In the course of the growth of centralizing ideas the project has been broached more than once to allow Congress to take the great water highways of the land under its protection, and thus expose our commercial advantages to rival routes and rival interests. This would destroy free competition in transportation and form a grand combination by which legislation in reference to the carrying trade of the canals, lakes, and rivers would regulate all charges for freights; and this would place the extended and complicated pursuits of industry and commerce at the mercy of a self-perpetuating lobby.

Under these circumstances the Democratic party has the opportunity to win a great victory by standing up for constitutional amendments of government. By its past traditions and history it is committed to this popular line of policy which the Republicans cannot adopt if they would. It is ours simply to be guided by the marvelous wisdom which originally distributed jurisdiction between different local departments, and which had been lost sight of in the tumults of war and in the extraordinary measures arising therefrom.

The Democratic party is in the position to make this issue. The disposition of the people, which had its origin in self-reliance growing out of the conditions of the first settlements, instead of growing weaker on the point of local self-government grows stronger. The masses prefer to keep political affairs under their own eyes and have no sympathy with centralization. The growth of intercourse between the different sections and the increase of agricultural and commercial interests have created a conservative intelligent interest which will rebuke all purposes and passions that threaten peace and harmony. I have no doubt of the success of the Democratic party and of the enduring triumph of its principles, as I have no doubt of the permanence of our constitutional institutions. The country grows stronger every day.

PEEILIOUS CHANGES SINCE THE WAR.

In conclusion, then, Mr. Chairman, let me say that if Bancroft could rise again, as he has himself risen in his old age, to write the history of our Constitution; if he could rise now with that vigor of his earlier days, when he was a Democrat, to write the history of the country since the civil war, he might draw abundant inspiration from the events which have transpired since that time and which have led to such appropriations as are now before us for our consideration.

Political and social changes have occurred in the structure of our polity. They have had and have a permanent interest for us to-day as well as in our future. We destroyed slavery. After the war the political supremacy of a section was for a time decreed. The slavery question was a strain upon our country and our Government. It was settled by an amendment of the Constitution. We are now striving to inaugurate a policy very akin to royalty or centralization.

Aside, sir, from the vices and the corruptions and the passions which resulted from our war; aside from the increase of crime and the schemes of speculation; aside from the collisions of race hardly yet fully reconciled; aside from the enormous frauds in our cities and our States and in the Federal Government, the time after the war was seized upon for other purposes by traders and manufacturers to overturn the revenue system. Its result was to incorporate within our body

of laws a partial and aggrandizing system. Out of this scheme came these vast moneys which we are seeking by such bills as this to take from the Treasury. This is the one hundred and fifty millions yearly surplus, as the result of our present infamous tax laws.

Aside from all these matters it becomes us, though that money be in the Treasury, to guard well our powers under the Constitution, lest a worse danger come upon us. For while there is no more danger of our country being parted or our States being torn apart, there is danger when men can come upon this floor and ventilate their French ideas about the solidarity of the nation with a view to raid the Treasury. Against this we should guard with vestal vigilance. We should denounce it with fearless and honest indignation.

I say, sir, in the spirit of Governor Seymour: "Let us return to the old ways of our fathers; let us stand on those ancient ways conforming to the rules laid down for the interpretation of the organic law and then we may stop at its fountain this corruption and putrescence that follow in the train of a large surplus in our Federal Treasury." [Loud applause.]

Mr. McLANE. In the short time that I have reserved for myself I shall confine my remarks to one branch of this subject which has been presented by the gentleman from New York, [Mr. COX.] I do not understand that he takes any exception to this bill except upon the constitutional ground and the questions of detail as to how much money ought to be appropriated. If I did not think he entirely misapprehends and misrepresents the constitutional polity of the party to which he and I are both attached I should make no reference to his argument at all. For on the question of discretion I concede fully that it is his right, as it is each individual's right in this House. It is the discretion of Congress that ought to regulate the amount of money appropriated for the improvement of rivers and harbors. To that I would take no exception. Indeed, it is the foundation of the argument I intend to address to the committee.

But when the gentleman from New York referred to the policy of this Government and appealed to this House to return to the policy of the Democratic party, which in its early history for a quarter of a century governed this country and for nearly as long a period after the election of Jackson, I feel at liberty to say to him that whether he gives us the politics or the poetry of Bryant, or the history of Bancroft, he misrepresents the political policy of the party to which he is attached. There was never in the history of this country under the administration of Jefferson or Madison or Monroe or Jackson the slightest difference of opinion as to the power of Congress in regulating commerce. And there has never been a court of the United States that questioned the policy of the Democratic party. The policy of Jefferson, the policy of Madison, the policy of Monroe, and the policy of Jackson has received the indorsement of Marshall and of every justice of the United States from Marshall's day to ours, so far as the power of Congress to regulate commerce included the power to facilitate commerce by the improvement of navigation on the coast and on the navigable rivers of the country, whether wholly in one State or in several States, the navigability thereof being exclusively under control of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, we may differ, and we ought to differ, if we are independent legislators, upon all questions where our discretion is appealed to. But if we are intelligent and faithful legislators we ought not to differ upon principle, and it is unreasonable to take advantage of each other. In my judgment it is not what we ought to do. I do not think that either a Republican or a Democrat ought to argue upon this floor as if he held the sacred fire of his party, and then, either misunderstanding or misrepresenting the policy of his party, lose himself in questions of mere detail or discretion. Why, sir, the power of Congress to regulate commerce has been declared by the highest judicial tribunals of the country to be a power to facilitate commerce, and to facilitate commerce has always been construed to be a power to improve navigation and intercourse between or among the States and with foreign nations. The gentleman from New York, [Mr. COX,] when he says that a river within a State could not be improved, and was not embraced in the power to regulate commerce, only advertises his own absolute ignorance of what the law of the land is, because the law of the land is that a navigable river within a State is as much the subject of commercial regulation as a river running through twenty States. A single river in a single State is just as much within the power of Congress to regulate or to improve its navigation as if it ran through ten or twenty States. [Mr. COX, of New York, rose.] The gentleman will please excuse me.

Mr. COX, of New York. The gentleman from Maryland misrepresents me.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Maryland yield?

Mr. McLANE. If the gentleman thinks I misrepresent him I will certainly yield to him for a correction.

Mr. COX, of New York. I held the controlling matter to be the quality of the stream, and not exactly where it is located.

Mr. McLANE. But the gentleman said a stream within a State.

Mr. COX, of New York. I spoke of a stream for small local commerce.

Mr. McLANE. And I am replying to that argument. I will not misrepresent the gentleman.

Mr. COX, of New York. We have debated this matter before.

Mr. McLANE. The gentleman from New York said the power of Congress to regulate commerce on a river within one State was an

assertion of unconstitutional power. Now, I tell him that every administration, from Jefferson down to this day, and every judge of the Supreme Court, from Marshall down to this day, has decided that the only question was, was the stream navigable? And the decision has expressly been that if it is navigable it is within the power of Congress to regulate commerce thereon, though it may be within one State. There can be no doubt about that being the language used by the judicial tribunals of the country, and there is as little doubt that Congress has exercised such power from the foundation of the Government to this time.

More than that, Mr. Chairman; there is another point where the gentleman from New York again fell far short of an intelligent appreciation of the constitutional polity to which he referred.

Why, sir, the Supreme Court of the United States states that the commerce which we have power to regulate is the commerce that the States originally had the power to regulate. That is the law laid down and accepted by everybody. Prior to the organization of this Federal Government the States were each sovereign and regulated commerce as fully and absolutely as the most sovereign government could do, and when they granted to Congress the power to regulate commerce among the States and with foreign governments it was the commerce which they had the power to regulate, and that power was everywhere recognized to be the power to facilitate commerce by improving the navigation of rivers and harbors in any way and to any extent which in their own discretion they deemed wise and expedient, or, in constitutional language, "necessary and proper." That is the law as laid down and accepted by everybody—that the commerce between the States and with foreign nations which Congress has the power to regulate is the commerce which the States originally had the right to regulate, before they made the grant of power to the General Government. Therefore, when an intelligent legislator comes to ascertain whether any regulation of commerce is a regulation of commerce he has only to look to what is the definition of a regulation of commerce.

It is the power to construct light-houses, buoys, piers, to improve rivers, to dig canals when the improvement of a river requires that a canal be dug. That is the view of the law accepted by the administration of Jefferson, to whom the honorable gentleman from New York referred.

Now, one of two things: we are guilty of great affectation, or we are imposing upon ourselves or we are imposing upon the country when we make the declaration that we desire to be governed by the policy of Jefferson, and then stand up and make an issue with colleagues who are following the policy of Jefferson.

For one, I will not accept that. I recognize the right of every gentleman, be he Republican or be he Democrat, to consult his own discretion and to vote just as much money as he pleases for any particular purpose. But let him stand on his own discretion. Do not let him impose upon the country and do not let him impose upon himself; do not let him go off and "lay the flattering unction to his soul" that he holds the fire of his party, and that he is its faithful interpreter. I know very few men who have sufficient intelligence and fidelity to their political convictions to carry the fire of the Democratic party, very few.

It is susceptible of great development, it is very elastic, and we are all of us obliged in the end to repose very much upon our own discretion and our own very fallible judgments. I hold under my hand here the messages of the Presidents to whom the gentleman from New York has referred, beginning with Jefferson and closing with Jackson. They do not confine the power of Congress to improve the rivers, build piers, light-houses, or buoys or harbors as a mere incident to the power of Congress to regulate commerce, though they fully recognize it and apply it in legislation. They claim the further power to appropriate money for any national object. They leave Congress the discretion to decide whether the object is national or not.

I have here in my hand Jackson's veto of the Maysville road bill. Why did he veto the Maysville road bill? He said he did so because it was not a bill of national importance. He contrasted it with the Cumberland road bill, and he referred to his predecessors and indorsed their views as to the power of Congress under the money power to appropriate for national works as independent, if additional to the power to regulate commerce, and in the exercise of this latter power he signed bills for the improvement of rivers and harbors.

And right by the side of Jackson's message I have Monroe's veto of the Cumberland road bill—Monroe, who put himself against the policy of Jefferson and of Madison in regard to this great public work, generally known as the "National road." Why? Because he said that it behooved us to have a rule, a limit, if possible a constitutional limitation to control our discretion. He did not doubt the power of Congress, but he said they were going, as we are now, to such excess of expenditure that it behooved every faithful public servant in the executive or in the legislative branch to regard the expenditure itself and to exercise a wise discretion. If that were the issue now, there would be no difference between us. I would be very willing to leave the bill as defended by the honorable gentleman from Michigan, [Mr. Horn,] and as attacked by the honorable gentleman from New York, [Mr. Cox,] and allow it to be a question of discretion. If there is too much money appropriated by the bill, then cut it down and do not appropriate so much.

If \$8,000,000 is too much for the Mississippi River and its tributaries, then appropriate less. If \$2,000,000 is too much for the har-

bors of the coast, then appropriate less. But do it on your manhood, do it as a matter of discretion, and do not attempt to put those who differ with you on the question of discretion into a false position in regard to the constitutional polity of the Government.

I am perfectly willing to meet any honorable friend I have on this floor on the constitutional issue as involved in the policy of the Democratic party. I maintain that, excepting Polk and Pierce, I know of no President of the United States, be he Democrat or be he Republican, who ever questioned the power of Congress to improve rivers and harbors, to build light-houses, to erect buoys, to build harbors of refuge as well as harbors which make commerce safe and easy, and to improve rivers so as to render commerce on them safe and easy, and though they all recognized the responsibility of a discretion by both Congress and the Executive, they were enlightened and liberal in the exercise of this great and beneficent power.

Mr. SPARKS. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him a moment?

Mr. McLANE. Yes.

Mr. SPARKS. What kind of rivers?

Mr. McLANE. All rivers that are navigable.

Mr. SPARKS. Navigable for what?

Mr. McLANE. Read the decisions of the courts, and they will tell you that it is not in the power of any legislative body to say whether a river is to be navigable by a ship of twenty-seven or twenty feet draft, or of a steamer or boat of as many inches.

Mr. SPARKS. Or a skiff, or a canoe.

Mr. McLANE. If you please; will the gentleman from Illinois who interrupts me be candid enough to accept my answer?

Mr. SPARKS. I beg the gentleman's pardon if I have interrupted him; I asked leave.

Mr. McLANE. There is no occasion to beg my pardon, since I have allowed the interruption. But I hope the gentleman will be candid enough to accept my answer. It does not rest with the gentleman from Illinois or with myself to decide what is navigable. That is a question of fact, and a stream which is navigable is within the admiralty jurisdiction of the United States, and if the honorable gentleman from Illinois will give it attention he will find all the rivers in this bill are navigable.

Mr. SPARKS. As the gentleman appeals to me in that way, I will say that these opinions of the distinguished gentlemen to which he has referred hold that the rivers to be improved should be such as were national in their character. I say that this bill is bristling all over with little streams that in no sense are navigable.

Mr. McLANE. I challenge the gentleman from Illinois to name a river or a stream included in this bill that is not navigable. Name one.

Mr. SPARKS. I will in a moment.

Mr. McLANE. You may go up to the headwaters of the streams in Georgia and Alabama, and you will find them as navigable at their head as one hundred and fifty miles below, though they do not carry as much water, and you must not confound the question of nationality with the question of navigability; the one has reference to the money power and the other to the regulation of commerce.

Mr. BROWNE. Will the gentleman inform me how much navigation there is on the Wabash River as high as Terre Haute? Will he state the number of steamers, or flat-boats, or coal barges, or whatever else, navigating the Wabash up to that point?

Mr. McLANE. If the gentleman will refer to the reports of the engineers—

Mr. HORN. The gentleman from Maryland will permit me to refer the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Browne] to his three colleagues, who came before our committee and gave us a detailed statement of exactly how much commerce there was on that river.

Mr. McLANE. I much prefer to take the official reports. But I do say to the honorable gentleman from Indiana that he knows the Wabash is navigable; and it rests with him, not with me, to inform the House how many feet of water it carries to the point he indicates. It is not a legitimate mode of meeting my argument to put to me any such question. He can well answer it himself, and he knows very well that the courts of the country would rule it to be navigable and subject to commercial regulation.

I make the point that under the Constitution a navigable stream in one State is just as much subject to the power of Congress to regulate commerce as a stream running through twelve States. I wish to see the gentleman of any intelligence in either House of Congress who will gainsay that proposition. There is none. It is the law of the land. It has been legislated upon over and over again. Every President of the United States, with the exceptions I have indicated, of every party has signed river and harbor bills which included rivers within a single State. More, sir; the courts have decided that if to improve a river you must construct a canal, if the canal be the proper mode of improvement, then the power to construct a canal is unquestionable, though the canal is constructed in one State. The man who is willing to spend a million of dollars in digging mud from a stream, but hesitates about spending \$100,000 for a canal around the obstruction, is not likely to command much respect in any legislative assembly when this bill is discussed upon its details and its merits.

We have taken the Portland Canal and have appropriated it to the Federal Government; we have paid for it; it belongs to us. We maintain it to-day. We have the Sault Ste. Marie Canal; we

have the Des Moines Canal; as also locks and dams in Pennsylvania and Virginia and other States. Canals being the only mode of improving the navigation in these cases, have been adopted to a very limited extent as yet. I for one see no reason why the same wise discretion should not be applied to that mode of improvement as well as any other.

One word, in conclusion, as to the Mississippi River and those observations which have been made here about the character of that improvement. Why, sir, every country on the face of the earth where the power to regulate commerce was involved has done just what is proposed to be done on the Mississippi River. The gentleman from New York [Mr. Cox] referred to Egypt and to Moses—to Moses's little well and little stream. Why, sir, if he had been disposed to deal with this subject in a catholic and intelligent spirit he would have referred to the river Nile, which bears a closer parallel to the Mississippi than any other river on the face of the earth. He would have found that more than \$100,000,000 have been invested between Cairo and Alexandria in precisely the way that we propose to invest these \$50,000,000 or \$70,000,000 upon the Mississippi. The difference is that the sovereign power of Egypt made no question as to whether the levees should be for the benefit of navigation or for the protection of the property and lives of the people upon the banks of the river. There the obligation was recognized that the commerce on that river should not only be made safe and easy but that the river, while its navigation was made safe and easy, should not be allowed to sweep away the population upon either bank, but be rendered a benefaction and blessing. Therefore at one and the same time the river was made navigable and the people who inhabited its banks were made secure. That is the obligation of any sovereign power on the face of the earth.

I stand here to-day to argue that this Government in its regulation of commerce is as sovereign as any power on earth. No Emperor of Russia, no Republic of France, to which reference has been made in this debate, has greater power than the Government of the United States when it comes to regulating commerce among the States and with foreign nations. This power is plenary and exclusive of the States. There is no power on earth known in this matter but the power of Congress. The history of the world is full of illustration as to how commerce is regulated and facilitated. Harbors constructed at immense cost, durable and capacious; rivers improved by dredging, blasting, and diking, and by the construction of canals around obstacles where such improvements were necessary; rivers connected at their source, and interior navigation secured to a people from ocean to ocean; and finally, canals of more than a thousand miles in length, constructed parallel to the ocean-bound coast, to give a country the blessing of easy and safe communication. Europe, Asia, and Africa all furnish ample illustration as to what are the ordinary facilities and regulations of commerce, the sole and exclusive control of which by the Constitution is vested in the Government of the United States.

Now, say what you will about this bill, criticize it as you choose, vote for or against it as you may, but I hope gentlemen will have too much respect for themselves and the House to argue that it is unconstitutional, or that it is against the constitutional polity of the Democratic party, to improve the rivers and harbors of the country. [Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BROWNE obtained the floor.

Mr. PAGE. I would like to find out if I can how much time is desired for general discussion of this bill. After the gentleman from Indiana has concluded his remarks I shall move that the committee rise for the purpose of limiting general debate.

Mr. REAGAN. I hope the gentleman will not make that motion until I have submitted a few remarks.

Mr. BROWNE. Mr. Chairman, this bill will pass. I feel a conviction when the Treasury is to be tapped for the benefit of thirty-three out of thirty-eight States of the Union, and when the appropriations interest so large a number of the Representatives of the people, that the measure has a sufficient influence in the House to secure its passage. [Laughter.]

I find on an examination of the bill that it is national in its character, certainly to this extent, that there are appropriations to be expended in thirty-three out of thirty-eight States, and it is gratifying to me to know so many of the States in this Union have navigable waters. I only regret they are so unfortunate, each of them, as to need an annual appropriation out of the Treasury.

Another fact to which reference has been made heretofore is, that there goes to the States represented by the gentlemen on the committee seven and a half million of dollars of the \$17,000,000 appropriated, and when you add the \$6,000,000 given to the Mississippi River the aggregate comes to something over \$13,000,000 of money.

I do not doubt the power of Congress to appropriate money for the improvement of the navigable rivers of the country, those that nature primarily has made so. If this appropriation was confined solely to such water-ways I should not interpose an objection, if in addition to that it was apparent that all these contemplated expenditures were judicious.

To assume that you may appropriate for slack-water navigation or to make a canal, is to assume the power on the part of the General Government to construct any kind of public highway. It is important to commerce we should have macadamized roads, and I remember when the Congress of the United States, years ago, at-

tempted to construct a public highway from the East to the West, through the States of Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Indiana, to the frontier, to be constructed, as was assumed by the Whig party of that day, as a military highway, to enable the Government to send its armies and supplies to the frontier for the defense of our people against the inroads of the savage tribes.

Mr. McLANE. I challenge that opinion; that is not the fact; it was constructed under Jefferson's administration, before the Whig party was in existence.

Mr. BROWNE. My memory does not go back as far as that of the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. McLANE. Mine does, and it goes to the fact.

Mr. BROWNE. I admit the gentleman is older.

Mr. McLANE. That is not the issue.

Mr. BROWNE. I remember the celebrated speech of Corwin, in which he immortalized himself in his witticisms against Crary, of Michigan, on that very constitutional question when the construction of this road was opposed by the Democracy on the ground it was an internal improvement, and did not come within the power of Congress under the Constitution of the United States. The doctrine which was held by the Democrats of that day was combated by Mr. Corwin.

Mr. McLANE. The gentleman will not accept my correction. That is not parliamentary; he ought to accept it.

Mr. BROWNE. I yielded to the gentleman for his statement. I say I am right as to the main point, although it may be I have not referred to the exact road.

Mr. McLANE. I do not want to interrupt the gentleman, but I think it is parliamentary that he should stand corrected. It is not a fact that the Cumberland road was organized by the Whig party and opposed by the Democratic party. As a matter of fact that is not so. Under Jefferson's administration the Democracy over and over again voted for that road.

Mr. BROWNE. I accept the gentleman's correction. The speech of Mr. Corwin to which I have referred grew out of the construction of a public highway, which was opposed by the Democracy. It may not have been called the Cumberland road in reference to which Mr. Corwin combated the constitutional scruple of the Democracy.

Mr. McLANE. That is the road the gentleman from Indiana referred to; he referred to the National road, and everybody knows the National road is the Cumberland road.

Mr. BROWNE. It may be the gentleman is correct on that point.

Mr. McLANE. That is correct.

Mr. BROWNE. Was it opposed by the Democracy?

Mr. McLANE. No, sir.

Mr. BROWNE. Was it opposed by Mr. Crary, a Democrat?

Mr. McLANE. I do not know who he is.

Mr. BROWNE. The gentleman does not know, then, an important fact of history. I pass from that. Now, so far as the Maysville and Lexington road is concerned it was vetoed by Jackson.

Mr. McLANE. I concede that.

Mr. BROWNE. The gentleman concedes that. It was vetoed because it was local in its character, wholly in one State, running from Maysville, on the Ohio River, to Lexington, in the State of Kentucky. Let me ask the gentleman why a macadamized road wholly in one State is more local than a navigable river wholly in one State?

Mr. McLANE. Will you allow me to answer?

Mr. BROWNE. Yes, sir.

Mr. McLANE. General Jackson stated expressly in that message that if it were under the power to regulate commerce he would not have offered any objection, but it was an appropriation under a general clause to raise money and expend it for national objects, (and that was not a national object, in his opinion;) but that if it had been national he would not have vetoed it, and if it had been under the power of Congress to regulate commerce he would not have taken exception to the fact of its being in one State only.

Mr. BROWNE. I have not read for a long time the message to which the gentleman refers—

Mr. McLANE. I have. I have it here under my hand at this moment.

Mr. BROWNE. I do not pretend to take issue with the statement. I have no doubt of its correctness; but I understand the gentleman from Maryland and those who agree with him to assume that the question of whether it is a matter of national importance or not is a matter for Congress, and not for the Executive.

Mr. McLANE. My opinion is that the discretion is with the law-making power.

Mr. BROWNE. So I understood the gentleman to argue; and I say, therefore, that if the gentleman from Maryland is correct in his position, all that Congress has to do to extract money from the public Treasury for the construction of a common dirt road, for a turnpike or a corduroy road, is to say that it is a matter of national importance, and that would justify the appropriation.

I cannot agree to that. What I complain of is, that if these appropriations are to be made for water-ways not national in their importance; if you carry the theory to its legitimate consequences, it will authorize Congress to enter into the construction of any kind of a highway, or any possible character of road, and that would convert the nation into a great corporation for the purpose of constructing local improvements everywhere. It is, to say the least, a dangerous power, if it be constitutional.



Now, while I do not pretend to argue this constitutional question, I do think that if it had been suggested in the convention that framed our Constitution, at the time it was declared by that instrument that Congress should have power to regulate commerce between the States, if it had been suggested by the gentleman from Maryland, or some other gentleman of that day, that this clause would be construed by Congress to mean that the nation was given the power to enter into the construction of all kinds of highways, and for the improvement of every character of stream, great and small, it would have excited a smile of incredulity on the face of every member of that distinguished body.

But leaving that question, Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of a river and harbor bill. I have never voted for one, to be sure. I regret that none has ever been brought in here that could command my respect and confidence to such an extent as to enable me to give it my support. But I favor some such system. I am in favor of improving the Mississippi River. I think it ought to be improved, and I think it ought to have all that is appropriated by this bill for its improvement. If I had my way about it I would begin this great work of improvement with the Mississippi River, and improve it first and wait until that work had been accomplished before I would take up the improvement of its tributaries. There is no question about the national character of the Mississippi River. There is no question of its vast importance to our commerce.

Mr. REED. We can improve all of them.

Mr. BROWNE. The gentleman from Maine says that he can do all this work.

Mr. REED. I was referring to the country, which is larger than the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. BROWNE. Not much. [Laughter.]

Mr. REED. I thank the gentleman; a compliment of that touching character is gratefully received—a tribute alike to me and to the country. [Laughter.]

Mr. BROWNE. I apologize to the country. [Laughter.] I hope that is satisfactory to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. REED. That is entirely satisfactory to me.

Mr. BROWNE. I say, Mr. Chairman, that there is no question about the importance of the improvement of the Mississippi River. I do not propose to discuss now whether or not it ought to be improved by the jetty system or the system of building up the levees, or by the outlet system. I know little about these systems; nor do I propose to say anything in regard to what the results may be if we enter into the levee system as to the interests of riparian owners. The only question with me is this: if it is essential to the proper improvement of the Mississippi River that we should rebuild the levees, let us rebuild them. If it is not essential to its proper improvement they should be rebuilt, then I am opposed to their rebuilding. If it is indispensable to the navigation of that great stream that we should build new levees, let them be built; if it is not necessary that they should be built, then this expense ought not to be incurred, and this system ought not to be adopted. If the result of our levee system, should that system be adopted, is to reclaim inundated lands; if the result shall be for the benefit of the people residing on the banks of this river and they shall be protected in their homes and lives, I will, for one, be glad of it. I hope it may so result, if it shall be seen proper to adopt this system. It would be a very strong inducement to adopt it. I confess I am somewhat prejudiced in favor of that plan, because I believe it will have that result.

Why, sir, gentlemen talk about the Constitution. When the Mississippi River gets beyond its banks, plantations are being flooded, homes are being swept away, the lives of our people are being lost; when there is danger of succeeding pestilence; when these unfortunate people are starving and the Congress of the United States is asked to make an appropriation for their relief, we do not hesitate; my friend from New York votes the appropriation; I vote it; we all vote it, and we ought to vote it. Yet, I ask the gentleman, where in the Constitution is a power to make this appropriation? If after the flood comes we may protect the lives of those people, if after the flood comes we may protect them from starvation, may we not protect them from death and starvation before it comes by making the flood impossible? I wish some gentleman would answer the question.

But, Mr. Chairman, I object to this bill and all bills of this character, because it makes appropriations for little inconsequential streams. I know whereof I speak. It makes appropriations for streams that need but one thing in the world that I know of to make them navigable, and that is water. [Laughter.] It is said, to be sure, that this appropriates a smaller sum of money in that direction than has been appropriated in any bill that has preceded it. That does not answer the objections in my mind. I am unwilling to vote sixteen millions of necessary appropriations for the purpose of getting the opportunity of squandering a million and a half dollars in waterless streams, and until bills of this character have eliminated from them this objectionable feature I shall not support them.

It is said that we have plenty of money. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HERR] dwells upon the fact, the very gratifying fact that we have in the Treasury a large sum of money unappropriated. Well, it strikes me, in the first place, that we have uses for it. We are still in debt about \$1,700,000,000, a very considerable portion of it bearing interest. He says that the farmer who improves his farm takes advantage of his personal prosperity, takes advantage of

the time when his granaries are full of grain for the market; or, when his purse is full of the money he has received as its proceeds, to make the necessary farm improvements. I grant it; but if the farmer were in debt and the debt bearing interest, the first thing the prudent and economical farmer would do would be to pay his debts. And rather than dump an unnecessary million and a half or three millions into the unnavigable waters of the United States, I am in favor of appropriating that sum to the payment of the debt of the nation.

More than that, let me say to the gentleman from Michigan, during the next three or four years the Treasury will be taxed quite a hundred millions a year to pay pensions due from the nation for her heroic defenders. I do not say the sum is too large or too small—that is not the question; the obligation is upon us. In a few days we will make an appropriation of a hundred millions for this purpose for the next fiscal year, and an equal or larger sum will be required for each succeeding year for the next four or five years.

The time is not far distant when we will need this large sum now in the Treasury for the discharge of this sacred obligation of the nation, and I am not willing to divert it to an improper purpose, as I conceive a part of this measure to be, until at least I know that the resources of the nation will be ample to meet this charge upon it.

But the Treasury, it is said, is full to overflowing. That is said every time we seek to erect a public building for the collection of revenue at some point where there is no revenue to be collected, or to build a court-house where no courts are held. It is used when we desire to erect a public building at Peoria, or an eight-hundred-thousand-dollar public building at Brooklyn. Whenever some measure of extravagance is contemplated by the representatives of the people they seek to justify their action by calling the attention of the nation to the fact that there are millions of unexpended money in the national Treasury. I am glad it is there.

Every time we propose to subsidize a railroad, every time we propose to put money into the hands of some corporation, we seek first to find that the work is national, and it is mighty easy under the construction given to the Constitution by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. McLANE] to find that fact. We find first it is public in its character, and then it is said, "Oh, take the money; it is in the Treasury." Let the money stay in the Treasury until it is needed. I say to adopt this idea leads to profligacy; it is debauching; it corrupts the political morals of the country. We ought to stand closely by every dollar in the Treasury, for every dollar there was collected by taxing the resources of the people.

When we want to get clear of some tax that ought to be levied—the whisky tax for instance, the tax that ought to remain as long as the Government needs a penny, or a gallon of whisky is manufactured or sold in the country—when we want to get clear of that tax these gentlemen say, "Oh, let us take off the whisky tax, because we have abundance of money in the Treasury;" and so you go along, and I do not know where the argument would end. Those who would relieve whisky and tobacco from the burden of taxation complain that there is too much money in the Treasury.

The very fact that we have money in the Treasury is a gratifying fact. I am glad it is there. I desire to keep it there until the time comes when it can be properly and economically expended, and then let it come out of the Treasury, and the sooner it goes to such purpose, I agree with you, the better.

But it is said this money we take out of the Treasury goes to our own people. To be sure it does; and that is supposed to be some kind of an apology for this prodigal expenditure. I do not see the matter in that light. Who does?

If it is necessary to take money out of the Treasury improperly, that it may go into the hands of the people, let us send it out in baskets and make a fair distribution of it among all the people. I know of no reason why we should give them anything from the Treasury; but if there is to be a grand gift enterprise, a gratuitous distribution without regard to causes or consequences, let us all have our share. Why, sir, it is absurd to say because it goes to our people therefore we should not rigidly guard the expenditure of the public moneys.

All our taxes, from the beginning of the Government down till to-day nearly, almost every dollar taken from the public Treasury has gone to our own people; not all of it, but it has been largely so. This fact has never been used to justify profligacy before.

Now, let us look at another feature of this bill. It is said that some of these unimportant streams have been eliminated from this bill. However, another fact is stated in that connection, that while we have got clear of some of these little streams, the Committee on Commerce has been on a voyage of discovery, and, like a second Christopher Columbus, has discovered forty new streams—little ones at that. If I understood correctly the chairman of the committee [Mr. PAGE] and the gentleman from Michigan, [Mr. HERR] there are forty new subjects of appropriation in this bill. Will these discoveries never end? Not until the Treasury is exhausted, I surmise.

How stands the matter, then? This bill appropriates in round numbers \$17,350,000. How has it been heretofore? At the first session of the Forty-second Congress, ten years ago, there was appropriated for this purpose \$5,588,000. At the second session of that Congress there was appropriated \$7,352,000. At the first session of the Forty-third Congress there was appropriated \$5,228,000, and at the second session of that Congress \$6,648,000. At the first session

of the Forty-fifth Congress there was appropriated \$5,015,000 for this purpose.

Let me call the attention of my Republican friends to the singular fact that during the whole of the Forty-fourth Congress, the first Congress for years in which the Democratic party had power, in order that they might go to the people with a record for economy, they appropriated during the whole two years of that Congress only \$5,015,000 for this purpose.

Those gentlemen who are so much enamored just now with the idea of promoting the commerce of the country, building up our business interests and doing so much for the benefit of our industrial classes, should bear in mind that during the whole Forty-fourth Congress, the first Congress for a decade and a half in which the Democratic party had power, they decreased the appropriations for all river and harbor improvements \$2,000,000 below what it is now proposed to appropriate for the Mississippi River alone.

What next? At the first session of the Forty-fifth Congress there was appropriated \$8,322,000 for this purpose, and at the second session of that Congress and for the first session of the Forty-sixth Congress there was appropriated \$9,557,000. At the second session of the Forty-sixth Congress there was appropriated \$8,976,000, and at the last session the amount was run up to \$11,547,000.

The point to which I desire to call the attention of the committee particularly is, that this river and harbor expenditure is constantly on the increase. We have not increased the number of our rivers; we have not increased the number of miles of navigation. But we are constantly increasing our annual expenditures in this direction, notwithstanding the millions of dollars we have already expended. Do you never finish any of these harbors? Are none of them completed? Do you never improve a navigable river to such an extent that further appropriations are unnecessary? If there has been one harbor completed, or one river for the improvement of which appropriations have been made which now needs no more appropriations, I wish the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. McLANE] would name that river or that harbor.

Mr. McLANE. Will the gentleman allow me to answer?

Mr. BROWNE. I have asked the question, and of course I will allow the gentleman to answer it.

Mr. McLANE. The harbors of the country were improved five years ago, we will say, up to the wants of the commerce of that day. The great carrying trade of the country was then conducted in ships drawing about twenty feet of water.

Mr. BROWNE. The gentleman does not answer my question.

Mr. McLANE. As the draft of vessels has increased to twenty-five, twenty-six, or twenty-seven feet we have improved the harbors of the country up to that point.

Mr. BROWNE. Then they are not completed and never will be?

Mr. McLANE. No; not so long as they build bigger ships.

Mr. BROWNE. I am glad to know that fact.

Mr. HERR. It is fair to state to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BROWNE] that there have been a large number of harbors completed—

Mr. BROWNE. No; they have not been completed, and as the commerce of the country increases and ships get larger you must continue to improve your harbors. I have the word of the gentleman from Maryland for it.

Mr. HERR. Not all of them. And there are a very large number of streams which have been improved and need nothing now.

Mr. BROWNE. I take the statement of the gentleman from Maryland, [Mr. McLANE,] that notwithstanding we have completed many harbors and finished the improvements on many rivers, yet these annual appropriations are constantly increasing and are to increase for all time to come.

Mr. McLANE. As our commerce increases.

Mr. HERR. To keep pace with our commerce.

Mr. BROWNE. It would be well to make an arrangement with the Almighty to increase the water supply as we increase our commerce, so that the Congress of the United States and the Great Ruler might go hand in hand in these very important matters. I assert again that what is needed most in a majority of streams and harbors is not larger appropriations but deeper water.

Now, in the past ten years we have expended in round numbers for the improvements of rivers and harbors \$68,233,000. Taking the sessions of Congress as twelve sessions, that is an appropriation of \$5,600,000 each session. That brings us up to last year with an average of \$5,600,000. This session we jump from an average of \$5,600,000 to \$17,000,000, and the argument is that our commerce within this time has increased in that ratio.

What next? These appropriations during the past ten years have averaged per year \$6,223,000. Upon the ratio of this bill in the next ten years the appropriations will reach the aggregate of \$175,000,000. And if we increase this appropriation as we have from the last year this, then the sum will be one-fourth more than that, and will jump up to over \$250,000,000, and will exceed annually hereafter \$25,000,000. Our appropriations for these improvements during the past ten years have reached the enormous sum of \$68,250,000. Is it not time we should stop and reflect? The people will call a halt if we do not.

I think when these facts are presented to us we ought at least to be careful in the consideration of bills of this character. That is all I have asked heretofore, that is all I demand now; that in this expenditure we shall appropriate the people's money simply to works

of a national character, that the appropriation shall be necessary, and judiciously and economically expended. I will not see the money of the people wasted if I can help it.

My friend from Michigan [Mr. HERR] said that all these little streams are national, because they empty into other streams, and they empty into other streams, and finally by the time they have emptied themselves three or four times they get into streams of national consequence. That is the gentleman's idea; it is not mine. The stream itself in its immediate consequences upon American commerce should be national in its character to justify an appropriation. I say that if you will confine your appropriations to streams of this character and the sums appropriated are reasonable I will give them my vote.

There is another thing which I would like to see done, though I do not expect to see it. When you find a work of national importance needing a Congressional appropriation, I would like to see Congress appropriate at once a sum fully sufficient to complete it. How have your expenditures heretofore been made? You find a stream or a harbor that needs an expenditure of \$100,000; you give it \$10,000. The storms of winter, the lashing of the waves, the insecure condition of the uncompleted work occasion damage and results in wasting say \$5,000 of the expenditure. Gentlemen know this to be the fact. One-half of these insufficient appropriations are wasted before the work is completed.

Why do you appropriate money in this way? I fear it is done (and gentlemen know whether this is the case) because if you appropriate enough to complete a few important works you reach speedily the limit of the amount which you can fairly appropriate in the aggregate; and if you should stop there you could not get a sufficient number of votes to pass your bill. Consequently you appropriate a little here and a little there, going round as you have done in this bill among thirty-three States; beginning with a small appropriation of \$18,500 in the little State of Vermont, you go on till you have swelled your appropriations to millions; and you make your appropriations in this way, I fear, because it is indispensable you should do so in order to make it sure that your measure will meet the approval of the House of Representatives.

If I had my way—I do not expect anybody to agree with me; I cannot help it; it is not my fault; I am willing that you should do so—if I had my way I would take up the most important of these works, the Mississippi River first, and I would try to demonstrate by all the money in the Treasury that could be appropriated for the purpose the feasibility of improving that river to the full demands of American commerce. When I had completed that I would take up the more important streams of the country and push each work to completion. This would be the economical plan and, in my opinion, the more expeditious one. If after getting through with these important works we then had an overloading Treasury I might be willing to waive my constitutional and economic scruples and favor an appropriation for the pollywog streams and the push-boat navigation of the country. Unless this bill is amended, radically amended, by the Committee of the Whole, I will not give it my vote.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee rose informally; and Mr. HARRIS, of Massachusetts, having taken the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, a message from the Senate, by Mr. SYMPSON, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. No. 531) for the relief of Christian Ruppert, William F. Mattingly, and Christian Heurick, trustees, of the District of Columbia.

The message also announced that the Senate insisted on its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. No. 1723) to increase the water supply of the city of Washington, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and had appointed as conferees on the part of the Senate Mr. HARRIS, Mr. INGALLS, and Mr. GORMAN.

The message further announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

A bill (S. No. 475) for the relief of A. A. Thomas;

A bill (S. No. 2033) to authorize the sale of certain lots in the city of Hot Springs, Arkansas, to the Woman's Christian National Library Association; and

A bill (S. No. 2001) for the relief of Eliza W. Patterson and others.

#### RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATION BILL.

The Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union resumed its session.

Mr. TOWNSEND, of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, before commencing the few remarks I had proposed to submit on this bill, I wish to say in response to my friend from Indiana [Mr. BROWNE] that the bill does not appropriate a dollar for any stream that is not to-day navigable and a national highway, over which a bridge cannot be constructed without getting permission from the Government. As the gentleman says he has no objection to appropriating money for national streams I shall expect him to vote for this bill.

The bill has been so ably and thoroughly discussed in its general features that I feel unwilling to trespass upon the attention of the committee, but as I had something to do with framing the bill I deem it my duty to put on record some of the reasons that have led me to concur in the conclusions reached by the committee.

Mr. Chairman, in the discussion of the present bill for the improve-

ment and preservation of the rivers and harbors of the country I shall ask the indulgence of the House for but a few minutes. Congress has annually been called upon to consider measures for this very purpose, but never before have the conditions been the same, never before has this question of improving the facilities for transportation been so carefully studied, and the need of liberal appropriations for this purpose been so strongly urged as at the present time; and I may add never before has the Government been so able as now to meet this demand of the people. The producers of the country have become aroused to this subject as the one great question affecting the rates of transportation.

The Committee on Commerce has given the best portion of the past four months to the consideration of this subject and the preparation of this bill. It has been called upon to look over the whole of the vast extent which this question of transportation covered. The estimates of the Engineer's Department have in every instance been carefully studied. No one will doubt the thoroughness with which that department does its work. The committee has also given patient attention to the arguments made by Senators, Representatives, and deputations who have appeared in behalf of this or that interest, and it may well be imagined that this duty has been one which has taxed its best judgment. Naturally enough, an avalanche of applications for appropriations to carry out questionable schemes of doubtful advantage has overwhelmed the committee. The committee rejected all of this class and appropriated for only such as they believed meritorious and had strong claims for favorable action. With the exception of the appropriations for the Mississippi River as a rule they do not exceed 33 per cent. of the Engineer's estimates, and only in exceptional cases do they exceed 50 per cent.

Look over the list as given in the bill. It will be perceived that the committee was governed by the policy which has heretofore been followed by Congress in making up the appropriations usually found in the river and harbor bill. A large proportion of the list is for the purpose of continuing works already begun, and but few new works are inaugurated this year. Only the natural water-ways of the country have been considered. It is true that the river and harbor bill is considered both extravagant and a waste of the people's money by some who have not carefully examined it, and who receive their impressions through criticisms of the press, without knowing any thing about its provisions. But it is doubtful if any one measure annually passed by Congress goes closer to dealing with the best interests of the whole American people than does this river and harbor bill.

It is the means by which the product of all labor is made more valuable and practical. It is impossible to measure or overestimate the ultimate advantage that must follow the improvement contemplated by every item in this bill. But few gentlemen on this floor whose attention has not been particularly directed to this subject can understand or properly appreciate the magnitude of the tonnage moved and the water craft employed upon our inland lakes and rivers, and for the information of the House I will refer to some valuable statistics which I have procured from official sources, and for which I am greatly indebted to Hon. Charles W. Seaton, the Superintendent of the Census Bureau. They refer to the northwestern lakes and the Ohio and Mississippi River systems, and exhibit in comparison the number of vessel employed, tonnage value, capital invested, and passenger and freight traffic of the lakes and rivers.

EXHIBIT A.

STEAM CRAFT—LAKE AND RIVER INTERESTS.

Statement of the number, tonnage, value, capital invested, passenger and freight traffic of steam craft of lakes and rivers compared, 1880.

Groups.	No.	Tonnage.	Value.	Capital invested.	Passenger traffic.	Freight traffic.
Total, lake interests.	973	224, 857. 69	\$14, 041, 425	\$17, 112, 808	1, 356, 010	4, 678, 591
Total, river interests	1, 186	269, 822. 12	14, 345, 000	18, 162, 532	6, 673, 581	7, 703, 114
Ohio River.....	473	107, 472. 48	5, 772, 000	6, 051, 522	3, 961, 798	2, 446, 353
Upper Mississippi..	377	87, 232. 12	3, 104, 050	6, 180, 760	1, 311, 976	3, 680, 546
Lower Mississippi..	* 336	75, 117. 52	5, 469, 550	5, 930, 250	1, 399, 807	1, 576, 215

\* Includes ocean-steamship interests of New Orleans.

STEAM CRAFT—NORTHWESTERN LAKES.

Statement of the number, tonnage, value, capital invested, passenger and freight traffic of the steam craft of the northwestern lakes, 1880.

State.	No.	Tonnage.	Value.	Capital invested.	Passenger traffic.	Freight traffic.
Total.....	973	224, 857. 69	\$14, 041, 425	\$17, 112, 808	1, 356, 010	4, 678, 591
Michigan.....	397	66, 457. 85	4, 508, 725	5, 972, 903	804, 454	929, 120
Wisconsin, (east.) ..	114	12, 977. 08	769, 500	1, 093, 650	116, 983	382, 100
Illinois, (east.) ..	115	16, 035. 35	970, 300	1, 342, 135	166, 743	561, 182
Ohio, (north.) ..	117	38, 353. 27	2, 124, 700	3, 089, 400	35, 826	782, 882
Pennsylvania, (Erie.)	26	24, 969. 33	1, 630, 100	1, 956, 700	32, 169	476, 780
New York, (west) ..	204	66, 064. 89	4, 038, 100	* 3, 658, 020	199, 835	1, 540, 527

\* Original investments. Reinvestment of profits not given.

STEAM CRAFT—OHIO RIVER.

Statement of the number, tonnage, value, capital invested, passenger and freight traffic of the steam craft of the Ohio River and tributaries, 1880.

States.	No.	Tonnage.	Value of steamers.	Capital invested.	Passenger traffic.	Freight traffic.
Total.....	473	107, 472. 48	\$5, 772, 000	\$6, 051, 522	Number. 3, 961, 798	Tons. 2, 446, 353
Pennsylvania, (west)	151	33, 802. 12	2, 161, 400	2, 258, 050	184, 742	299, 855
West Virginia.....	61	7, 497. 34	312, 600	426, 600	179, 785	121, 308
Ohio.....	119	35, 171. 33	1, 488, 000	1, 565, 422	764, 991	562, 190
Kentucky.....	91	23, 256. 89	1, 411, 000	1, 415, 500	2, 626, 680	678, 428
Indiana.....	51	7, 744. 80	399, 000	445, 500	205, 594	796, 572

STEAM CRAFT—UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER.

Statement of the number, tonnage, value, capital invested, passenger and freight traffic of the steam craft of the Upper Mississippi River and tributaries, 1880.

States.	No.	Tonnage.	Value of steamers.	Capital invested.	Passenger traffic.	Freight traffic.
Total.....	377	87, 232. 12	\$3, 104, 050	\$6, 180, 760	Number. 1, 311, 976	Tons. 3, 680, 546
Minnesota.....	49	4, 375. 52	196, 500	284, 252	63, 054	14, 027
Iowa.....	66	9, 813. 69	383, 050	1, 332, 374	154, 013	485, 987
Wisconsin, (west) ..	39	5, 658. 64	169, 200	204, 500	48, 921	54, 318
Illinois, (west) ..	59	6, 510. 77	256, 500	540, 050	403, 685	569, 399
Missouri.....	167	60, 873. 50	2, 998, 800	* 3, 819, 584	642, 303	2, 556, 815

\* Includes barge interests of Saint Louis.

STEAM CRAFT—LOWER MISSISSIPPI RIVER.

Statement of the number, tonnage, value, capital invested, passenger and freight traffic of the steam craft of the Lower Mississippi River and tributaries, 1880.

State.	No.	Tonnage.	Value of steamers.	Capital invested.	Passenger traffic.	Freight traffic.
Total.....	336	75, 117. 52	\$5, 469, 550	\$5, 930, 250	Number. 1, 399, 807	Tons. 1, 576, 215
Tennessee.....	61	11, 348. 40	589, 000	708, 500	76, 203	399, 565
Arkansas.....	37	5, 046. 75	227, 400	270, 800	57, 979	82, 635
Mississippi.....	40	3, 657. 20	204, 450	242, 150	33, 131	93, 364
Louisiana.....	* 198	55, 065. 17	4, 448, 700	4, 709, 900	1, 232, 494	1, 000, 651

\* Includes ocean steamship interests of New Orleans, consisting of 19 steamers, measuring 25,958.15 tons, valued at \$2,605,000. Capital invested, \$2,650,000; passenger traffic, 14,338 persons, and freight traffic, 283,469 tons.

It is a somewhat singular coincidence that the value of steamers plying on the lakes is very nearly equal to the whole river interests. Again, the Ohio River and the Lower Mississippi River interests approximate nearly the same, while the capital invested is also nearly equal in both cases. The capital invested in steam crafts on the Upper Mississippi, Lower Mississippi, and the Ohio River is in each instance close to \$6,000,000. Mr. Seaton has also furnished me with a statement of the approximate number, tonnage, and value of the craft, sail-barges, and flats on the northern lakes and western rivers. As they tell their own story without the need of elaboration or comment, I submit them as they were prepared for me :

EXHIBIT B.

LAKE AND RIVER INTERESTS.

Statement of the approximate number, tonnage, and value of the craft on the Northern lakes and Western rivers.

Region.	No. of craft.	Tonnage.	Value.
Total Northern Lakes.....	2, 686	553, 362. 45	\$21, 855, 808
Total river interests.....	6, 709	1, 581, 742. 71	16, 909, 265

SAIL—NORTHWESTERN LAKES.

Statement of the number, tonnage, and value of sailing craft on the Northwestern lakes.

State.	*No.	*Tonnage.	Value.
Total.....	1, 459	304, 932. 32	\$7, 623, 308 00
Vermont.....	17	897. 86	23, 446 50
New York.....	230	63, 124. 91	1, 578, 122 75
Pennsylvania.....	12	5, 111. 07	127, 776 75
Ohio.....	196	56, 275. 32	1, 406, 883 00
Michigan.....	470	62, 105. 15	1, 552, 628 75
Illinois.....	275	68, 528. 27	1, 663, 206 75
Wisconsin.....	258	50, 800. 11	1, 270, 002 75
Minnesota.....	1	49. 63	1, 240 75

\* Register of the Treasury.

## BARGES—LAKE AND RIVER INTERESTS.

Approximate statement of the number, tonnage, and value of barges on the lakes and rivers, 1880.

Groups.	Number of barges.	Tonnage.	Value.
Total, northern lakes.....	44	7,541.44	\$74,500
Total, rivers.....	3,845	1,083,468.27	4,280,750
Ohio River.....	3,320	838,220.41	3,099,100
Upper Mississippi.....	387	211,652.57	1,094,550
Lower Mississippi.....	138	33,595.29	87,100

NOTE.—In addition to the above, there were 145 wharf-boats, measuring 86,390 tons, and valued at \$385,000, in use on the rivers.

## FLATS—LAKE AND RIVER INTERESTS.

Approximate statement of the number, tonnage, and value of flats on the lakes and rivers, 1880.

Groups.	Number of flats.	Tonnage.	Value.
Total, northern lakes.....	207	16,031.00	\$116,575
Total, rivers.....	1,552	168,060.47	502,915
Ohio River.....	1,272	148,670.47	416,550
Upper Mississippi.....	147	11,339.00	57,200
Lower Mississippi.....	133	8,051.00	29,165

In the preparation of a report which I had the honor to make to the last Congress in reference to the construction of a railroad bridge across the Detroit River, my investigations led to the discovery of some facts relative to the immense traffic of the lakes. According to an official statement, by actual count at Fort Gratiot light, there was during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1879, a steady stream of 9,705 steamers, 6,391 schooners, 4,395 barges, 1,108 scows, 523 barks, and 32 brigs, being 22,150 vessels observed going up and down the Detroit River between the lakes. This is below rather than above the real facts in the case. The number of tons thus transported through the straits by American vessels alone during the season of 1879 is stated at actually 12,006,000 tons. But this does not take into account the tens of thousands of smaller craft and their cargoes, nor the Canadian tonnage, nor the many immense timber rafts floated down. The lake-tonnage movement appears to be far more enormous than is here represented.

The register of the United States Treasury Department shows that 3,087 steamers, propellers, tow-boats, and schooners, with a registered tonnage of 537,376 tons are engaged in carrying the commerce of the lakes; the estimated value of such vessels being nearly \$60,000,000, and their carrying capacity for a single trip 969,739 tons. Large, however, as is the moneyed value of the vessels and the various producing and other interests thus engaged in peaceful commerce, and important as it is to encourage the increase of our lake merchant marine as a school for the American seaman, these considerations are absolutely dwarfed by comparison with other and weightier ones.

Our great lake system comprises Lakes Superior, Michigan, Huron, Erie, and Ontario, connecting through the Saint Lawrence and the Welland and Erie Canals with the Atlantic Ocean on the one hand, and on the other reaching far west into the very heart of the continent. Upon or near the margin of these noble inland seas sit the great cities of Milwaukee, Chicago, Detroit, Toledo, Cleveland, Rochester, and Buffalo, and the large towns of Duluth, Houghton, Hancock, Marquette, Saginaw, Bay City, Port Huron, Sandusky, Erie, Oswego, Ogdensburg, and innumerable smaller ones. Their waters wash the boundaries of the great States of New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota.

The entire domain of the American and the British northwest is tributary to our lake system, a domain capable of supporting twenty million of people in comfort. With improved instead of obstructed navigation, in less than a quarter of a century such a population will be there, and the commerce of the lakes, already amazing, will have grown in still vaster proportions. It is therefore not alone to the necessities of to-day but to the requirements of the future that we should look in legislating on this vital question.

Already America is regarded as the granary of Europe. We have in the Northwest the abundant space, the virgin soil, the favorable climate, and the cheap transportation by water and otherwise to enable us to successfully compete with the Russian, the Polish, and the Egyptian grain-grower in the markets of Europe. Providence has given us all these favorable conditions of growth and prosperity. Should it not be our duty to improve our national highways so that the present cheap transportation to the seaboard shall be even

cheaper? The prevailing business and financial prosperity of this country may be largely attributed to the necessities of Europe, and the abilities of the great Northwest, through its grain production and cheap transportation, to supply them. It was this that gave us the large balance of trade in our favor and the heavy shipments of European gold to our shore, which gave a new impetus to the wheels of our industries everywhere and brought again abundant prosperity and contentment to this land.

In relation to the coastwise trade on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts, each have had large appropriations made for their harbors. I have only time to state briefly that the tonnage employed during the year 1880 amounted to 2,598,183 tons. The fleet engaged in this trade comprised about 22,000 vessels of various descriptions, employed between seventy and eighty thousand men, and represented an investment in capital amounting to not less than \$120,000,000. These immense interests are now steadily growing. I have referred to these statistics gathered from official sources to show the magnitude of the shipping interests of this nation in the water-lines of transportation, and how insignificant in amount, when compared to the immense interests benefited, are the appropriations made from year to year for the improvement of the inland rivers and lake harbors and the numerous harbors on the long line of ocean coast extending from Maine to Texas and from Puget Sound to Lower California.

The river and harbor bill reported by the committee is the largest in amount of any that has preceded it. But when you analyze it, and find that \$925,000 is for the Missouri River, a stream over 3,000 miles in length, \$4,923,000 for improving the Mississippi River, and \$780,000 for other works on these two streams, the amount appropriated by the bill, outside of the amounts appropriated for the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers, being \$10,714,875, it will be seen that the amount for the rivers and harbors outside of these two great water-ways is but little more than it was last year.

It may be claimed, and doubtless will be, that these appropriations are extravagant; but when it is remembered that there was an unusual and unprecedented rise in the Mississippi River resulting in the overflow of its banks, entailing so great a destruction of property as well as loss of life as to direct public attention sharply to the need of protection against the destruction by further floods to navigation and to warrant President Arthur in a special message urging upon Congress the necessity of meeting the emergency with speedy measures of relief; and when the Senate, responding to this appeal, passed a bill appropriating \$6,000,000 for the improvement of these rivers, you will readily understand the great pressure brought to bear upon the committee for large appropriations for these works. National in their character, far-reaching in results, they demanded appropriations somewhat in proportion to the estimated cost of the work so imperatively called for, and such as would insure the immediate inauguration and ultimate completion of a comprehensive plan of improvement of these important systems of water-way transportation. In the other portions of the bill will be found appropriations for numerous smaller streams, a feature which has always been sharply criticised as a needless and unjustifiable expenditure of money.

On a careful examination it will be found that there are three hundred and fifty-one distinct appropriations, one hundred and seven of which are \$5,000 and under that sum each; and the aggregate amount of all the money appropriated for these one hundred and seven objects is \$397,000, which takes in all the small streams, and is about 2 per cent. of the aggregate amount of the whole bill. It will also be seen that appropriations have been made for no streams or so-called creeks that are not branches of or tributaries to large rivers, and in their ramifications penetrate sections of country which are not reached by railroads or other means of transportation. Thus their improvement becomes of inestimable importance to the section of country through which they pass, and are the only means afforded the people living along their banks of getting their products to the markets of the world. Thus they form an important factor of the vast water system by which the commerce of the country floats to the seaboard. In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, of all the amounts appropriated, there is no part of this bill that yields better results, and there is no more worthy class than those very small appropriations, improving, as they do, small streams that are a part of the water system that reaches all over the country and for competing lines with the railroad system, the effect of which is the equalization and cheapening of transportation all over the country.

I will not discuss in detail the various provisions of this bill, as it will be analyzed in its consideration. The merits of each appropriation will then become apparent. While I would not invite or sanction an unnecessarily large expenditure of money for these purposes, yet the nation was never better prepared to improve its harbors and rivers or its public works wherever needed than at the present time. Our railroads are ample in their facilities, and why should we not avail ourselves of the favorable condition of things to go forward with these improvements while it will not embarrass the public Treasury? If delayed in the hope that a more favorable time will come, we may find the financial condition of the country such that it would be unwise and inexpedient to make liberal appropriations to continue the work. I am in favor of adequate and even liberal appropriations to carry forward public works, provided we have the money

that can be properly expended in that way. The last report of the Secretary of the Treasury shows such to be the condition of things at this time. I believe that this bill, as a whole, is as equitably adjusted as it is possible to make it, and should not be altered or amended in any important particular, but pass as it left the hands of the committee.

Mr. REAGAN. Mr. Chairman, it was understood that in this debate I should follow the gentleman from New York, [Mr. COX,] but by some arrangement, I do not know how, I failed to get the floor at that time. Notwithstanding the lateness of the hour, there are some subjects which have been presented in the discussion which from my stand-point ought to receive some consideration.

When a committee comes before the House asking appropriations of \$17,000,000 upon a system of expenditures which is large annually we should be prepared to show that upon principle we are justified in the recommendation, and that in policy and as an economic question it is proper to make the expenditures. If we cannot make a satisfactory showing on both these points we are not justified in asking these large appropriations for this purpose.

It has been objected by the gentleman from New York, [Mr. COX,] and also by the gentleman from Indiana, [Mr. BROWNE,] that the bill in some of its aspects is violative of the Constitution. If it anywhere violates the Constitution it ought not to receive the sanction of the House. The feature in which it is alleged to be violative of the Constitution is that it appropriates money for the improvement of small and inconsequential streams. The difficulty with these gentlemen seems to be that they are hunting in the Constitution for a power to improve rivers and harbors because they are rivers and harbors.

If that is the power they are hunting for, it is not to be found in the Constitution. What we have the constitutional authority to do by the expressed terms of the Constitution is to regulate commerce between the States; and, as was suggested by the gentleman from Maryland, [Mr. MCLANE,] that power has been interpreted by the political and judicial authorities of the country to embrace the power to facilitate commerce by the improvement of the means of transportation.

Then is this power clearly given by the Constitution and repeatedly interpreted by the courts violated by the provisions of this bill? The gentleman from New York [Mr. COX] called for the reading of a proposition which he made to amend the rules so as to require a separate report in reference to rivers which passed through two or more States and those which were located in a single State, showing his idea was that the constitutional authority to improve navigable rivers rested on the fact as to whether they ran through two or more States or not. It was only necessary for him to have examined the judicial decisions on this subject, and especially the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States running through a long period, to know that no such distinction can be made under the Constitution; that it is not a distinction which rests on any constitutional authority or any judicial interpretation of the Constitution.

On the contrary, sir, the courts hold in cases raising the question that the Government may improve rivers navigable in themselves or susceptible of being made navigable where their waters connect with other navigable waters so that the commerce passing over them goes from one State into another, or out into a foreign country.

That is the extent of the ruling of the Supreme Court of the United States; and, Mr. Chairman, if a stream is ten miles long, wholly in one State, the constitutional authority is as clear to improve it as it is to improve the Mississippi River, provided the commerce passing over it goes into another State or out to a foreign country. This is the judicial interpretation of the provision of the Constitution; and if the gentlemen who raise the question will take the trouble to examine that interpretation it will remove the ground upon which they have hinged their objection to this bill.

Now, as to these small streams, it seems to me there is a misconception. Why should a river five hundred miles long, bearing fifty millions of commerce, be entitled to be improved, when a river one hundred miles long, bearing ten millions of commerce, shall not be improved independently of State lines? Who can say that the one may be improved and the other may not be improved? Who can say that the burden of taxation shall be levied on the people who live on the river one hundred miles in length to improve the river five hundred miles in length and that their own river shall not be improved?

The present Chief of Engineers has made a statement, in which I concur, that for the amount of money expended on the small navigable streams more good has resulted than from any other money appropriated in the river and harbor appropriation bill of like amount. Why is this? A river may be navigable a part of the year for fifty miles of its length; it may be the only means of transportation except to haul the commodities of commerce in wagons. If it gives open navigation for six months in the year or for such portion as to carry off the crops or manufactured articles and return articles necessary for the people, and saves them the cost of hauling considerable distances in wagons, has it not rendered a special and great benefit to that community?

But I may be told that is local. Every city in this country is local, but the commerce that passes from it goes into the general body of

the commerce of the country, and going into the general body of the commerce of the country it becomes general. It is one of the definitions of the Supreme Court that the question is as to whether the commerce mingles with the general commerce of the country without reference to State lines and where there is continuous water navigation.

Now, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BROWNE] ridiculed the idea that we had to take two or three degrees of streams before we got to one of national importance. He has but to consult the decision of the Supreme Court to know that the first one he strikes is national, by the interpretation of the Supreme Court, if its navigation extends from the local river in a single State to other navigable waters in other States or out to foreign countries.

There is another point of view I desire to refer to.

I agree with my friend from New York in desiring to adhere to a strict construction of the Constitution of the United States and to keep within its limitations in all our action. He thinks there was something in the opinion of our predecessors that we ought to follow, and he assumes that we are not now acting constitutionally. There is something in this subject which gentlemen may find by examination a little curious in history. For the first twenty years of the Republic there was no appropriation of this kind, because the population of the country was confined mainly to the Atlantic seaboard and relied on sail-vessels and such bays, harbors, and navigable waters as could be reached by them, and because the country was poor and its commerce small.

From the time of Mr. Madison, from 1816 down to now, a great many bills have been passed and approved by Democratic as well as by Whig and Republican Presidents. Mr. Madison, in 1816, approved one; Mr. Monroe, the next administration, approved two—I mean river and harbor appropriation bills for the improvement of the navigable waters of the country. John Quincy Adams approved four of these bills. Andrew Jackson approved eight river and harbor appropriation bills, and my friend from New York [Mr. COX] seems to rely upon him as authority. Mr. Van Buren approved one. Mr. Fillmore approved two. Mr. Polk approved one. Mr. Pierce approved two. Mr. Tyler approved two. Mr. Lincoln approved one. Mr. Johnson approved three. General Grant approved eight; and President Hayes, three. I give this, sir, as showing that from 1816 down to the present time Presidents of all political parties have been in the habit of approving bills for the improvement of the navigation of the rivers and harbors of the country. That would seem to be sufficient authority to meet the criticisms made upon the present system that we are not following in the track of the fathers and that we are not acting as good Democrats in such a matter as this.

But I may say further upon this subject, as a part of the history connected with it, with reference to the subject of the improvements of the rivers and harbors of the country, there was in early years a political opinion, which was never at any time a judicial opinion, that our right to do so was limited to tide-water, as suggested a while ago by the gentleman from New York. I say that was first a political idea. During General Jackson's administration he improved on this a little and reached the conclusion that we could improve rivers up to the custom-houses. That was not a very distinct or satisfactory definition of the right, certainly, but the idea was that the commerce of the country must flow to the custom-houses. That might be difficult to carry into effect now, for the reason, I believe, that we established one of these the other day at Denver.

Mr. BROWNE. There is one now at Indianapolis.

Mr. REAGAN. And one at Indianapolis, as my friend from Indiana tells me. However, that was the idea, the orthodox faith, on the subject at that time. Afterward, some forty years ago, when Mr. Calhoun attended a great convention down at Memphis, on the Mississippi River, he reached the conclusion that the Government could improve the Mississippi River, and that it might do so by treating it as a great inland sea, whose waters washed the shores of a number of States. When his Democratic friends and associates heard the announcement of this doctrine they shrugged their shoulders and looked incredulous, suspecting that he had departed from the faith of the fathers, as my friend Mr. COX seems to think now. But that connected the idea of States with the subject of these improvements. Afterward it was assumed that a river might be improved if it passed through two or three States, and that was the plan which became the orthodox doctrine of the day, that it was the right and power of Congress to appropriate for the improvement of rivers and harbors for the sake of promoting the commerce of the country. While that opinion was adhered to for a time, and it went through its various political phases of opinion, yet nowhere do you find that any one of them has been settled by a judicial opinion upon the subject. From the earliest decision that touched or dealt with the subject in any manner, the opinion of the courts, the judicial opinion of the country, has been uniformly expressed that under the power to regulate commerce we may improve the navigation of rivers; and they go on to define navigable waters as those which are navigable in themselves, or which are capable of being made navigable to the point of absolute obstruction of navigation. And so with the waters of any one State on which commerce may pass into a neighboring State or to a foreign country, they were within the constitutional power of Congress to improve. That is the view which the committee has taken. It is a view which the various members of the com-

mittee, both Republican and Democratic, have held for years past. It is the view of the courts of the country.

What next? The question of expediency; the question of the necessity, the question of the propriety of making these large appropriations for the benefit of the commerce of the country arises. It has seemed to me, with all respect to gentlemen who oppose appropriations and improvements of this kind, that their objections must to some extent arise from the fact that they have not given themselves the trouble to investigate the subject and ascertain the character and extent of the commerce of the country, and the commercial interests that demand these improvements. They have not examined into the benefits to the country which the improvement of its commercial facilities must produce, and which reach all classes, both the producer and the consumer, and have a bearing upon all questions which enter into the commerce of the country. If you cheapen transportation it is a saving to both the consumer and the producer, and a benefit to all concerned.

Here we are, Mr. Chairman, with a country reaching in extent three thousand miles from ocean to ocean, and from the lakes to the Rio Grande. We have three million square miles of territory teeming with a greater luxuriance of products in their variety and in their values and magnitude than any other country perhaps beneath the sun. We have the great lakes which form an important line of water communication. We have the Mississippi and its tributaries, forming vast lines of communication. We have other great rivers and river systems which facilitate our transportation. We have our seaports, but few of which could receive in their natural condition the ships that are now engaged in bearing the ocean commerce of the world. What must we do? Our people produce millions of bushels of grain in the West that must be shipped to the seaboard for transportation to the world's markets, or shipped to the East and South to furnish bread to those who do not raise grain. Our Eastern people are engaged largely in manufacturing; the products of their manufactories must be transported to the West and South over those vast regions. Both manufacturers and producers of these commodities desire and deserve, if we can give it to them, cheap and speedy transportation. Our people in the Southern States, who are devoted largely to the production of cotton, sugar, and rice, must transport those products over this vast territory to the North and West, to the East and to the seaboard, to be borne to the markets of the world.

I mention these things so that we may comprehend that while the production of this country is enormous, the extent of the territory is so great, so much transportation must be employed to reach markets and the seaboard, that it becomes a question of the first magnitude to see what we can do to benefit and improve the commercial facilities of the country.

When we remember that we have about thirty billions of internal commerce annually to be more or less affected, or I might say to be entirely affected by our means of transportation, and that a very considerable proportion of this transportation is by the water routes, we can see how important it is that we should provide for a class of vessels of deep draft, carrying sufficient freight to make it cheap; that we should relieve our rivers and harbors from snags, from bowlders, from obstructions dangerous to navigation, and increasing the cost of insurance; that we should enable the producer of the products of the field, the forest, the orchard, and the mine to reach the market cheaper with his products; that we should enable him to take back to his home the products of our manufactories and the commerce of the balance of the world cheaply to promote the welfare, the happiness, and the prosperity of our people.

Why, sir, if we think of a reduction of the cost of transportation of 1 per cent. on the thirty billions of commerce we have annually \$300,000,000 saved. But we raise constitutional questions, we raise questions of doubt and expediency about appropriating five, ten, or fifteen million dollars and securing this boon to the American people.

Sir, we live in an age and time and country where we cannot remain in the swaddling-clothes of infancy. The man who legislates for the vast country I have spoken of and for its fifty million people must be able to grasp the great problem of the material as well as the political interests of that country. He must be able to see what policy will contribute to the promotion of the welfare, the prosperity, and the happiness of the people whose interests under the Constitution are confided to his charge. It will not do to crawl into a shell of the olden times and say, "I will not look out for fear I shall see something that will trouble me." We cannot do that. We have to meet this great problem in this great country and act so as to promote the welfare and happiness of this great people. We can only do it by grasping this whole subject, by laying hold of the powers the Constitution places in our hands and wisely executing them.

I state in reference to the point made by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BROWNE] that the present plan of legislation may not be satisfactory to him or to any of us. It certainly is not entirely satisfactory to me. I would infinitely prefer if the assent of Congress could be given to the proposition that we should have the necessary surveys and estimates, and be able to select a given number of harbors and rivers, whatever number the Government could afford to improve, and appropriate money to complete the work.

What the gentleman states as a matter of derision comes to us as a necessity. He says if we do that, then we cannot get support to

pass the bill. We recognize that very fact. We regret to have to recognize it, but we must recognize it. Then the question arises, if we cannot execute the best policy of selecting a given number of works, the cheapest and most economical policy to the Government; of selecting a given number of works and completing them, shall we abandon the idea of improving the rivers and harbors of this country, and lie in our state of helplessness as to transportation? Men who assume we should not make some sacrifice and carry out these improvements I fear do not grasp the whole subject.

If you remember that forty years ago a ship of ten or twelve feet draught was regarded as a large ship, and might enter a great many of our ports, while now the ships that do the ocean-carrying trade of the world range from twenty to twenty-five feet draught, you see our harbors must be deepened to receive them. When you see the shoals and obstructions that impede or endanger the navigation of our inland waters, when you see that freights are high because of these dangers and impediments, when you see that insurance is high, that navigation is uncertain, then you see where the necessity comes in to improve these navigable waters in the interest of commerce.

I have felt, and I believe that has been the feeling of the committee with which I have been associated for the last seven years, that the interests of the country would be best promoted by improving our rivers and harbors on the defective plan we now pursue rather than to neglect them and say that we will never improve them because we cannot adopt the plan which commands the approval of our judgment as the most economical. I wish it were so that we could consult our views of economy on this subject.

I think there has been no difference of opinion, so far as I am aware, among gentlemen whose business it has been to study this subject, that the plan suggested by the gentleman from Indiana was the true economical plan; and the question has been, can we execute it?

There we were confronted by a fact which practically prevented the execution of that plan, and we were then driven to the one which we have now adopted, or else forced to abandon the work of giving improved facilities to the commercial intercourse of the country.

It has been stated to you by the chairman of the Committee on Commerce [Mr. PAGE] that the ordinary appropriations contained in this bill are about \$10,000,000, exclusive of the appropriations made for the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers. None of the gentlemen who have spoken to-day have disapproved of the idea of large appropriations for those great arteries of commerce. When we remember their length, when we remember the amount of population, the productions and the commerce benefited by these rivers; when we remember that these rivers and the system of great lakes are of inestimable value and importance to the American people as a means of transportation and as entering into competition with freights by railroads and other means of transportation, no one can doubt the great importance of their improvement.

The Mississippi River with its great tributaries, the Red River, the Arkansas, the Tennessee, the Cumberland, the Ohio, the Missouri, the Illinois, draining a vast system of States, and accommodating a commerce the amount and character of which has been several times stated before this House on former occasions, and which I need not now if I could restate—all that shows the great importance of providing safe and speedy transportation of that commerce.

We cannot know whether the plan adopted will be an assured success. As suggested by other gentlemen, it may be an experiment. But the Government has adopted the plan, has selected the ablest men it could for the purpose of devising a system for the improvement of the navigation of these great rivers, and that commission has submitted its plan. The interest and importance of the matter is so great that I feel it is not only safe but it is right for Congress to make such effort as it can to ascertain if these rivers are susceptible of permanent improvement in their navigation. If they are, then the amount of money, even if it be \$50,000,000, necessary to make that permanent improvement in their navigation will be well and usefully spent by the Government.

As to that, we last year appropriated \$1,000,000 for the improvement of that portion of the Mississippi River below Cairo. The necessity of providing the plant and the preliminary arrangement in order to get at work was such that the amount given did not demonstrate to any important extent the advantages of the plan which had been adopted. But the gentleman from Maryland, or some gentleman, stated the effect of a single improvement near the city of Saint Louis.

Now, if by narrowing the wider and shoaled portions of the channels of the river by jetties and breakwaters we can deepen and render uniform the depth of the channel, if by revetments we can protect the banks in the bends of the river, if by strengthening the levees at such places where it is necessary to strengthen them to confine the volume of water we can succeed in the improvement of its navigation, so as to give a permanent and durable navigation, we will render a vast benefit not only to the particular localities but to the entire country.

Mr. BLOUNT. If it does not interrupt the gentleman I would like to ask him if the improvement of the Mississippi River does not stand on a different basis from the other improvements in the bill, in the view that there has been special legislation for that particular work.

Mr. REAGAN. It differs in this as to the general works—I do

not know that I apprehend the gentleman exactly, but I think I do: as regards the general improvements laws have been passed authorizing surveys and estimates; the Chief Engineer has directed the Engineer Corps to make surveys and estimates and return them here. In this case there was special legislation for appointing a commission to make surveys and examinations and report from year to year.

Mr. BLOUNT. It was in regard to that matter that I asked the question, supposing that the Committee on Commerce would regard the Mississippi River improvement as more emphatically a measure for their consideration than other items in the bill.

Mr. REAGAN. It would be so regarded only because of the great magnitude of these rivers and the amount of commerce upon them; just as we would regard the great chain of northern lakes because of the large amount of commerce those lakes would bear. For that reason it would occupy a higher position in our estimation.

Mr. MCLANE. Not in any legal aspect.

Mr. REAGAN. Not in any legal aspect.

Mr. MCLANE. The preliminary survey was the same in both cases.

Mr. REAGAN. The gentleman from New York, [Mr. COX,] I believe, and also the gentleman from Indiana, [Mr. BROWNE,] have arraigned the committee.

Mr. MCLANE. With the permission of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. REAGAN] I desire to state that the Mississippi River improvement was authorized; that is to say, Congress authorized the appointment of a commission to make a survey and present a plan. That survey and that plan were sent to the Committee on Commerce, and the appropriation now in this bill is founded upon that survey and that plan.

Mr. CLARDY. I beg leave to correct the gentleman from Maryland, [Mr. MCLANE.] The survey and the report of the Mississippi River commission were sent to the Committee on Levees and Improvement of the Mississippi River. That committee reported a bill to this House, which was sent to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. MCLANE. Pray, what else did I say but that?

Mr. CLARDY. And that committee ignored the bill.

Mr. MCLANE. I said that the appropriation for the improvement of the Mississippi River in this bill was founded upon the survey and plan made by the Mississippi River commission; that that survey and that plan were sent to the Committee on Commerce. I did not find it necessary to go into the details and to state just how it was done, or that it went to some other committee first. The fact is that the survey and plan went to the Committee on Commerce without any legislation by Congress. No law was ever passed by Congress indorsing that plan or that survey. That plan and that survey went to the Committee on Commerce, and the item in the bill relating to the Mississippi River improvement is founded on that survey and that plan. Now, every other item in the bill is founded on a survey and a plan authorized by law of Congress.

Mr. REAGAN. I have but a few more words to say.

Mr. DUNN. Allow me to make one statement in regard to what the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MCLANE] has said. He states what is literally true, but he does not give the full measure of the fact. He says that no law of Congress ever indorsed that plan. The fact is that Congress sent a special commission, when that plan was first reported, to make personal observation of the river and of that plan, and the commission reported favorably upon it, and upon that report this appropriation is based.

Several MEMBERS. That is correct.

Mr. PAGE. It was indorsed in the last river and harbor bill.

Mr. REAGAN. There is but a single other point I care to notice, and then I shall cease to trespass upon the attention of the House.

Mr. BLOUNT. If the gentleman will allow me a moment, I wish to say that in preceding Congresses appropriations in connection with this survey, failing to be placed upon the river and harbor bill, have been put even on the sundry civil appropriation bill.

Mr. DUNN. Those were for salaries and expenses of the commission itself, not for the improvement of the river.

Mr. BLOUNT. Of course not for the improvement. The gentleman did not confine his remarks to the improvement. My only idea in calling attention to this matter was because this improvement seems to have been emphasized by the House in various ways beyond what has occurred with reference to items upon the river and harbor bill.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is true.

Mr. REAGAN. All I want to say is that there is no difference in the legal aspect.

Mr. BLOUNT. My purpose was not to attack the other portions of the bill; but I had felt my objections to the Mississippi River improvement largely removed by the fact that the House had so emphatically committed itself to this policy.

Mr. REAGAN. I trust I shall now be permitted to conclude my remarks without further interruption by these colloquies.

The Committee on Commerce has been arraigned because, as it is said, the fifteen committee States—that is the fifteen States represented by members of the committee—have obtained in this bill too large a proportion of the appropriations for their respective States. I have not gone over this bill as I have usually gone over prior ones, for the purpose of seeing State by State the amount of money appropriated to each, but, taking the statement of the gentleman from

New York that these fifteen States, all happening to be States largely interested in the improvement of their navigation, will receive under this bill \$6,000,000, leaving to the other twenty-three States, \$11,000,000, these twenty-three including such States as Nevada, Colorado, Nebraska, New Hampshire, Delaware, and others which have no appropriations or very small appropriations, I incline to think from the gentleman's own statement of his case that he hardly made out a good case against the committee.

It may be that members of the committee being more thoroughly familiar with the necessities of the States they represent may give larger attention to them. But, so far as I know, I think it safe to say that in their action the committee were not governed by partiality to particular States, particular localities, or sections, but tried to frame a bill which would command by its equity the confidence and respect of the House. That members of the committee may be more or less, perhaps insensibly, biased in favor of works in their immediate vicinity is but the assertion of a principle of human nature which we cannot escape. I would not be understood as declaring that there is absolute impartiality in the bill in all its parts; but I do think we have come as near making an equitable and impartial bill as our weak human nature would allow us to do.

I do not believe we have intentionally made any unjust discrimination for or against any State or any portion of the country throughout the Union. If the gentlemen making this charge had devoted a very small portion of time to an analysis of the bill in connection with the commercial necessities of the country and the manner in which they are to be met they would hardly have felt themselves justified in assuming that the committee had shown an undue preference for the interests of the particular States they represent.

Certainly there is no committee which requires more judicial justice in the minds of its members than the Committee on Commerce, especially as it has sometimes been necessary to pass such bills as this bill under a suspension of the rules, so that individual members of the House have not had opportunity to offer amendments or to express their opinions, but have been under the necessity of accepting what the committee did. In such a case it is of great moment—we all feel and understand it—that the members of the committee should act a conscientious part, and regard themselves as representatives of the whole country, rather than representatives of the particular State whose members are upon the committee.

Mr. Chairman, it is not unnatural that opposition should manifest itself to a measure of this kind. The extent of the interests involved, the very magnitude of the policy which underlies the measure, must of necessity invoke thought and criticism. What it is necessary for us to do in order to make our criticisms just is that we should devote study and attention to the subject so as to be able to comprehend what is done and the motive that underlies the doing of it.

I think, sir, the policy of improving the navigation of this country, cheapening transportation, removing the dangers to travel, lessening insurance, increasing the profits of the consumer and producer, should commend it to the best judgment of the people; and I feel, both on constitutional grounds, as well as on grounds of expediency, there does exist fair satisfaction with the policy which has been adopted for the improvement of our rivers and harbors. [Applause.]

Mr. PAGE. Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of fixing some time within which general debate shall close, I move that the committee rise. By a previous order of the House at five o'clock a recess will have to be taken for an evening session to be held at eight o'clock. If we can finish the general debate this afternoon I am willing to vacate the order for the evening session. I now move that the committee rise for the purpose of coming to some agreement on the subject.

The motion was agreed to; and Mr. HASKELL having taken the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, Mr. BURROWS, of Michigan, reported that the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union had, according to order, had under consideration the bill (H. R. No. 6242) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. PAGE. In order to test the sense of the House, I move that all general debate on the river and harbor appropriation bill be closed at ten minutes before five o'clock this afternoon.

Mr. HENDERSON. How many are there who desire to be heard?

Mr. PAGE. I am not informed. I have myself some time left, but do not propose to consume it. My desire is to get as soon as possible to the discussion of the bill under the five-minute rule. It seems to me that all of the objections which have been urged against the bill have already been sufficiently and successfully answered. I ask for a vote on the motion to close all general debate at ten minutes before five o'clock this afternoon.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MARTIN 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.

Mr. PAGE. I now move that the session provided for this evening be vacated.

Mr. BROWNE. Only so far as this evening is concerned.

Mr. PAGE. That is all I intend.

Mr. HOLMAN. In that event what reason can there be for limiting debate this afternoon?

Mr. PAGE. The general debate has been closed this afternoon, and my desire is that when we go into committee to-morrow on the river and harbor appropriation bill the debate shall proceed under the five-minute rule.

Mr. HOLMAN. Why not by unanimous consent agree that general debate shall run on this afternoon to the hour of adjournment? The members of the House might consent to remain after the hour which has been fixed.

Mr. PAGE. If so we might go on with the debate under the five-minute rule.

Mr. HOLMAN. I ask by unanimous consent that the general debate terminate with the adjournment to-day.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The general debate by order of the House has been limited to ten minutes to five o'clock this evening.

Mr. PAGE. Let us vacate the evening session and go into the committee.

Mr. HOLMAN. I have asked by unanimous consent that the general debate continue until adjournment.

Mr. HAWK and others objected.

Mr. PAGE. I now ask by unanimous consent that the evening session for this day be vacated.

There was no objection, and it was ordered accordingly.

Mr. PAGE. I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the purpose of further considering the river and harbor appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the House accordingly resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, Mr. BURROWS, of Michigan, in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. By order of the House all general debate has been closed on the pending river and harbor appropriation bill at four o'clock and fifty minutes this afternoon.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, the bill under consideration proposes to appropriate for the improvement of rivers and harbors \$17,342,875. This is certainly the largest sum of money ever proposed to be appropriated in any one river and harbor bill; and we, the representatives of the people, may well pause for a moment to consider whether so large an appropriation of the public money shall be made at this time for the purposes mentioned in the bill.

Is the public to be benefited by such improvements as are proposed in the bill to such an extent as to justify so large an expenditure of money? Have we the power, under the Constitution, to appropriate the public money for such purposes? And if so, is it wise policy to make such appropriations? These are questions pertinent for us to consider at this time.

I, for one, Mr. Chairman, am in favor of the improvement of rivers and harbors, and believe in reasonable if not liberal appropriations for that purpose. And I neither doubt the wisdom of the policy nor the power of Congress, under the Constitution, to make such appropriations whenever commerce with foreign nations and among the States is to be benefited to such an extent as to justify the expenditure. But whenever any proposition is made to give the people increased facilities for transportation, by which to enable them to reach the markets of our own country and of the world, and thereby build up the commerce of the country, we are met by some who object to such proposition on constitutional grounds. Such persons tell us the improvement is within the limits of a single State; or not more than two States are interested; that it is local in its character, and therefore there is no power under the Constitution to enter a State and usurp the privileges of a State and make such improvement.

Now, I desire to call the attention of the committee for a few moments to some of these questions; and I do it to test the consistency of some who urge constitutional objections to a measure pending before this Congress, in which not only the people whom I have the honor to represent but those of the great Northwest are deeply and vitally interested, and to which such objections as I have stated have been urged.

Mr. Chairman, how many of the appropriations contained in this bill are for the improvement of rivers which are within the limits of a single State? I do not know how many, and have not taken the trouble to look the matter up, but we all know that a large number of them are within the limits of single States, and many of them do not even empty into other rivers which run through or border on two or more States, and therefore, according to the opinions of some gentlemen, there is no power under the Constitution to improve such rivers. But many others vote for such improvements, and a sufficient number to pass river and harbor bills, and where do they find the authority in the Constitution for doing so?

We all know the importance of the Mississippi River, of the Missouri, the Ohio, and many other rivers which run through or border on many States. We admit their improvement to be of great importance to the commerce of the country and that appropriations of money made for that purpose are made in the interest of the people and are constitutional. But I repeat the question, Where is the power found in the Constitution to make any of these improvements, either of these larger rivers, which are great highways of commerce, or of the smaller rivers lying within a single State? If we should go back a few years and accept the doctrines of some of the expounders of the Constitution as to the powers of Congress we would be compelled to strike out of this bill by far the larger number of appropriations contained in it.

There was a time in the history of this country when one who was regarded as one of the ablest of American statesmen declared there was no power in Congress to provide for the improvement of commercial harbors; no power to construct or improve a harbor, except for shelter or naval stations. This doctrine will be found fully set forth and argued at length in a report made to the United States Senate in 1846 by Mr. Calhoun; and if correct, out must go nearly all the appropriations made for harbors in this bill, and so must other appropriations contained in the bill, of which I shall hereafter speak. But I am glad to know that these doctrines of the constitutional powers of Congress have largely passed away, and that a more liberal rule now prevails in regard to making these improvements in the interest of the commerce of the country.

If we have the power under the Constitution to improve rivers and harbors it is found in the provision which gives to Congress the power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States and with the Indian tribes." There are other provisions of the Constitution under which the power has been claimed, but the better opinion seems to be that the provision just recited is the one which gives to Congress the power to make improvements for regulating and facilitating commerce among the States, and which has been exercised for that purpose for so many years.

And if the power is found in this provision of the Constitution, and I do not doubt but it is, then I ask where is the limitation of the power of Congress to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States to be found? The only limitation is found in the words of the Constitution granting the power; and therefore the act of Congress, whatever it may be, whether to improve a river or a harbor, or to build a railroad or construct a canal, to be constitutional must be to regulate; that is, to aid or facilitate commerce among the several States and with foreign nations; for if the "power to regulate commerce among the several States" does not include the power to aid and facilitate commerce, then there is no power under the Constitution to improve a river or harbor; and if it does include the power to aid and facilitate, then there is constitutional power to improve rivers and harbors, and just as much to build railroads and canals, if thereby you aid and facilitate commerce among the several States and with foreign nations.

The Constitution nowhere confines the power of Congress over commerce among the States to navigable rivers; to natural waterways. If we can spend millions of money to improve and make navigable natural waterways to facilitate commerce among the several States and with foreign nations, we can just as well spend the same amount of money to give the people any other means of transportation which will aid and facilitate such commerce. There can be no distinction, it seems to me, under the Constitution, for the power to regulate commerce extends to the land as well as to water, and it has been so held by the Supreme Court of the United States. The power to regulate commerce among the States is conferred upon Congress, but the means by which the power is to be executed are nowhere prescribed or limited in the Constitution, and therefore must rest entirely within the discretion of Congress.

And now, Mr. Chairman, if we admit the power in Congress to aid and facilitate commerce among the States and to make improvements for that purpose, then the question in regard to any proposed improvement is simply one of policy or expediency. Will the improvement facilitate commerce among the States and with foreign nations? Will it promote the public good to such an extent as to justify Congress in appropriating the money to make the improvement? Is it a work of general interest to the people of more than one State, or of many States? If these questions can be answered in the affirmative, and the improvement will give to the people in carrying on commerce among the States or with foreign nations increased facilities and cheaper transportation, then the improvement should be made whenever the commercial interests of the country require it.

Mr. Chairman, a long time ago in the history of our country it was proposed to construct a canal to connect the waters of the Hudson River and the Atlantic seaboard with the lakes of the North and West. This canal was wholly within the State of New York and was of great interest to the commerce of that State, and especially to the interest of the city of New York, that great commercial metropolis of the country. But it was also of great interest to the commerce of the West and of the whole country; and a survey having been made of the proposed canal, application was made to Congress in 1811 for aid in its construction through a commission consisting of Messrs. Clinton, Morris, Fulton, and others. They asked for the sum of \$8,000,000.

Now, it is said that when they made application for this aid Mr. Madison thought there was no power in the General Government to aid in this work; and while I have not been able to find any authority upon the subject, yet I take it for granted that the statement made by my friend from New York [Mr. DWIGHT] to that effect is correct. But it is certain that eminent men of that day, among them Clinton, that great man to whom the people of this country are so much indebted, believed there was the power, and made the application to Congress for aid. And it has been stated, and I do not doubt the truth of the statement, that in consequence of the threatened war with Great Britain Congress declined to make the appropriation at that time. I do not understand there was an absolute refusal, but in consequence of the threatened war with Great Britain,



which would be expensive, it was not deemed prudent to enter upon such a work at that time.

I desire now for a few moments to call the attention of the committee to another proposition, the proposition to construct a canal from the Illinois River, at Hennepin, to the Mississippi River, at Rock Island, Illinois. Although that canal is entirely within the limits of the State of Illinois, yet it is a work of great importance to the country, and is designed to connect the waters of the Upper Mississippi with the lake system of navigation, and do for the Upper Mississippi River exactly what was done for the Hudson and the Atlantic seaboard in the construction of the Erie Canal. The other day I had no opportunity to reply to certain remarks which were made by my friend from New York, [Mr. DWIGHT,] and I speak the word in its fullest sense, for I entertain for that gentleman great respect. And I desire now to answer some objections made by him to this proposed canal.

When my friend from New York tells us, as he did in his remarks the other day, that the day for building canals had in his judgment gone by, and that the history and experience of the country tells us too plainly that the day of their usefulness is to a large extent over; when he reads from Poor's Manual of the railroads of the United States to show that certain canals have been practically abandoned since the introduction and completion of competing lines of railroad, I will say to him, without stopping to read what he said—

Mr. DWIGHT. Will the gentleman allow me just a single word?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. HENDERSON. For a moment.

Mr. DWIGHT. I am quite willing the gentleman from Illinois should discuss the Hennepin Canal while the river and harbor bill is under debate, if that is in accordance with the rule, or with the feeling and practice of the House. But if he can do that, then I presume the opponents of that measure can be heard also in this discussion on the river and harbor bill, for that I understand is what the committee is in session for. I ask for information—

Mr. HENDERSON. My friend has had his day—

Mr. DWIGHT. I want to say further—

Mr. HENDERSON. I am taking no unusual liberty, when in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, under general debate. My friend has had his day; his views are found in the RECORD, and I want to reply to him.

Mr. DWIGHT. I want to say a single word. The friends of the Hennepin Canal had as much time as those who believed it a great mistake to undertake that work. They had as much time on the one side as the other. I desire also to say that when I was on the floor on that occasion I said all I could during the time allotted me, and obtained leave to print certain tables and illustrative statements. If the gentleman from Illinois is permitted to go into this matter, I desire to have the same opportunity.

Mr. HENDERSON. I was about to say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DWIGHT] when interrupted, that when he read, as he did the other day, from Poor's Manual to show that certain canals, since the completion of competing lines of railroad, had been practically abandoned, I would remind him of the fact that there are lines of railroad, as well as lines of canal, which are not remunerative; and the gentleman is railroad man enough to know, and doubtless does know, that there are any number of railroads constructed in the West and in various parts of the country which have not paid, and have gone into the hands of receivers. In some cases these roads have been driven into bankruptcy by stronger competing lines, that they might gobble them up and remove a competitor, just as railroads would be glad to gobble up all the canals and navigable waters of the country. They have done this largely in England, and in some parts of our own country have got control of the canals.

It certainly will not be insisted, because some railroads have not paid, therefore no railroads should be built. Canals, like railroads, depend upon location as to their usefulness and value, and while many may not pay, there are others that do pay. If the gentleman from New York [Mr. DWIGHT] has studied the history of the Erie Canal in his own State, connecting with the Hudson River, the Atlantic seaboard, and the lakes, he must know that it has paid not only for its own construction but nearly, if not entirely, for the construction of all the other canals, worthless or otherwise, in the State of New York. And when he says that canals have to a large extent lost their usefulness, and that it is a mistake to suppose that the comparatively low rates which obtain on the New York Central and the New York and Erie Railroads are due to the competition of the Erie Canal, I have some authority here to which I will refer on that question, and which fully answers, as it seems to me, the statements made by him as to the usefulness of the canal and the effect it has in compelling lower rates on the railroads.

Horatio Seymour, jr., State engineer and surveyor of New York, in his annual report on the canals of that State, dated January 30, 1879, and transmitted to the Legislature January 31, 1879, says:

The opinion held by many that canals and water routes have lost their value for internal commerce has proved to be unfounded. Never in the history of our country have they been of greater use. Only in the years 1861, 1862, 1863, when the Mississippi River and other routes were closed against Northern commerce by the war, have the Erie and Oswego canals carried as much grain as during the past season; and this has been done in the face of the lowest prices ever charged by railroads in their efforts to control the carrying trade.

In 1874 their lowest rates for carrying a bushel of wheat from Buffalo to New

York was 8 cents. This season they cut this down at one time to 4½ cents. This shows that our canals have not only carried large amounts at a low price but they are to be credited with the fact that they have benefited the public by forcing the railroads to reduce their rates to a point that they have either lost money in order to break down canal competition, or their charges heretofore have been too high.

But the amount saved in transportation is not the full measure of the benefits to all classes of our citizens of low tolls and cheap transportation. These have enabled us to send vast quantities of grain and other products to the markets of Europe which could not have been sold there if they had been burdened with the pooling rates of railroads.

And again, in the same report, he says:

The cost of carrying our products to the markets of the world has been so much reduced that the balance of trade has been turned in our favor; the currency of our country has been lifted up to a par with specie, and the wealth which it has yielded to our producers gives hopes to all classes of more prosperous times. No one can study the statistics of the past two years who will not see that the better state of things and the hope of the future which now dawn upon us are mainly due to our canal and water routes, without which we should not have had such a volume of exports nor such a wide margin in our favor in our commerce with the world.

Mr. Seymour has made a later report as State engineer and surveyor, for the year 1881, and from that it appears that canals have not survived their usefulness, and the fact is shown by statistics. I have not seen the report itself, but am indebted to a newspaper account of it for the following facts: in the year 1843 it was predicted that the carriage of some articles, lumber for example, would diminish. The intervening time has witnessed the remarkable development of the railroad interest. Yet the quantity of lumber transported last year "is twice as much as the entire tonnage of the Erie Canal in 1843." There were carried thirty-eight years ago by canal 51,219 tons of stone, lime, and clay. In 1881 there were carried 235,514 tons. The tonnage of coal in 1843 was a little more than 20,000 tons. In 1880 it was 1,000,000.

To measure the force of this comparison it must be remembered that at the earlier date the canals had a practical monopoly of the business. It is well said that the commerce whose vast increase is thus indicated cannot spare the water-way of the State. The last report shows that, notwithstanding cheap railroad freights and other drawbacks, the tonnage last year was 5,176,505 tons, and the receipts were \$818,264, "an amount sufficient to maintain the canal the coming year." And instead of the Erie Canal being practically abandoned, Mr. Seymour urges the improvement of it by increasing the depth of it one foot, at a cost of \$1,000,000.

But, Mr. Chairman, we have still later proof that this canal has not lost its usefulness, as will be shown by the following paragraph from the New York Herald of a few days since:

The returns for the month of May of the business on the Erie Canal make an excellent showing as compared with those for a corresponding period a year ago. The tolls collected were, in round figures, \$44,000. In May, 1881, they were \$33,000. The boats cleared this year were 856. In May of last year they were only 561. The tolls collected to June 1, this year, were \$65,424, as against \$32,996 to June 1, 1881. Twelve hundred and fifty-one boats have cleared this year, or 690 more than were cleared in the same period last year. It is true that 1881 was an exceptionally dull year in the business of the Erie Canal, but the heavy increase that has taken place goes to show that the decline then was not, as it was alleged by the foes of the canal that it would be, permanent. The exhibit is gratifying, for it proves that the canal when made free, as it will be by the people's ratification of the pending amendment to the constitution, will be able to hold its own against all the competing lines of land and water transportation.

Now, I earnestly commend this statement to my friend from New York, [Mr. DWIGHT,] for the other day he stated in his remarks that in 1880 the Erie Canal shipped from Buffalo 71,909,964 bushels of grain, and that in 1881 it shipped only 31,000,000 bushels; and this statement was made to show that the business of the Erie Canal was rapidly on the decline and that canals in New York were doomed to become useless.

The above paragraph states that the year 1881 was an exceptionally dull year. My friend should have known that one reason why the canal did not carry more grain in 1881 was not owing to a disuse of the canal but to a short crop. The secretary of the board of trade of Chicago, in his last annual report, estimates the deficit in the wheat crop of 1881 in Ohio, Michigan, Indiana, Illinois, Minnesota, and Iowa, as compared with that of 1880, as little if anything short of 100,000,000 bushels, and that is the reason why the canal did not carry the grain in 1881 it did in 1880.

But now it appears from the very latest reports we have that the receipts on the canal up to June 1 of this year are about double what they were up to June 1 of last year, and that there is a very large increase of business on the canal this year over the corresponding periods of last year.

When the gentleman from New York said the canal carried from Buffalo in 1880 71,909,964 bushels of grain, he might have added that the railroads only carried from Buffalo during the whole of that year 31,000,000 bushels. And I have seen it stated that the difference in cost of transportation was as six and one-half cents per bushel on the canal to nine cents on the railroads for that year, which would show a saving on the grain carried by the canal for 1880 of \$1,797,749.10, to say nothing of what the charges on the railroad would have been but for the canal.

Now, how can the gentleman from New York claim, in view of the foregoing facts, taken from the very highest authority, the official reports, that canals are doomed to become useless in New York; that the Erie Canal has no effect in compelling lower rates on the railroads;

but, on the contrary, the competition of the railroads is constantly crowding down the freights and tolls on the canal.

The tables showing a reduction of rates from year to year on the New York Central and the New York, Lake Erie and Western Railroads from 1874 to 1880 inclusive, which he publishes with his remarks, do not, it seems to me, prove the statement that the Erie Canal has no effect in compelling the comparatively low rates which obtain on these roads from Buffalo to New York. They just as well prove that the canal has compelled the railroads to reduce their rates.

I have no doubt, Mr. Chairman, none in the world, but that the railroads would gladly crowd down the freights and tolls on the canals until they crowd them out of existence; and for the very reason that the canals do compel them to carry for lower rates.

I have in my hand here the very best authority on the effect had upon railroad charges by the canals and water-ways—the authority of a man who has given more thought to the subject of transportation, perhaps, than any other man in the country; I mean Albert Fink, one of the railroad commissioners appointed by the great trunk-line railroads to adjust their differences.

In a letter written by him April 16, 1881, to the New York World, I find the following statement:

I was glad to see that one of the leading commercial journals of the country, the New York Journal of Commerce, has at last recognized the fact that the railroad tariffs are not solely under the control of the railroad managers, but, to the contrary, are regulated by a power entirely beyond their control.

In its editorial of April 5, referring to the late reduction in the rates of transportation on grain, it endeavors to explain the strange phenomenon that the railroad companies should voluntarily make a reduction in the rates at this time. It says: "Is anybody so dull as not to see that the Erie Canal is the moving cause of this periodical fall and rise in railroad rates? To us this coincidence furnishes its own explanation. There is no escaping the conviction forced upon us by the overwhelming evidence that the Erie Canal is the only competitor of which the pooling railroads are afraid. \* \* \* It is to the Erie Canal only that we owe the reduction proclaimed by Commissioner Fink. The railroad pool is master of the situation in the winter-time, but the Erie Canal holds that proud position in summer. To that reverse relation, and not to the public spirit of the railroad combination, the concession now made by the pool is solely due."

It would appear from this extract that with the Journal of Commerce the fact that the Erie Canal is a power above the railroads is a recent discovery, though the railroad companies themselves have always recognized this fact, and have called attention to it as an assurance to the public that the railroad management could exercise no monopolizing power over transportation rates, and have referred to it as evidence that the cry of "wolf" so lustily shouted by anti-monopolists should cause no alarm to an intelligent public.

Mr. Fink, in the letter referred to, further says:

In the argument I made before the Committee on Commerce of the House of Representatives while the Reagan bill was under consideration, I made the following remarks, which bear so directly upon this subject that I may be permitted to repeat them here:

"The competitive railroad tariffs for the interstate commerce are not, as is so generally supposed, under the absolute control of railroad managers, but the carriers by the water routes really establish these tariffs, and the railroad managers have nothing to do but to conform to them. The water routes not only control the tariffs of their immediate railroad competitors, at points where they can render like service to the same people, but their influence reaches directly and indirectly to the remotest parts of the country.

"Compared with this natural, powerful regulator of railroad tariffs, the efforts of State or Congressional restrictions (and I might have added anti-monopolist leagues) to prevent extortionate railroad charges appear to those who are fully conversant with the subject as perfectly useless, and the declamation against the baneful effect of the so-called railroad combinations and monopoly appear simply as idle talk. This is clearly proven from the fact that charters of railroad companies fix the maximum limit of charges not unfrequently at eight cents per ton per mile, (which charge was, no doubt, considered reasonable at the time the charter was granted,) while water competition has actually reduced the earnings of railroads frequently to one-fourth cent per ton per mile; and the maximum charge on grain from Chicago to New York will hardly ever again exceed eight-tenths of one cent per ton per mile."

Here Mr. Fink expressly tells us that the Erie Canal and the water routes not only control the tariffs of the immediate railroad competitors at points where they can render like service to the same people but their influence reaches directly and indirectly to the remotest parts of the country in controlling railway charges. The fact is, as regularly as navigation opens on the lakes and the Erie Canal, the freight rates on the railroads leading from the Atlantic seaboard to the West and Northwest go down, and just as regularly as navigation closes you find the rates on the same railroads going up.

Mr. DWIGHT. Will the gentleman from Illinois allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. HENDERSON. Certainly I will.

Mr. DWIGHT. Does the gentleman not know that when cold weather commences it costs a large percentage more to transport freights on the railroads than it does in summer?

Mr. HENDERSON. It may cost something more, but I will let Mr. Fink answer the gentleman's question. In the same letter referred to, he says:

The railroad charges in winter cannot exceed those in summer by more than the expense of storage, insurance, and interest on the investment in the property to be transported during the time navigation is closed. By far the greater portion of the property would be stored, awaiting open navigation, if the winter rates were much in excess of these expenses over summer rates.

Mr. Fink further says:

This is not a mere theory, but the actual policy pursued by the railroad companies is shown by the fact upon which the Journal of Commerce comments, namely, that the rates on grain were lowered on the 1st of April last from thirty-five to thirty cents, and have since been lowered to twenty-five cents, although it will be a month or longer before the opening of navigation on lake and canal, and an additional reason for this earlier reduction will be found in the influence exercised by the present active competition of the Mississippi River.

I will also refer the gentleman to the official report of Mr. Seymour, from which I have already quoted at some length. On page 6 of that report Mr. Seymour says:

"How are we to sell our products to the people of other lands?" This can only be done by means of cheap water routes, which control railroad charges. We see that the moment the canals are closed by winter, the railroads put up their rates far beyond any difference the season can make in the cost of their business. Last summer the railroad charges from Buffalo to New York, at times, were 4½ cents a bushel for wheat. Now they are about 10 cents.

So it seems that the Erie Canal and water routes not only keep railroad freight rates down in summer but actually keep them down in winter. The New York Tribune, in its issue of April 20, 1881, commenting upon the letter of Mr. Fink referred to, thought there was some inconsistency in the action taken by the railroad managers, on the 16th, increasing the rates from 25 to 30 cents per hundred pounds, with the explanation given by Mr. Fink, that the rates were fixed by competition of water routes, and were not under the control of the railroads. To which Mr. Fink replied in the following letter, published in the Tribune of the 21st of April, 1881:

To the Editor of the Tribune:

SIR: I note in your editorial of to-day that you have not fully understood some portions of the argument contained in the article published in the World of the 16th, in which I endeavored to show that the railroad companies are limited in their charges by canal competition. I meant, of course, limited as to their maximum charges. They can arbitrarily, if they choose, make rates much lower, but not higher than canal competition allows. You ask the question, "Whether the commissioner can explain what the water routes had to do with the reduction of the rates on April 11, from 30 to 25 cents, or with the advance of April 18?"

To this I answer, they had nothing to do with it. But the water routes had everything to do with the reduction of rates from 35 to 30 cents on April 1. The 30-cent rate, it was agreed, should be maintained during the summer months. It was on account of the agreement of March 11, to which you refer, and the object of which you correctly explain, that it became necessary to make the reduction from 30 to 25 cents. This low rate, in the opinion of the railroad managers, is not justified at present by water competition. It is very unprofitable to the railroad companies, hardly paying more than operating cost.

Under the agreement of March 11 all shippers are to be put upon the same footing, and the plan of reducing rates to a common level in case it was found that any shipper was favored with special rates was devised for the purpose of putting a stop to favoritism and unjust discrimination. As soon as the desired object was obtained the rates were restored to 30 cents.

With this explanation I hope you will perceive that there is no inconsistency in the action of the railroad managers with any statements that I have made in my letter of April 16.

Respectfully, yours,

ALBERT FINK.

NEW YORK, April 20, 1881.

So here in this letter we have the statement of Mr. Fink, one of the ablest railroad men of the country, that water routes had everything to do with the reduction of railroad rates from 35 to 30 cents on the 1st of April, 1881.

Now, I desire to say to my friend from New York that if his State should dry up and abandon her canals, and especially the Erie Canal, for the others may not be so important, he would soon find that the city of New York, that great commercial city of the country, would suffer the most serious damage from such a suicidal policy. Her commerce would begin to decline at once, and she would not be able to maintain her commercial supremacy for many years.

Mr. Chairman, the Erie Canal could not be closed, in my judgment, without great injury not only to the prosperity of New York but of the whole country. It is of interest to the commerce and to the people of the West as well as of the East. It has been in the past and is to-day a great blessing to the whole country. And we can no more do without it in Illinois and in the West than you can in New York unless you drive us through Canada and make us depend upon the greater enterprise and spirit of that Dominion. The fact is Canada has expended on the construction and enlargement of her canals up to June, 1881, \$41,832,564, and that expenditure has been made largely to divert the commerce of our country through Canada and to build up her commerce and her cities.

Mr. SKINNER. I believe the gentleman from Illinois is in favor of Government aid to the Hennepin Canal.

Mr. HENDERSON. Certainly I am. We are asking the Government to build the Hennepin Canal.

Mr. SKINNER. Then I would like to ask the gentleman if on that same principle, the Erie Canal being about to be made free, he would vote in favor of the United States purchasing the Erie Canal at cost, to be run hereafter by the Government of the United States?

Mr. HENDERSON. Not to pay New York the cost of constructing the Erie Canal when that State has received all her money back and in addition thereto a large sum has been paid into her treasury.

I will say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SKINNER] that from the official report of Mr. Horatio Seymour, jr., of January 30, 1879, heretofore referred to, he will find that the Erie Canal has paid into the treasury of the State of New York over and above the cost of construction, repairs, and management, about \$42,000,000. The following is the statement from the auditor's office contained in the report:

It has paid into the treasury of the State, tolls, &c.....	\$118, 142, 837 81
Its cost has been to this date for construction and enlargement.....	\$49, 387, 422 77
There has been spent for repairs and management.....	26, 851, 515 45
	76, 238, 938 22

This leaves a balance of money paid into the treasury, without computing interest, of.....	41, 903, 899 59
--	-----------------

I cannot see the propriety of paying the State of New York the cost of constructing the canal, but I can see great propriety in the Government running the canal if it is made free to the commerce of this great country. While the canal is in the State of New York, it is undoubtedly of national importance, and can as properly be maintained at national expense as any of the canals constructed and operated by the Government, and I would be entirely willing to vote to improve it and to maintain it free for the public good.

It is hardly necessary for me to say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SKINNER] that my own State (Illinois) and other States have helped to pay the cost of constructing the Erie Canal and other canals of New York. Certainly a considerable percentage of the freights carried over the Erie Canal have come from and gone into the State of Illinois.

We also have constructed a canal in the State of Illinois, the Illinois and Michigan Canal, and it cost many millions of dollars. But the canal has long since paid for itself, and has also contributed several hundred thousand dollars toward the improvement of the Illinois River, and I may say that, like the Erie Canal, it has been of great benefit to the people and to the commerce of the country, in giving to the people cheap transportation, and in its influence upon the railroads running in competition with it in reducing their rates.

This is one of the canals referred to in the extract from Poor's Manual of the Railroads of the United States, quoted by my friend from New York [Mr. DWIGHT] in his speech of June 5, as having been practically abandoned. But the Illinois and Michigan Canal has not been abandoned. And if there should be an attempt to abandon and close it up, it would, in my opinion, create a revolution in the State of no small magnitude. It is true the amount of freight now carried on the canal is not as large as it was at one time, but it pays the expenses of running it, and is no expense to the State, and it secures to the people cheaper transportation. It has saved to the people of the State millions of dollars.

The reason why the canal has not done more business is, that the railroad which runs along the line of the canal, the whole length of it, charges in all cases the same rates from the same points that the canal does. The charges from Henry on the Illinois River to Chicago, a distance of one hundred and thirty miles by canal and river, including tolls for transporting wheat, is 3 cents per bushel, and from La Salle to Chicago by canal, including tolls, is 2½ cents per bushel.

I have said the railroad running along the line of the canal and the river charges the same rates from the same points that the canal does; while the railroads off the canal for the same distance it is from Henry to Chicago, one hundred and thirty miles, charge 7½ cents per bushel, and for the same distance from La Salle to Chicago, one hundred miles, they charge 6.6 cents per bushel.

The report made to the Senate of the United States in 1874 by the Select Committee on Transportation Routes to the Seaboard, of which Senator WINDOM was chairman, shows that the charges on the Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railroad, which runs along the canal for the length of the canal, one hundred miles, was only 53 per cent. of the average charge on four other different lines of railroad running out of Chicago for the same distance, one hundred miles. Certainly nothing can show more clearly the utility of this canal than these facts and figures, and that the canal should be maintained in the interest of the people. If it did not do the business very largely it did secure to the people cheaper transportation.

And now it is proposed to extend this canal to the Upper Mississippi, and thus give to the country a continuous water route from the headwaters of the Mississippi River to the Atlantic seaboard by way of the lakes of the north.

It does seem to me, Mr. Chairman, that the importance of such a connection as the proposed canal from the Illinois River, at Hennepin, to the Mississippi River, at Rock Island, will make can neither be overestimated nor too greatly magnified. Look at the map. See the Illinois and Michigan Canal and the Illinois River to Hennepin, running but very little south of a direct line from Lake Michigan, at Chicago, to the Mississippi River, at Rock Island, and then think for a moment that a canal of sixty-five miles in length will connect the lakes with the navigable waters of the Upper Mississippi and give to the Northwest—the rich and productive Northwest, with its immense grain fields and its vast herds—cheap water transportation to the Atlantic seaboard and to the markets of our country.

The benefits of such a water connection to the people of the East as well as the West cannot be overestimated. It is in the interest of the people. It will do more to secure cheap transportation to the people than all the legislative restrictions which can be enacted by Congress to prevent railway extortion. It would no doubt save to the people annually as much money as it would cost in the way of securing to them cheaper transportation.

We all know what the water-line from Chicago to the Atlantic seaboard does in securing cheap transportation. This water-line not only carries cheaply but it compels all the railroads running from the West to the Atlantic seaboard to carry at more reasonable rates; and in that way saves annually millions of dollars to producers and consumers. No well-informed man, no man who regards his reputation, will hazard a denial of this.

Now, what we ask is, that this water line be extended from Chicago six or seven hundred miles west and northwest, and secure to

the people, producers and consumers, cheaper transportation, just as the water line east from Chicago secures cheaper transportation. The one will do it just as certainly as the other. Only a short link is necessary to connect the Upper Mississippi with the lake at Chicago, and then you have a continuous water line of transportation, extending from the city of New York to the headwaters of the Mississippi, a distance of, say, nineteen hundred miles, and reaching into the very heart of the great grain-growing region of the country and of the world.

Mr. Chairman, there is nothing in my judgment which this Congress can do of greater importance to the people of the Northwest than to authorize the construction of this connecting link—this canal of only sixty-five miles in length—uniting, as it will, the Upper Mississippi River with the lake system of navigation. There is no appropriation contained in the river and harbor bill, now under consideration, which would be so satisfactory to them as an appropriation for this canal would be.

That the construction of this canal will be of great commercial advantage to the country no one, it seems to me, who has given any intelligent thought to the subject can well doubt. It will benefit the people of the whole country to as great an extent as any work that can be done in any one section. It will certainly benefit the East, as well as the West and Northwest, if there is any advantage in cheap transportation and in maintaining commercial relations between the people of these sections. It will help the people of the West and Northwest to reach the old and populous States of New England and the Atlantic seaboard, and their large manufacturing towns and cities at less cost, and find a market for their surplus products. And so it will help New England, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and other States in like manner, to send back to the people of the Northwest their manufactured fabrics, their coal, iron, and other products; and thus these two large and populous sections of the country will both derive mutual benefit from the construction of this important work. But it is said the people on the Upper Mississippi cannot be affected by this canal beyond points possibly twenty or thirty miles above the western terminus of the canal, for the reason that barges, such as are available for canal transportation, would find it much nearer to the seaboard by the way of the Wisconsin and Fox River route.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is no antagonism between these improvements. They were both recommended by the Select Committee on Transportation Routes to the Seaboard after careful investigation of the whole subject of transportation, and I want to see both completed. But gentlemen must not forget that great commercial cities like Chicago are an outgrowth as well as necessity of commerce; that products are not, and in the nature of things cannot be, transported directly from the producer to the consumer, but go from one market to another, and always try to find the best market. Chicago is the great commercial city of the Northwest, built up by the wonderful activities, energy, enterprise, and resources of the great Northwest. Chicago is a necessity to the Northwest, and Chicago with her half million of people, and her thousands of active, intelligent merchants and business men engaged in commerce, is the great grain market of the world; and such a city and such a market cannot be ignored, and should not be, in constructing lines of transportation. And the producers of the valley of the Upper Mississippi will of necessity seek the commercial advantages and benefits of Chicago, and will not be excluded from them, for Chicago belongs not to Illinois alone but to the Northwest and to the whole country, and while many barges may take the Wisconsin and Fox River route, thousands and tens of thousands will go on by the water line to Chicago, if you will give them a chance by constructing this canal from Rock Island to Hennepin.

No, Mr. Chairman, give to the people of the country this great cheap transportation line from the headwaters of the Mississippi to the Atlantic seaboard, and commerce will flow to it by the millions, and certainly unless other transportation lines would carry at reasonable rates. It has been well said that naturally and logically freight will gravitate toward the cheapest line of transportation and will avoid others, though perhaps more eligible, over which the rates or tariff of transportation are higher. Establish this line, and unless freight rates come down to reasonable figures, men will cart their produce to the river and canal twenty and thirty miles right across and by the side of railroads. But the truth is well known that railways, when under competition of cheaper water transportation are invariably reasonable in their charges; and I am sorry to say, if not under such competition, they are not.

I am not unfriendly to railroads. But when they make their freight charges so high that their stock is at a premium of 30, 40, and sometimes 60 per cent., and that, too, watered so as to double and sometimes treble the actual cost of construction, and to pay such large dividends; when they claim the right to impose just such burdens upon the commerce of the country as they think proper; to tax by way of freight rates, at pleasure, all the products of the industry of the country carried over their roads, then I have no sympathy to express for them, and no fear of interfering with such individual enterprises. On the contrary, I believe it to be the duty of the representatives of the people to take all lawful and constitutional steps to prevent extortion, and to secure to the people cheaper transportation. And one of the best means of doing this is to improve and

construct water lines of transportation when the importance of the work is such as to justify it, and only in such cases.

In reference to the importance of this proposed canal and the influence it would have if constructed, as a regulator of railway freight tariffs, a leading newspaper of the Northwest expressed some time since the following opinion:

In reality there is not a navigable water-way in America that is not a more potent regulator of railway freight tariffs than all the railway managers and all the legislative genius of the country combined would be. An extension of the Chicago and Illinois Canal from La Salle to Rock Island would prove a more potent regulator of freights on all the railway lines that cross the Mississippi (whose charges that stream now regulate to a more limited extent) than all the "omnipotence of legislation" of all of the Legislative Assemblies in the West.

But, Mr. Chairman, we are asked, why does not Illinois build this canal? It is said Illinois is a rich and prosperous State; and if Illinois wants this canal, let Illinois build it, and not ask the United States to do so. We are even reminded that Illinois has had a magnificent land grant made to the State to aid in building a railroad; and that is offered as a reason why the General Government should not be asked to build this canal. I know that Illinois did receive a liberal land grant to aid in building the Illinois Central Railroad; but when the General Government made that grant of lands to Illinois, it at the same time raised the price of a section of land for every section granted to the State to \$2.50 per acre, when \$1.25 per acre was the maximum price for Government lands; so the people of Illinois virtually paid for every acre of land given to the State by the General Government; and, in fact, the General Government actually lost nothing, not a dollar in the world by the gift.

But in answer to those who say let Illinois build this canal, I will remark that Illinois is not any more interested in the construction of this canal than Iowa and other parts of the country. By reference to the map of Illinois any one can see that by far the larger portion of the State is so situated as not to be especially interested in the building of the canal. That portion of the people of the State who live east and south of the Illinois and Michigan Canal and of the Illinois River would only be benefited to the same extent the people of the country are generally benefited by every improvement which promotes the public good.

That is one reason of the vote in the constitutional convention of Illinois in 1870 and of the people in ratifying the constitutional provision referred to by the gentleman from New York [Mr. DWIGHT] in his remarks the other day, and also in the report of the minority of the Committee on Railways and Canals against the so-called Hennepin Canal bill. And while I am on that subject I will say that another reason for the vote referred to in the remarks of the gentleman from New York is that there has been a very strong feeling largely prevailing in Illinois for many years that this canal should be built by the United States, and not by the State of Illinois.

Surely no one can claim that there was any special opposition to this proposed canal in the constitutional convention of Illinois in 1870. The debates in the convention were upon the article proposed in the convention relating to the Illinois and Michigan Canal, and to a provision in the same "that the General Assembly shall never loan the credit of the State in favor of railroads or canals;" and another provision "that the General Assembly shall never make appropriations from the treasury in aid of railroads or canals," but providing that any surplus earnings of any canal might be appropriated for its enlargement or extension; and it was the votes on these two propositions, given in the convention, which were referred to by the gentleman from New York [Mr. DWIGHT] in his remarks in the House some days since.

The vote on the first proposition, "that the General Assembly shall never loan the credit of the State in aid of railroads or canals," was 49 for and 11 against. And the vote on the proposition, "that the General Assembly shall never make appropriations from the treasury in aid of railroads or canals" was 35 for and 25 against, as stated by him. But neither of these propositions related to the proposed Hennepin Canal any more than it did to the Illinois and Michigan Canal or any other canal; and to show that I was correct when I said that there was no particular opposition in the convention to canals, and especially to the Hennepin Canal, and that one reason of the vote for the proposition referred to was owing to a feeling that the United States should build the canal and not the State of Illinois, I will state that the same constitutional convention adopted the following resolution:

*Resolved*, That our Senators and Representatives in Congress be, and they are hereby, respectfully and earnestly requested, to use all honorable means in their power to secure at as early a day as possible the passage of an act of Congress for the construction of a ship-canal on the line of the Illinois and Michigan Canal, and the improvements of the Illinois River, so as to admit the passage of ships and steamers from Lake Michigan to the Mississippi River.

And another thing should not be forgotten, and that is, this same constitutional convention provided that the Illinois and Michigan Canal should never be sold or leased by the State without first submitting the proposition to a vote of the people of the State, and that was ratified by the same vote of the people referred to by the gentleman from New York; thus placing it out of the power of the Legislature of the State to dispose of the canal, and showing the care of the convention and of the people that this canal should be maintained by the State in the interest of the people and of cheap transportation. And now, Mr. Chairman, another objection urged against

this canal, and dwelt upon with great force, is that if this canal should be constructed it would greatly damage the manufacturing establishments on Rock River.

The gentleman from New York, in his speech the other day, repeated a statement found in the minority report already referred to, that—

The residents along Rock River, from which stream it is designed to supply the canal with water, see in its construction a menace to their extensive water-powers and all the interest thereby involved.

And says:

The engineer's estimates show that at least a large percentage of the water of Rock River would be needed.

In reply to this, I will say that there is only one place on Rock River, so far as I have ever heard or believe, where any fears are entertained that damage will result to any person or any manufacturing establishments on Rock River, and that is at the city of Sterling, in Whiteside County. I know there is a feeling on the part of some of the citizens of that city that their manufacturing interests would be damaged by the construction of this canal. But while I would regret much that any damage whatever should result to the people of Sterling from the construction of this canal, I believe their fears are not well founded and are based upon a misapprehension of facts.

The engineer's estimates referred to, and which it is stated show that at least a large percentage of the water of Rock River would be needed, were made for a ship-canal and not for a commercial canal. They were made for a canal 160 feet in width at the water-line, and 7 feet deep, and for locks 350 feet long and 75 feet wide, with a feeder from Rock River 140 feet in width at the water-surface, and 112 feet on the bottom, and 7 feet deep. And for such a canal it was estimated that there would be a loss of water-power at Sterling of 36.8 per cent. of the water-power of Rock River. But no such canal as the one this estimate was made for is contemplated by any one, so far as I know or believe.

A commercial canal is all that is needed and all that is proposed by the bill reported from the Committee on Railways and Canals, and when you take the difference in the quantity of water necessary to supply a canal 160 feet in width and 7 feet deep, with locks 350 feet long and 75 feet wide, and a canal only 60 feet in width and 6 feet deep, with locks 170 feet long and 30 feet wide, any one can see that the percentage of water-power which would be lost at Sterling would be greatly reduced, and the loss could be easily compensated by a slight elevation of the dam. It is confidently believed that the percentage of water-power lost at Sterling would be so small as not to affect seriously the manufacturing interest of that enterprising city. But some supposed small damage should not stand in the way of this great work, which is to benefit so many people and which will result in so much of public good. And I may say that both the senator and representative from that county in our State Legislature voted for resolutions instructing our Senators and requesting our Representatives in Congress to use all possible and proper means to secure the passage of a bill at this session of Congress ordering the immediate beginning of the work of constructing this canal, which resolutions were unanimously adopted by the Legislature of Illinois. Similar resolutions were also unanimously adopted by the Legislature of the State of Iowa, and have been by a number of the Legislatures of that State. Resolutions favoring the construction of this canal have been adopted by the boards of trade of many commercial cities, by large and respectable conventions composed of representatives from all parts of the country, notably those held at Davenport and Saint Louis last year, and it is the height of folly for any one to talk of its being a scheme or a job in the interest of individuals or of any one locality.

If there is any legitimate measure before this Congress, any measure in the interest of the people, and demanded by the people, it is the measure which proposes the construction of this canal. And I invite the earnest consideration of its importance to the commerce of the country by every member of this House. I want to say to Representatives representing States bordering on the Mississippi River, and especially to those who represent Saint Louis, that the friends of this measure are, and have been, the friends of the improvement of the Mississippi River to its utmost capacity, to meet all the demands of the largest commerce which that river can command. It certainly will command all the commerce which the markets on that river will encourage.

But we ask them if it is not selfish, supremely selfish, while we are voting large sums of money, many millions of dollars, at this present session of Congress, and must vote many more, to improve that river, to say to us that we shall have no additional facilities to enable us at less cost to reach the better markets of our own country, the large commercial and manufacturing towns and cities of New England, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and other of the older and more populous States of the Union, with our immense surplus of the products of the Upper Mississippi Valley, which they need largely, and must have, while we want their manufactured fabrics, their coal, iron, and thousands of their products of industry and enterprise.

I will say to my friend from Illinois [Mr. SINGLETON] and to my friend from Missouri [Mr. BLAND] that this canal will not divert

one drop of water from the Mississippi River, and we do not seek to divert commerce from the Mississippi. We only ask the construction of this canal as a choice of routes and as a means of carrying at less cost the large commerce which must go, in the nature of things, from the valley of the Upper Mississippi to that portion of our country to which I have already alluded. I know it is objected that there is no power under the Constitution to build this canal; but, Mr. Chairman, we are constructing twenty or thirty miles of canal around the Muscle Shoals of the Tennessee River, we are constructing a canal around the Cascades of the Columbia River, we have constructed a canal around the lower rapids of the Mississippi River, we are also constructing a canal to connect the Fox and Wisconsin Rivers. If we can construct and operate these canals, surely we can construct and operate this greater work, which will prove, it is confidently believed, as beneficial to the commerce of the country as any of the canals mentioned.

The committee of the Senate in the report made by Mr. Calhoun in 1846 not only held that there was no power to improve harbors of commerce but also held there was no power under the Constitution to cut a canal or construct a road around shoals, falls, or other impediments of rivers or their tributaries. And I commend this to the consideration of gentlemen who are voting here every year appropriations for the construction and operation of the canals alluded to, and yet hesitate and doubt the power to construct this canal.

But, Mr. Chairman, I have authority here which ought to be very high, especially with Representatives from the State of Missouri, as to the power of Congress to construct a canal, and that is the opinion of Thomas H. Benton, who was elected five times consecutively to the United States Senate. In 1847, at the great river and harbor convention at Chicago, that distinguished statesman made a speech in which he used the following language:

The lake and river navigation of the great West, to promote which your convention is called, very early had a share of my attention, and I never had a doubt of the constitutionality or the expediency of bringing that navigation within the circle of internal improvements by the Federal Government when the object of the improvement should be of general and national importance.

The junctions of the two great systems of water which occupy so much of your country, the Northern lakes on one hand and the Mississippi River and its tributaries on the other, appeared to me to be an object of that character, and Chicago the proper point for effecting the union; and near thirty years ago I wrote and published articles in a Saint Louis paper in favor of that object, indicated and almost accomplished by nature herself and wanting from man little to complete it.

This is certainly very high authority, from an able and distinguished statesman, not only as to the constitutional power of Congress to construct a canal but as to the general and national importance of connecting the lake system of navigation with the Mississippi River, which I submit may be done at Rock Island as well as any other point, and especially as the Government has a great armory and arsenal established on the Mississippi River at Rock Island.

Mr. Chairman, a few words more and I close my remarks. The gentlemen who submitted the minority report of the Committee on Railways and Canals urge as a reason against the construction of this canal that should the General Government enter upon the building of canals for transportation purposes, such a step would prove a check to private enterprise, and claim that if the Government wishes to enter upon the construction of free transportation routes that railroads have a great advantage over canals. But I submit to these gentlemen that while railroads have an advantage in running the year round, and in speed, they do not give the advantage of cheap transportation to the people that canals do, and it is cheap transportation which is absolutely necessary for the success and prosperity of our commerce.

Why, Mr. Chairman, not long since an inquiry by the French Government showed that heavy merchandise could be carried by water at from two-fifths to one-third the lowest price that it could be done by rail. And so that government determined upon an outlay of 200,000,000 francs to improve the harbors, rivers, and canals of France. We are told that the German Government is concerning itself with a plan for uniting by a canal system the Elbe, the Weser, the Ems, the Rhine, and the Meuse, all the great navigable rivers of the empire; also to connect the Baltic and the North Sea by a deep-draught canal. Holland has lately appropriated money to improve the canal from Rotterdam to the sea, and has approved the cutting of a new canal from Amsterdam to Utrecht and thence to the Merwede River, near Gorcum. Belgium has declared in favor of the policy of "the transport of heavy goods at small cost by canals and rivers." And it is making a canal and water route system, aimed to bring through traffic to maritime rates. England, I have already said, improvidently allowed her canals and water-ways, like our own State of Pennsylvania, to get into the hands and under the control of the railroads, and but the other day the associated chambers of commerce of Great Britain and Ireland, which is said to be a part of the executive of the Queen's Government and one of the most painstaking institutions in the universe, considered the subject of canals, and passed the following very sensible resolution:

That in order that commerce and agriculture may be able to take every advantage of the easily and cheaply worked traffic of the canals of Great Britain and Ireland, it is greatly to be desired that canals be entirely emancipated from the control of the railway companies.

The traffic on them requires no organization like that on railroads, and hence should be free from the railroad companies, as the high roads now are, thus mak-

ing canals here what they are in other countries, namely, the cheapest means of conveying goods and agricultural products to market, and not the obstructive instruments of railway companies.

That the executive council be requested to submit the opinion of this meeting on the subject of the above resolution to the parliamentary committee now sitting on railway rates and fares.

And so we find this question of cheap transportation and of transportation by canals and water-ways agitating the people and governments of every commercial country. And so we find the evidence everywhere overwhelming in favor of canals and water-ways, as giving to the people the very cheapest possible transportation.

There need be no fear but that railroads will have enough to do to enrich their owners and managers; the fear should rather be that they will absorb far too largely the wealth of the country, and become so wealthy and powerful as to control all the industrial interests of the country. Many of them to-day make and unmake individuals and communities at pleasure. And it is the duty of the representatives of the people to stand between them and these mammoth corporations, and protect them so far as can be properly done from extortion and wrong. But I have said there need be no fear but that railroads will have enough to do.

When we think of this great country, and especially of the great Northwest, with its rapidly growing and ever-increasing commerce, we cannot fear but that railroads and all other means of transportation which we can give will be required. The other day the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HORN] told us that the State of Illinois had 36,000 square miles of coal fields; that in some places her coal was piled up so that it aggregated a hundred feet in thickness. He further told us that Illinois raised last year 325,000,000 bushels of corn, 51,000,000 bushels of wheat, 63,000,000 bushels of oats, 1,250,000 bushels of barley, 3,000,000 bushels of rye, 13,000,000 bushels of potatoes; and Illinois is but one of several large and productive grain-growing States and Territories of the Upper Mississippi.

When we think of that vast empire, with the wonderful industry, activity, and energy of the people who inhabit it, and who will have an immense commerce to transport to the markets of our own country and of the world, can any man doubt but that this proposed canal and all other means of transportation will be needed and employed?

In view of all these great interests; of this vast empire; of the immense and ever-growing commerce to be transported, and in the interest of cheap transportation and of the millions of people who are looking anxiously to us for favorable action, I stand here to-day and plead for the construction of this great work. I earnestly trust that Congress will not disappoint the people who are friends of this measure, but will take some favorable action at the present session, authorizing a commencement of the work. If we should do this I know that thousands and tens of thousands of people will rise up and exclaim, "Well done, thou good and faithful representatives of the people."

Mr. HAWK Mr. Chairman, the improvement of the Mississippi River and its tributaries has been so fully and exhaustively considered by many eminent men in and out of Congress, and plans for the improvement of the navigation of these streams have been so thoroughly and exhaustively presented by the river commission, that there is nothing new to be said upon the subject.

Living as I have for over thirty-five years in the center of the great Mississippi Valley, and being honored by representing a fertile agricultural district bordering upon the east bank of that river, are, I trust, sufficient reasons for at this time asking the indulgence of the House while presenting a few facts in connection with the improvement of our river system.

This is deemed a subject of no small importance when it is remembered that this great river and its tributaries constitute a natural water-way of fourteen thousand miles in extent and communicate with eighteen States and three Territories of the Union. A passing reference to the geographical extent and commercial importance of this vast area cannot fail to be of interest. The territory traversed by these streams contains the natural requirements for the establishment of a republic much greater in extent than many of the largest and most populous nations of Europe. Its hundreds of thousands of square miles of area are capable of sustaining many millions of population when brought to the highest state of development. Located as is this great expanse of country inland, and peculiarly adapted to agriculture, Providence has laid down at intervals these water-courses as natural highways of commerce, as if realizing that transportation and commercial problems would vex and perplex the inhabitants of this section. These natural channels are established for us, and all that is required is that we improve and utilize them to the fullest and greatest capacity of which they are capable.

By a glance at the map it will be seen that the conformation of our country is peculiar in this as in other respects, to wit: the mountain ranges of the East and West are near the Atlantic and Pacific coasts, and the vast area of agricultural lands lying within these limits comprise a great basin with its streams all flowing to a common center, with the Mississippi River forming one chief artery of commerce, discharging its waters into the Gulf of Mexico. This inflowing of our river system is but the physical indicator of the common and inflowing concentrating interests of our nation, and its tendencies are for union of purposes, of sentiment, of interest—an indivisible union.

Early in the history of the country it became apparent that the area lying in the valley of the Mississippi River and its tributaries must be very largely a country whose inhabitants must depend upon agricultural pursuits for subsistence, and later developments have confirmed what was from the first so apparent.

To those located in the center of a continent and producing a large surplus of agricultural and other products grave questions of transportation to the ocean, which is the great international commercial track of the world, very soon grew out of the situation. The absorbing question was, and is to-day, how shall the vast and rapidly growing surplus of our agricultural, mining, and manufacturing industries seek the markets of the world with the least tax upon the labor of the producer?

Capital, ever watchful and calculating, did not fail at an early day to become apprised of the rich harvests in reach, and came to the rescue, to some extent at least, and the country was soon checkered with railroads, which found great profit in the transportation of this surplus production to the seaboard, that it might thence by the ocean trade be sent to the less productive and more thickly populated portions of the world. We find, however, this railroad transportation to be very expensive to the producer, and in many localities, where competition among railway companies is not established, these vast corporations in great measure fix the prices of production by laying such transportation charges as it is believed the products will bear, regardless of a fair compensation to such companies.

We may in this connection add that, where competition should be depended upon by reason of proximity of railroads owned by different companies, it is not only frequently but almost universally the case that pools are formed for the purpose of controlling traffic, and the competition that was hoped would benefit the producer is transformed into a greater monopoly, in that two or more companies must be profitably sustained by a community that before had to contribute to the profits of but one.

True, by this rapid transportation of our surplus production an equilibrium in prices is established, and while national lines of boundary nominally exist, the tendency is toward the consolidation of the civilized world into one "common brotherhood of man." In the accomplishment of this grand purpose too much praise cannot be bestowed upon the achievements in the last quarter of a century of our railroad system. From an infancy of twenty-five years ago we find it at present developed into the most gigantic and unprecedented proportions.

The number of miles of railroad operated in our country to-day, including side and double tracks, amount to nearly if not quite the vast aggregate of one hundred and ten thousand miles, which would make a continuous track over four times around the earth. The number of miles of main track in operation at the close of 1879 was 86,497, the balance of about twenty-three thousand miles being side and double track. The cost of this immense improvement for transportation purposes aggregates nearly five thousand millions of dollars, or an average during the last twenty-four years of two hundred millions per year. Upon this capital there was paid in dividends, after the payment of all interest and expenses of operating for the year 1879, the sum of \$61,681,470, the gross earnings of these railroads for the same period being \$529,012,999. The same ratio of gross earnings for the next twenty-five years would show the immense sum or more than thirteen and a quarter billion dollars, and a net earning to stockholders of more than one thousand five hundred million dollars.

This immense amount of earnings by these great and growing cor-

porations is a tax upon the industries of the country, and the proper and satisfactory solution of this important problem is of paramount interest to the whole country, East, West, North and South, excelling all others individually regarded, and perhaps equaling all the other economic problems combined that vex the student of the science of government.

To establish an equilibrium and retain control of our national commerce it is quite apparent to every thinking person that a competing power to these railroads must be maintained in order to the curbing of their ambition, which is human to say the least; and the chief if not the only way that is at all apparent at this time by which this result can be accomplished is by opening up and improving our immense system of rivers and lakes, as well as maintaining them as competing lines for the outlet of our surplus.

In accomplishing this object no effort should be made to break down our railroad system, but the object should be to keep it within proper bounds. It is believed this can be done better by the competitions of water traffic than by the enactment of statutes.

It must be confessed by all that railroads exercise a wonderful and beneficial influence in civilizing nations and peoples by blending their interests. Our means of wealth have been increased in marked degree by their potent influence, our civilization has assumed a higher plane, and our peace at home and abroad has been assured by the exercise of their power and influence in marked degree.

While this is true, it is also undeniable that this corporate power is becoming so strong that it is able in great measure to fix the price of production. Under its influence we are taught, and almost led to believe, that water channels for the purposes of commerce were made in vain. This belief is fostered, too, by the fast age in which we live. We have become so accustomed to rapid transit that we are impatient of delays and cannot await the slower returns of a cheaper system. The time, however, is upon us when we must meet these transportation questions face to face, and treat them in their broadest and most comprehensive sense. We have in our commercial transactions two kinds of products, the transportation of which must be considered. The one heavy and bulky in proportion to value, and demanding no special haste in transit to market; the other more concentrated and valuable, in many instances perishable, requiring the most rapid means of conveyance. To meet the demands of the latter class of commerce we have our more than one hundred thousand miles of splendidly equipped railways. For our other heavier and bulkier products we have our vast natural navigable lake and river shores as well as our ocean coasts, as yet, it is true, comparatively unengaged from the condition in which nature has left them, but upon the improvement of which depend the happiness and prosperity of millions of our people. Some gentlemen have questioned whether these improvements should be taken under the special charge of the General Government. Surely if any enterprise is national this must be in the broadest sense of the term, for there is no portion of the country that will not be affected very materially by this great work. Every city, State, Territory, or association of people, in all the sections of the Union, must be interested in cheap food; the cheapening of transportation cheapens food and, in fact, all the necessaries of life.

The production of various articles of commerce, as shown by the reports of the late census, is almost beyond the grasp of the most comprehensive mind.

By the courtesy of the efficient and accommodating Superintendent of the Census, I present the following comprehensive table of the production of the six principal cereals of the United States for the year 1879, together with the acreage of the same for that year:

Summary, by States, of the cereal production of the United States.

States.	Barley.		Buckwheat.		Indian corn.		Oats.		Rye.		Wheat.	
	Acres.	Bushels.	Acres.	Bushels.	Acres.	Bushels.	Acres.	Bushels.	Acres.	Bushels.	Acres.	Bushels.
United States .....	1,997,717	44,113,495	848,389	11,817,327	62,368,869	1,754,861,535	16,144,593	407,858,999	1,842,303	19,831,595	35,430,052	459,479,505
Alabama .....	511	5,281	42	363	2,055,929	25,451,278	324,628	3,030,639	5,834	28,402	264,971	1,529,657
Arizona .....	12,404	239,051			1,818	34,746	29	564			9,026	136,427
Arkansas .....	157	1,952	92	548	1,298,310	24,156,417	166,513	2,219,822	3,290	22,387	204,131	1,269,730
California .....	586,340	12,579,561	1,012	22,307	71,781	1,993,325	49,947	1,341,271	20,281	181,681	1,832,429	29,017,707
Colorado .....	4,112	107,116	8	110	22,991	455,968	23,023	640,900	1,294	19,465	64,693	1,425,014
Connecticut .....	575	12,286	11,231	137,563	55,796	1,880,421	36,691	1,009,706	29,794	370,733	2,198	38,742
Dakota .....	16,156	277,424	321	2,521	90,852	2,000,864	78,226	2,217,132	2,385	24,359	265,298	2,839,289
Delaware .....	19	523	397	5,857	202,120	3,894,264	17,158	378,508	773	5,953	87,539	1,175,272
Dist. Columbia .....					1,032	29,750	267	7,440	301	3,704	284	6,402
Florida .....	21	210			360,294	3,174,234	47,962	468,112	601	2,965	81	422
Georgia .....	1,439	18,662	58	402	2,538,733	23,202,018	612,778	5,548,743	25,854	101,716	475,684	3,159,771
Idaho .....	8,291	274,750			569	16,408	13,197	462,236	354	4,341	22,066	540,589
Illinois .....	55,267	1,229,523	16,457	178,859	9,019,381	325,792,481	1,959,889	63,189,200	192,138	3,121,785	3,218,542	51,110,502
Indiana .....	16,399	382,835	8,846	89,707	3,678,420	115,482,300	623,531	15,599,518	25,400	303,105	2,619,695	47,284,853
Iowa .....	193,861	4,022,588	16,318	166,895	6,618,144	275,024,247	1,507,577	50,610,591	102,607	1,518,605	3,049,288	31,154,205
Kansas .....	23,993	300,273	2,458	24,421	3,417,817	105,729,325	435,859	8,180,385	34,621	413,181	1,861,402	17,324,141
Kentucky .....	20,089	486,326	1,024	9,942	3,021,176	72,852,263	403,416	4,580,738	89,417	668,050	1,160,108	11,356,113
Louisiana .....					742,728	9,906,189	26,861	229,840	201	1,013	1,501	5,034
Maine .....	11,106	242,185	20,135	382,701	30,997	960,633	78,785	2,265,575	2,161	26,398	43,829	665,714
Maryland .....	226	6,097	10,294	136,667	664,928	15,908,533	101,127	1,794,872	32,405	288,067	569,296	8,004,864
Massachusetts .....	3,171	80,128	5,617	67,117	53,344	1,797,593	20,659	645,159	21,666	213,716	963	15,768
Michigan .....	54,506	1,204,316	33,948	413,062	919,792	32,461,452	536,187	18,199,793	22,815	294,918	1,822,749	35,532,543
Minnesota .....	116,020	2,992,965	3,677	41,756	498,737	14,831,741	617,469	23,382,158	13,614	215,245	3,044,670	34,601,030
Mississippi .....	44	348			1,570,550	21,340,800	198,497	1,959,620	806	5,134	43,524	188,890
Missouri .....	6,472	123,031	5,463	57,640	5,588,265	202,485,723	968,473	20,670,958	46,484	535,426	2,074,394	24,966,627

Summary, by States, of the cereal production of the United States—Continued.

Table with 12 columns: States, Barley (Acres, Bushels), Buckwheat (Acres, Bushels), Indian corn (Acres, Bushels), Oats (Acres, Bushels), Rye (Acres, Bushels), Wheat (Acres, Bushels). Rows include Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

This vast array of figures shows but a fraction of the production of the country. The value of these six cereals at a fair average market, with barley at 50 cents, buckwheat at \$1, Indian corn at 50 cents, oats at 33 1/2 cents, rye at \$1, and wheat at \$1 per bushel, gives a grand total of \$1,526,568,941, a sum more than \$25,000,000 greater than the interest-bearing debt of the nation. A reduction of one cent per bushel in the cost of transportation upon this would be a saving to the producer of almost \$27,000,000, a greater sum than has been appropriated by Congress for the whole internal-improvement system of the country during the last three years.

It is not pretended that the whole of this vast production would seek transportation to the seaboard; much of it would be consumed on the ground by the producers themselves. But it must be remembered also that these figures represent but a fraction of the total production of the country for the year to which reference is made.

The following table, showing the production of wheat, corn, oats, and barley in the seven Northwestern States of Illinois, Iowa, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, and Kansas, is of interest as stating the production of these cereals in these States for the year 1879 as shown by the census of 1880. With an area of 470,150 square miles and a population of 10,345,894 the production of these grains was as follows:

Statement showing the production of wheat in the seven Northwestern States.

Table with 5 columns: States, Wheat, Corn, Oats, Barley. Rows include Illinois, Iowa, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, Kansas, and Totals.

RECAPITULATION.

Summary table for Recapitulation: Wheat 197,889,201 bushels, Corn 1,023,544,231 bushels, Oats 205,494,487 bushels, Barley 15,439,184 bushels.

Grand total ..... 1,442,367,103

Enormous as are these totals, their significance is small in itself considered when compared with the fact of their vast increase from year to year. Thus in 1865 the total wheat product of the United States was only 151,999,900 bushels, while the late census gives the total in bushels at 459,479,505, an increase of 307,479,605 bushels, or over 200 per cent. in five years.

That the attention of Congress may the more forcibly be called to the magnitude of questions connected with transportation, I present an advanced statement from the Census Office of the live-stock wool clip for spring of 1880, and the dairy products for the year 1879. The statement is as follows:

United States live stock, wool, and dairy products.

Large table with 12 columns: States, Live stock (Horses, Mules and asses, Working oxen, Milch cows, Other cattle, Sheep, Swine), Wool clip (Pounds), Dairy products (Milk, Butter, Cheese). Rows include Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Dakota, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan.

United States live stock, wool, and dairy products—Continued.

States.	Live stock. <sup>1</sup>							Wool clip, spring of 1880. <sup>2</sup>	Dairy products.		
	Horses.	Mules and asses.	Working oxen.	Milch cows.	Other cattle.	Sheep. <sup>3</sup>	Swine.	Pounds.	Milk.	Butter. <sup>4</sup>	Cheese. <sup>4</sup>
Minnesota	257,282	9,019	36,344	275,545	347,161	267,598	381,415	1,352,124	Gallons, 407	Pounds, 385	Pounds, 138
Mississippi	112,309	129,778	61,705	269,178	387,452	287,694	1,151,818	794,643	427,492	7,454,657	4,239
Missouri	667,776	192,027	9,020	661,405	1,410,507	1,411,298	4,553,123	7,313,924	3,173,017	28,572,124	283,484
Montana	35,114	858	936	11,308	160,143	184,277	10,278	995,484	41,165	403,738	53,570
Nebraska	204,804	19,999	7,234	161,187	590,129	199,453	1,241,724	1,282,656	625,783	9,725,198	230,819
Nevada	31,087	1,258	765	13,319	158,137	133,695	9,080	655,012	149,889	335,188	17,420
New Hampshire	46,773	87	29,152	90,564	112,689	211,825	53,437	1,060,589	5,739,128	7,247,272	807,076
New Jersey	86,940	9,297	2,022	152,078	69,786	117,020	219,069	441,110	15,472,783	9,513,835	66,518
New Mexico	14,547	9,063	16,432	12,955	137,314	2,088,831	7,857	4,019,188	10,036	44,827	10,501
New York	610,858	5,072	39,633	1,487,855	862,233	1,715,180	751,907	8,827,195	23,196,553	111,922,423	8,362,590
North Carolina	133,686	81,871	50,188	232,133	375,165	461,638	1,453,541	917,756	44,679	7,212,507	57,380
Ohio	736,478	19,481	8,226	767,043	1,084,917	4,902,486	3,141,333	25,003,756	4,680,153	67,634,263	2,170,245
Oregon	124,107	2,804	4,132	59,549	352,561	1,083,162	156,222	5,718,524	22,754	2,443,725	153,198
Pennsylvania	533,587	22,914	15,062	834,156	861,019	1,776,598	1,187,968	8,470,273	3,654,504	79,336,012	1,008,686
Rhode Island	9,661	46	3,523	21,460	10,601	17,211	14,121	65,680	383,170	1,067,103	67,171
South Carolina	60,660	67,005	24,507	139,881	199,321	118,889	628,198	272,758	25,718	3,196,851	16,018
Tennessee	266,119	173,488	27,340	303,832	452,462	672,117	2,158,109	1,917,268	100,679	17,886,369	98,740
Texas	806,999	132,581	90,603	606,717	3,387,967	2,411,887	1,954,948	6,928,129	129,680	13,910,396	58,466
Utah	38,131	2,898	3,963	32,768	58,670	233,121	17,198	973,246	15,526	1,652,903	126,727
Vermont	75,215	283	18,868	217,033	167,204	439,870	76,384	2,555,113	652,655	25,240,826	1,545,789
Virginia	218,838	33,598	54,709	243,061	388,414	497,289	956,451	1,836,673	122,446	11,470,923	85,535
Washington	45,848	626	3,821	27,622	103,111	292,883	46,828	1,389,123	22,670	1,556,103	109,200
West Virginia	126,143	6,226	12,643	156,956	288,845	674,769	510,613	2,681,444	75,027	9,309,517	100,300
Wisconsin	352,428	7,136	28,762	478,374	622,065	1,536,867	1,128,825	7,016,491	2,515,697	33,353,645	2,281,411
Wyoming	11,975	671	718	3,730	273,625	140,225	567	691,650	7,534	105,643	2,930

(1) On farms, June 1, 1880. Ranch stock not included.  
(2) Exclusive of spring lambs.

(3) Ranch clip, fall clip of 1879, and "pulled wool" not included.  
(4) Made on farm. Factory production not included.

It is interesting to know in this connection the fair valuation of the property and production shown in the foregoing statement. With horses, mules, and asses valued at \$50, work-oxen at \$40, milch-cows and other cattle at \$20, sheep at \$2, and swine at \$5 per head, we have the total value of the live stock enumerated at \$1,651,751,377. The value of the products, with wool at 40 cents per pound, milk at 10 cents per gallon, butter at 20 cents and cheese at 10 cents per pound, aggregates for the one year for which enumerated for the whole country the sum of \$273,441,049, making the total value of the live stock and products enumerated in said statement almost \$2,000,000,000.

It is not expected that this vast compilation of production will be transported to the seaboard or in fact to any considerable distance, but the table is valuable in that it aids materially in enabling some just conception to be formed of the wonderful productive capacity of the country.

It will be seen that many of the important branches of industry are not presented, such as lumber, of the production of which no statement could be obtained, and of iron, of which for the year 1880 there were 7,971,706 tons produced. And coal, of which there was mined for the year ending June 1, 1880, 42,420,581 tons of 2,000 pounds each of bituminous, and 28,646,995 tons of 2,000 pounds each of anthracite, or 71,067,576 tons of 2,000 pounds each of both.

It may be properly and pertinently suggested that much of the expense of coal to consumers arises from transportation charges, and any cheapening of this necessity would tend to popularize it as a fuel and very greatly increase its consumption, necessitating the employment of a greater number of miners. Thus, besides direct benefits to the masses in cheapening fuel, other callings will be relieved from overgorging of labor.

I have not mentioned zinc, copper, lead, gold, silver, or any of these products of the mines other than coal and iron, not having been able to accurately ascertain the amount of production of these articles, or the value of the same. I have not all the means of ascertaining critically the amount of production of the country of all kinds per year, but I have no doubt from a somewhat careful examination and estimate made that the value of the same for the United States for each and every year will not fall far short of \$5,000,000,000, which amount represents in transportation of various kinds not far from 250,000,000,000 pounds, or 125,000,000 tons of 2,000 pounds each. A saving in transportation of one-half of one mill per pound on one-fifth of this vast production would amount to enough in five years to thoroughly improve all our natural water-ways and make them competing lines of commerce.

It is believed that this is by far the most practical mode of settlement of the transportation problem. It has been said by an English statesman that in times past a coach and four could be driven through any act of Parliament that could be framed, and it has certainly been demonstrated that an engine and train of cars can be and have been driven through any act of legislation that has as yet been placed upon the statute-books for their control. The competition that must grow out of a well-established system of improved water chan-

nels must be the chief factor in the solution of these important questions, and none know it better than the railroad companies themselves.

I have thus far presented figures and facts showing the wonderfully productive powers of the country as indicated by the late census, and by the best obtainable information. It is submitted that the array is most bewildering and overwhelming; yet who can conceive of the magnitude of this wonderful aggregation of forces when our population shall have reached 100,000,000, as will certainly be the case in the next twenty-five years at our present rate of increase? With the productive capacity of the country more than doubled, as it certainly will be, these questions of transportation of our surplus assume an importance that is hard to estimate. They certainly are by far the most overwhelming and absorbing that can possibly engage the thought and careful examination of the greatest minds of the nation.

The attention of Congress has but recently been called to the importance of the improvement of our natural water-ways, which was wholly under the control of the Corps of Engineers of the Army up to the appointment of the Mississippi River commission in 1879. Comparatively little had been accomplished in the improvement of the Upper Mississippi and its tributaries prior to 1878. On the Lower Mississippi from Cairo to the mouth of the river considerable sums have been expended by the States bordering the river in the construction of levees, chiefly for the protection of the bottom lands against overflows at high water. These expenditures were not made, however, with special reference to the improvement of navigation.

The Forty-third and Forty-fourth Congresses gave some attention to matters connected with water transportation and the improvement of water-ways, but not until the Forty-fifth Congress was the subject given the consideration due to its magnitude. Upon the Upper Mississippi River very little was accomplished of substantial benefit until 1878. On the 18th of June of that year Congress appropriated \$250,000 for the improvement of the river between Saint Paul and Des Moines Rapids. On March 3, 1879, the sum of \$100,000, and again on June 14, 1880, \$150,000 were appropriated by Congress to be expended between the same points as above indicated, making a total appropriation of \$500,000 for that portion of the Mississippi River from June 18, 1878, to June 14, 1880. During the same period the sum of \$240,000 was voted by Congress on account of the improvement of the river below the Des Moines Rapids to Cairo, making a total of \$740,000 appropriated for the Upper Mississippi during the period indicated. In addition to the above amount a further sum was voted of \$1,000,000 on the 3d of March, 1881, to this portion of the river.

These several sums, amounting in the aggregate to \$1,740,000, have been expended in the construction "of low-water dams, closing sloughs, or wide channels, to augment the flow through the main channel," &c., as expressed in the report of the Mississippi River commission to the Secretary of War of date of January 8, 1881. A statement of the investigation of the subject by the river commission, and the plans adopted for the improvement of the river, are so



comprehensive that I present extracts from their report as a portion of my remarks, as follows:

The plan of improvement adopted for this part of the river consists of low-water dams closing sloughs, or side channels, to augment the flow through the main channel; of spur-dikes built out from concave shores, where the width is too great, to direct and concentrate the flow and produce scour over that part of the bed promising the best channel; of revetments to protect such parts of the bank as may be attacked by the direction and concentration given to the current by the dikes.

The dikes consist of layers of stones and of brush, bound into fascines or mats. The details are described and illustrated by Major Farquhar's report for 1879. Both free and engaged ends are protected by additional and heavier work. Their usual inclination is slightly up-stream, in order that the draft of water toward and discharge over the dike may be away from the bank, and also to check the race along and around the free end of the work.

The distance between these spur-dikes is greater than their length, the latter being controlled by experience, by the widths required for easy navigation, and by a theoretical consideration of cross-sectional area.

At first these dikes and dams were raised only about one foot above low water. They are now built about four feet above, and give more prompt and definite results. The additional height is of great advantage against ice, and as serving to indicate the location of the dikes, which, if concealed, might prove dangerous obstructions to passing boats. This last-mentioned benefit should be still more completely secured by the erection of beacons or lights on the free ends.

There is no evidence that the system of improvement has yet approached its practical limit, or developed any adverse operation or tendency.

Dredging has been occasionally resorted to, where erosion is very slow, or to secure landings in front of towns.

Inasmuch as all work heretofore done constitutes both in location and construction part of the final and complete plan, the application of the system simultaneously to all parts of the river needing improvement is highly judicious, both as giving results more generally useful and satisfactory, and as admitting a more tentative and experimental development of the system. The varied and contradictory experience and testimony of engineers concerning the improvement of rivers by this method rendered its cautious adoption necessary. The results are now fully justifying the judgment of the engineers in charge, and may be comparatively tabulated as follows:

Part of river.	Before improvement.	After partial improvement.
Saint Paul to Saint Croix*.....	16 inches.....	2 feet.
Saint Croix to Chippewa.....	1.5 feet.....	3 feet.
Chippewa to Wisconsin.....	20 inches.....	3 feet.
Wisconsin to Illinois.....	2 feet.....	3½ to 4 feet.

\* Only two of the worst bars on this stretch improved.

The following local results are more indicative of the capabilities of the system, as the appropriations have not permitted work on all the shoals on any one reach:

Locality.	Before improvement.	After partial improvement.
	<i>Feet</i>	<i>Feet.</i>
Pig's Eye.....	1.3	4.5
Nininger.....	1.0	3.7
Smith's.....	1.3	4.5
Mount Vernon.....	2.0	4.5
Betsy Slough.....	1.5	4.5
Winona.....	1.5	3.0
Queen's Bluff.....	2.5	3.6
Cassville.....	1.9	4.0

We do therefore agree in approval of the system and work of improvement now being conducted on the Upper Mississippi by Captain A. Mackenzie, United States Engineers, and in the recommendation that it be prosecuted, with such modifications as experience may suggest, simultaneously on all the parts requiring improvement, as far as practicable under appropriations, with a view of securing a minimum depth of six feet from Saint Paul to Saint Louis.

Whether this work is done directly by the engineers in charge or by contract, it is equally essential that the sums appropriated be sufficient to justify the procuring of the complete and expensive plant necessary for the efficient and economical execution of such work. The appropriations heretofore made have not allowed the necessary provision by the Government's agents, nor have they induced or justified parties qualified by large means and experience for the performance of engineering contracts to engage in this business.

Numerous plans for the improvement of our rivers, and especially of the Mississippi, have been presented by the river commission. Among them is the reservoir system, which contemplates the erection of dams at feasible points to retain the surplus water at periods of freshets caused by spring rains and melting snows, so that a sufficient amount may be discharged during dry seasons and portions of the year when low water prevails, to keep the stage of water uniform for purposes of navigation and to guard against destructive overflows at periods of high water.

This plan is not, however, thought feasible as a separate project by the river commission, and must be considered as merely an auxiliary to the one now adopted and which is commended by the commission as the most likely to prove satisfactory in the accomplishment of results.

The conclusions of the commission have been reached after the most mature deliberations and the application of scientific and practical tests, which conclusions are tersely and forcibly stated in the following, taken from the report of 1880:

In recapitulation, the conclusions of the commission may be stated as follows: First. The system of works in progress on the Mississippi River between Saint Paul and mouth of the Illinois River, with the modifications which experience will suggest, is adequate for the improvement of navigation, and should be pushed rapidly to completion.

Second. A sufficient improvement of the river is not to be expected from the action of a system of reservoirs alone.

Third. It is possible that on the completion of the observations now in progress

some of the proposed reservoirs which furnish water at the least cost may be found to be economical aids to the principal system of channel contraction. But they should only be built when the works for channel contraction approved have been carried to the fullest economical development.

Fourth. It is recommended that the entire amount estimated by Captain A. Mackenzie for the coming fiscal year, for carrying on the adopted improvements between Saint Paul and the mouth of the Illinois River, be appropriated in one sum.

As an indication of the favor with which the improvement of the Upper Mississippi River is received by the business interests most affected, I present two representative letters from a number written in response to a circular of Captain A. Mackenzie, of the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, especially charged with the supervision of the work. W. J. Young & Co. represent an immense lumber interest at Clinton, Iowa, and Captain Davidson is largely interested in river transportation as the owner of a line of steamboats plying between Saint Paul and Saint Louis. Their letters are as follows:

MESSRS. W. J. YOUNG & CO.

OFFICE OF W. J. YOUNG & CO., STEAM GANG-SAW MILLS,  
Clinton, Iowa, December 4, 1880.

DEAR SIR: Your favor of present month, December, 1880, at hand. In reply will say we think a large amount of good has been done to navigation of the Mississippi River by your commission, and yet we think that you have only demonstrated in a miniature way the great possibilities of making the Mississippi River one of the best navigable rivers in the world, and it should not be neglected any longer. The United States is able, and we believe the people of the United States are willing, to make liberal appropriations to carry forward this great national work, and we trust that the importance of the work will be truly and faithfully presented to the present Congress, and that liberal appropriations will be made.

We would most respectfully call your attention to another matter of much needed improvements in river, namely, guard-booms or piling properly located at each bridge so as to insure more safety to passages of boats and rafts. It is not an uncommon occurrence for our boats as well as passenger-boats to be detained a whole day and night on account of danger of getting through when there is a stiff breeze blowing; we think that every bridge that our boats pass through with rafts costs us not less than \$25 more than it would if there was no bridge there. Now let us count from Beef Slough to Clinton, La Crosse, Dubuque, and Sabula, three bridges, makes \$75; and seventy to eighty rafts. It will be safe to say we will average eighty rafts per year, and with present mode of passage through bridges it will cost us \$6,000 per navigable season. Will you please call Mr. Weyershanser's attention to this, and see how near he agrees with this statement, and we do wish you would call attention of all navigators of Mississippi River between Saint Louis and Saint Paul to this matter of so great importance. Pardon this long letter, hastily written, about these matters of much importance.

Very truly, yours,

W. J. YOUNG & CO.

A. MACKENZIE, Captain of Engineers, U. S. A.

LETTER OF MR. P. S. DAVIDSON.

LA CROSSE, December 6, 1880.

DEAR SIR: I think the improvements done along at different points on the upper river have been the means of making a good channel where the channel was bad. I think the work has done all that could be expected of it.

Work of a similar kind is needed at the following points: between Wabasha and Reeds, at West Newton, Homer, Dresbach, Coon Slough, and Bad Axe. If those places were fixed, I think we would have a pretty good channel in this part of the river.

Yours, truly,

P. S. DAVIDSON.

Captain A. MACKENZIE.

The opinions of these gentlemen that much good has been done and good channels have been made where the channel was bad are entitled to full credit. They certainly express the opinions of those who are abundantly competent to judge from long experience and business contact with the subject upon which they so freely and favorably give expression. It will thus be seen that the improvement of the Upper Mississippi River, although progressing slowly, is still making fair advancement toward the much-to-be-desired perfection of a channel for the purposes of commerce and navigation.

LEVEES.

The improvement of the Lower Mississippi River is of a nature different from that above Cairo, and yet I perhaps may state in this connection that the successful improvement of navigation must no doubt be based upon the same principles as apply in general to our river system. As I have before stated, considerable sums of money have been expended by States and individuals in construction of levees to keep the water in the channel and protect the alluvial lands bordering the river from overflow. Some of these levees are of immense proportions, reaching occasionally heights of from fifteen to eighteen feet. In so far as these levees confine the water within certain limits and assist in the "scouring out" process they may be said to benefit navigation.

It is not, however, necessary for present purposes to dwell at length upon this particular feature of river improvement, as the levee system has for its chief, and I may say only object, the protection of the low lands bordering upon the river. It may not be wholly outside of the duty of States to apply the revenues collected within their borders to the reclamation of these lands that their enhancement in value may increase their taxable property. It is not, however, my purpose to discuss this phase of the question at length. It is not believed that the law or any established precedent would warrant the General Government in assuming control over the natural water-ways of the country for other than the purpose of navigation.

It is observed in the report of the Mississippi River commission of March, 1880, that where the river is more than three thousand feet in width bars are liable to form and obstruct navigation. In so far,

therefore, as these levees contract the width of the channel they may be of benefit to commerce, but this would only be incident, and was not thought of by the original projectors of the work.

I present the following extracts from the report of the river commission, to which I have before referred, as explanatory of the origin and for the purpose of conveying some idea of the extent of these great works:

The construction of levees on the Mississippi River was commenced at New Orleans in 1720. Their extension was encouraged, and even enforced, under French rule, and at the time of the cession to Spain, 1763, they extended continuously, on both banks, twenty miles below and thirty miles above the city, besides isolated settlements at Pointe Coupee, Manchac, La Fourche, and elsewhere. Little progress was made by the Spaniards, but, "by 1828, levees were continuous from New Orleans nearly to Red River Landing, except above Baton Rouge, on the left bank, where the bluffs rendered them unnecessary. Above Red River they were in a very disconnected and unfinished state, on the right bank, as far as Napoleon.

"In 1844, the levees had been made nearly continuous from New Orleans to Napoleon, on the right bank, and many isolated levees existed along the lower part of the Yazoo front. Above Napoleon few or none had been attempted."

The act of September 28, 1850, granting swamp lands to the States, for drainage and reclamation purposes, gave great impetus to levee building; so that, by 1858, it reached its greatest extension. In that year levees were complete from Commerce to the Saint Francis, excepting about twenty-five miles; and, also, from the Saint Francis to Cypress Creek, excepting about fifty-seven miles. Thence down, they were continuous on the right bank. The fifty-seven miles unbuilt was in a stretch of river which included the mouths of the White and Arkansas rivers.

On the left bank the system was complete. The levees not only restrained floods, but closed outlets through which the river discharged into swamps, at mid and lower stages.

The present condition of the levees, January 8, 1881, is tabulated as follows:

List of levees.

Location.	Miles built.			Remarks.
	Distance.	Right bank.	Left bank.	
Forts to New Orleans .....	70	70	70	
New Orleans to Baton Rouge...	132	132	132	
Baton Rouge to Red River ....	73	73	0	
Red River to Glasscock's.....	45	0	0	Hills on left bank. Hills on left bank. Overflow on right bank re-discharged by Red River.
Glasscock's to Sargent's Point.	113	113	0	Hills on left bank.
Sargent's Point to Delta .....	18	0	0	Overflow on right bank checked by Walnut Bayou.
Delta to lower end of Mississippi levees.	33	33	0	Drain of Yazoo Bottom.
To Arkansas line.....	51	48	51	
Arkansas line to head of Lower Mississippi district.	175	.....	175	Breaks unknown on right bank.
Between Mississippi districts.	10	.....	0	Breaks unknown on right bank.
Upper Mississippi district ....	94	.....	94	Breaks unknown on right bank.
Norfolk to Cairo .....	271	.....	0	Breaks unknown on right bank. Hills on left bank. Hills on left bank.
Cairo to Cape Girardeau .....	50	.....	0	Breaks unknown on right bank.
	1,135	469	522	

Right bank:	
Miles of levee built.....	469
Miles of levee unbuilt.....	66
Miles of levee unknown condition.....	600
	1,135
Left bank:	
Miles of levee built.....	522
Miles of levee unbuilt.....	10
Hills and openings for draining Yazoo Bottom.....	603
	1,135

There is no known warrant in law or precedent for the assumption of control by the General Government of these works, unless it proposes to commit itself to the protection of its citizens against natural emergencies that may and do overtake and affect unfavorably those who east their lots in such localities as are liable to such visitations. It is believed that the commitment of the General Government to a policy that is so far-reaching in its effects can in no sense be justified by the most reckless theorists.

Among other plans suggested and considered, the outlet system has commanded no little attention.

Captain John Cowden is the chief champion and advocate of this theory, which has been considered not only by the committee of this Congress on the improvement of the Mississippi River and its tributaries, but by the river commission. The plan is to open channels at points as far above the mouths of the river as appear to be practical for the purpose of relieving the river from the surplus flow of water at flood periods. The outlet to which particular attention has been

called by Captain Cowden and his co-workers in the scheme is one proposed by opening a channel from the river into Lake Borgne; but after careful examination it is believed that such a deflection of water would very materially and unfavorably affect the jetties already in successful and highly satisfactory operation at the mouth of the river.

It is further found, by practical tests and observations, that obstructions bars are formed by the projection of sediment at these cut-offs; hence this plan is not deemed practical, at least in so far as it is likely to permanently affect the navigation of the river favorably. Neither is it believed that such an arrangement would very materially aid in relieving the river from a superabundance of water at flood times. In short, this plan is not found to stand the tests of thorough examination and practical experience.

I have thus sketched the various principal plans in contemplation for the improvement of the Mississippi River, and which are believed to be applicable alike to the improvement of all our natural waterways.

The plan which is regarded as the most practical, satisfactory, and economical, and the one which has received the favorable indorsement of the river commission, is set forth in the following, taken from the report of the commission, and explains quite fully the proposed manner of conducting the work, to wit:

Experience, as well in this country as in Europe, justifies the belief that the requisite correction and equalization of the transverse profile of the stream, by developing new shore lines and building up new banks, may be made chiefly through the instrumentalities of light, flexible, and comparatively inexpensive constructions of poles and brush, and materials of like character. These constructions will commonly be open or permeable to such a degree that, without too violently arresting the flow of water, thereby unduly increasing the head and causing dangerous undercurrents, they will sufficiently check the current to induce a deposit of silt in selected localities.

The works which have been used in similar improvements are of various forms and devices, such as the hurdle, composed of a line of stakes or light piles, with brush interlaced; the open dike, formed of stakes, with waling strips on both sides, filled in loosely with brush; the continuous brush mattress, built or woven on fixed or floating ways and launched as fast as completed, as a revetment to a caving bank, the mattress used as a vertical or inclined curtain, placed in the stream to check the current, the same laid flat on the bottom as the foundation for such a curtain or as an anchorage for other brush devices; curtains of wire or brush netting, placed vertically or inclined in the stream, and various other forms of permeable brush dikes, jetties, or revetments. Some of these methods of construction have been used on the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers with increasing satisfaction and success, although they cannot yet be regarded as entirely beyond the experimental stage. In some, perhaps in many localities, works of a much more solid character than those above indicated may be necessary.

The closure of deep channels or low-water chutes, with a view of confining the flow to a single passage, may require substantial dams of brush and riprap stone or gravel, but it is believed the lighter and less costly works will generally suffice.

By a permeable dike located upon the new shore line to be developed, connected with the old bank at suitable intervals by cross lines of like character, or by jetties of hurdles or other permeable works projecting from the bank with their channel ends terminating on the margin of the proposed water-way, or by any other equivalent works, the area to be reclaimed and raised will be converted into a series of silting basins, from which the water, flowing through the barriers with diminished velocity, will, after depositing its heavier material, pass off and give place to a new supply. In this manner the accretion will go on continuously through the high-water season, or through two or more seasons if necessary, the works being renewed on the higher level as occasion requires.

Wherever necessary, the new bank must be protected by a mattress, revetment, or some equivalent device.

That these methods of improvement are practicable is shown by the works already executed on the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers.

This is a most concise and clear explanation of the general system of improvement of rivers, and is based upon the theory of turning the forces of the current into accomplishing the deepening of the channel by their own action. It is found by tests that at the time of the receding of the waters during the last stages of flood periods is when the most satisfactory results are obtained. During flood times the water is highly charged with silt, and much of it is precipitated upon the bottom of the channel, which of course tends to fill it up. The new shore line confines the water, and as soon as the flood subsides sufficiently for these jetties to begin to guide and direct its course the forces are concentrated and the channel is cleared of any extraordinary deposit that may have been precipitated. Thus it is that the forces of the stream are made under the touch of scientific tests to serve man by deepening and maintaining the channels for the benefit and advancement of commerce. The feasibility of this plan has been so fully and thoroughly tested during the last two or three years that it can no longer be considered an experiment.

By its application to the bar that formed below Saint Louis it was clearly demonstrated that a channel could be effectively and permanently deepened at comparatively little cost. It thus commends itself to the candid consideration of all, in that it is not only satisfactory as to results, but the most economical of any of the various plans that have been examined or tested.

Since its practicability and economy have been so fully and successfully demonstrated, it becomes the duty of Congress to make such liberal appropriations as shall appear to be necessary in the rapid prosecution of this work, having due regard for economy. By all means should there be a careful guard thrown round expenditures of this kind, to make it certain that there be no undue wastage. The people never object to a liberal expenditure of public money provided value received can be shown. Complaint comes only when there has been waste and unwarranted extravagance.

Much might be said of the vast commerce that is already carried upon our rivers even in their present imperfect condition. An immense impetus was given to river trade by the completion of the jetties at the mouth of the Mississippi a few years since. It is believed, however, that we have as yet marked but the beginning of an activity that must be unprecedented when it is well established that the river improvement and the maintenance of the system are understood to be fully and entirely under the control of the General Government and that the policy is fixed that these improvements will be maintained by expenditures from the general Treasury.

In securing these results the whole country is materially interested, but especially is it of paramount benefit to the great agricultural communities of the valleys permeated by these natural arteries of commerce.

Upon no country on the face of the earth have such advantages been bestowed by a kind Providence as upon the United States. For easy communication within its limits by natural water routes, and from the interior to connection with ocean, the great highway for distribution to the markets of the world, the natural placing of its navigable streams, is unsurpassed by any country of the civilized world.

No reference has been made to the use of these streams for heavy transportation during periods of war. The immense amount of blood and treasure expended to force the free navigation of the Mississippi River to the Gulf of Mexico during our late war is a sufficient indication of the importance of this subject as to its bearing upon the maintenance of national unity, to say nothing of the incalculable benefits which would result from the transportation of troops, heavy ordnance, and army supplies, in case of war.

As has been said, railroads must be bounded by limits in capacity for bulk of material transported, and must certainly always be the more expensive means of transportation. It is certainly clear to all reflective and comprehensive minds that in the coming years every resource of transportation of rail and water must be taxed to the utmost to relieve us at reasonable rates of the vast surplus accumulations that must continue to be produced from our fields, mines, forests, and manufactures. Competition of every nature must be fostered to the utmost and by every means within reach. To it we must largely look for the relief from overcharges in transportation for which all our industries so greatly feel the necessity.

It is believed that no more feasible, cheap, popular, and effective plan can be inaugurated and adopted for the amelioration of the condition of our people in this regard than a vigorous prosecution to completion of this great national work and the maintenance of the same by the Government for the purposes of competition.

The national Legislature has now fairly taken hold of and committed itself to this great and beneficent work, and it is profoundly to be hoped that there will be no abatement of zeal in its prosecution to final and satisfactory completion, ever keeping in view an economic application of the funds set aside for such purpose.

For the accomplishment of this object liberal appropriations must be made by Congress. I therefore, in view of the necessities of the country in the directions mentioned, and which I believe to exist, shall most heartily vote for this bill, or any properly guarded measure looking to the speedy and economic accomplishment of this much to be desired object.

With these improvements accomplished and our natural arteries of commerce thronged with steam vessels and barges, as they surely will be in the not distant future, an impetus will be given to our prosperity hitherto unprecedented.

Millions of happy homes and bright firesides with increased comforts and assured leisure to the family, thus affording the means for the cultivation of the higher and better impulses, will dot the whole of our vast area; and we shall be blessed in our day for bringing about, by the enactment of just laws, these splendid results; and the thanks of our constituents as well as the gratitude of the world, for cheapening the necessities of life and for making it possible to build up and support cultivated, bright, and happy homes, will be freely bestowed for all time to come.

The CHAIRMAN. By order of the House the time for general debate upon this bill has expired. The bill will now be read by paragraphs for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, &c.*, That the following sums of money be, and are hereby, appropriated, to be paid out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War, for the construction, completion, repair, and preservation of the public works hereinafter named:

Improving harbor at Portland, Maine: Continuing improvement, \$35,000.

Mr. RANDALL. Will not the gentleman from California [Mr. PAGE] consent that the committee now rise?

Mr. PAGE. Yes; I move that the committee now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose, and Mr. HASKELL having taken the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, Mr. BURROWS, of Michigan, reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had had under consideration the bill (H. R. No. 6242) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### INTERNATIONAL FISHERY EXHIBITION AT LONDON IN 1883.

Mr. WILLIAMS, of Wisconsin, by unanimous consent, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, reported a joint resolution (H. R. No. 237) concerning an international fishery exhibition to be held at London in May, 1883; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

#### REMOVAL OF SUITS FROM STATE COURTS.

Mr. HAMMOND, of Georgia, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (H. R. No. 6515) to amend section 643 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

#### ANN ELIZABETH RODGERS.

Mr. KING, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (H. R. No. 6516) granting a pension to Ann Elizabeth Rodgers; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

#### COMPENSATION FOR SOLDIERS' PRIVATE PROPERTY BURNED.

Mr. STEELE, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (H. R. No. 6517) authorizing compensation to members of Company B, Fourteenth Infantry, for private property destroyed by fire on the Nashville and Chattanooga Railroad; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. HOLMAN. I rise to a privileged motion, and move that the House now adjourn.

Mr. RANDALL. And I call for the regular order.

#### MRS. F. L. CLAIBORNE.

Pending the motion to adjourn, The SPEAKER *pro tempore* laid before the House a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the report of the register and receiver of the United States land office at New Orleans, Louisiana, on the private land claim of Mrs. F. L. Claiborne, No. 13, of class 1; which was referred to the Committee on Private Land Claims.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. LADD, for ten days, on account of important business.

And then the motion of Mr. HOLMAN was agreed to; and accordingly (at four o'clock and fifty-five minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

The following memorial and petitions were laid on the Clerk's desk, under the rule, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BINGHAM: The petition of the captain of Company D, Twenty-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteers, asking for the medals voted by Congress, July 22, 1861, for the men of his command—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BLAND: The petition of F. M. Mansfield, for the establishment of a mail-route in Wright County, Missouri—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. CASWELL: The petition of Charles P. Huntington and others, United States gaugers, for an increase of compensation—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEUSTER: The petition of B. Schlichting and others, gaugers of Milwaukee, Wisconsin, for increase of pay to former rate—to the same committee.

By Mr. FLOWER: The petition of George C. Ellison, for compensation as clerk to Committee on Agriculture from the beginning of the Forty-seventh Congress to the appointment of his successor—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. B. W. HARRIS: Memorial of wives and daughters of naval officers, praying that provision be made insuring a pension to the widows of deceased naval officers—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HUMPHREY: The petition of Charles P. Huntington and others, internal-revenue gaugers of Milwaukee, Wisconsin, asking that the law limiting the fees of gaugers be amended—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING: The petition of A. L. Alley and others, citizens of Floyd, Louisiana, for an appropriation for educational purposes—to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LATHAM: Seven petitions of citizens of North Carolina, for an appropriation for educational purposes—severally to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPEER: The petitions of the grand jury of Gilmer County and of prominent citizens of Gilmer County, Georgia, for an appropriation for educational purposes—severally to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TILLMAN: The petition of Sarah Carson, of South Carolina, for compensation for dwelling-house alleged to have been destroyed by General Sherman's army in 1865—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. YOUNG: The petition of the National Cigar Manufacturers' Association, for a reduction of the tax on cigars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.