


F

1783

C47





Class F1783

Book 247

1
ACQUISITION OF CUBA.

SPEECH

OF

HON. ZACHARIAH CHANDLER,
OF MICHIGAN,

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES, FEBRUARY 17, 1859.

The Senate having resumed the consideration of the bill making appropriation to facilitate the acquisition of Cuba by negotiation—

Mr. CHANDLER said:

Mr. PRESIDENT: This is a most extraordinary proposition to be presented to the Congress of the United States, at this time. With a Treasury bankrupt, and the Government borrowing money to pay its daily expenses, and no efficient remedy proposed for that state of things; with your great national works in the Northwest going to decay, and no money to repair them; without harbors of refuge for your commerce, and no money to erect them; with a national debt of \$70,000,000 which is increasing in a time of profound peace at the rate of \$30,000,000 per annum, the Senate of the United States is startled by a proposition to borrow \$30,000,000. And for what, sir? To pay just claims against this Government, which have been long deferred? No, sir; you have no money for any such purpose as that. Is it to repair your national works on the northwestern lakes, to repair your harbors, to rebuild your light-houses? No, sir; you have no money for that. Is it to build a railroad to the Pacific, connecting the eastern and western slopes of this continent by bands of iron, and opening up the vast interior of the continent to settlement? No, sir; you say that is unconstitutional. What, then, do you propose to do with this \$30,000,000? Is it to purchase the Island of Cuba? No, sir; for you are already advised in advance that Spain will not sell the island. More, sir; you are advised in advance that she will take a proposition for its purchase as a national insult, to be rejected with scorn and contempt. The action of her Cortes and of her Government, on the reception of the President's message, proves this beyond all controversy.

What, then, I ask again, do you propose to do with this \$30,000,000? I ask any friend of the measure what he proposes to do with the money? The question is absurd. There is no man, woman, or child, who does not know for what purpose this \$30,000,000 is intended. It is a great corruption fund for bribery, and for bribery only.

It is a proposition worthy of its author; it is a proposition worthy of the writer of the Ostend manifesto; a proposition worthy of the brigand; worthy of James Buchanan; but it is unworthy of the President of the United States; it is a proposition disgraceful to be made to the Congress of the United States.

Again I ask, what do you propose to do with the money? Is it intended that this grand corruption fund shall be used in the purchase of foreign ministers and ministers of State and high Spanish officials? Is this what the friends of the measure would have us believe it to be? Such, possibly, a small portion of it may be intended for; but, in my estimation, that portion will be found to be infinitesimally small. There are other, and, in the estimation of some, more important, objects to be attained by the use of this money.

The Democratic party is damaged, badly damaged at the North. Its principles are gone, and even its occupation of public plunder is gone, for there is nothing left to steal; your Treasury is bankrupt, and there is no hope of replenishing it before the presidential contest of 1860. In this emergency something must be done for the Democratic party, and here is the proposition to do it. A new issue is to be raised to call off the attention of the country from past extravagant expenditures and present bankruptcy. Cuba is to be the cry in the next presidential election, and \$30,000,000 is to be the inducement to cry loud and long. This is a mere clap-trap proposition to go into the canvass of 1860; and the friends of this measure have no more idea of purchasing Cuba under it than I have of buying it on private account. They are to go before the country upon this cry of Cuba, and upon it they hope to float into power again in 1860. Vain, fallacious hope. Forty Cubas and \$300,000,000 as a bribery and corruption fund, would not save the Democratic party from that annihilation which the Almighty has decreed.

But, sir, let us examine this proposition in its practical effects upon our constituency. I propose

to take a practical view of it. I propose, before we go into a speculation of this kind, to ascertain whether it will pay. The calculation which I am about to present, was made before Oregon was admitted, which has on, in favor of the House of Representatives, and this fact would vary my figures a few dollars; but a few dollars only. Of this \$30,000,000 bribery fund, each congressional district will pay \$127,118 64. The State of Michigan, under the present representation, according to the census of 1850, having four members, will pay \$508,474 56. But the population of Michigan has more than doubled since 1850, and she is now entitled, according to her population, to eight Representatives; and will, in 1860, be entitled to eight, at a ratio of one hundred and twenty-five thousand people to a Representative; so that her present proportion would be, according to a proper apportionment, \$1,016,949 12, the interest upon which, at six per cent. per annum, would be \$61,016 94. I name six per cent., because if you go into any such wild scheme as this, borrowing money to buy islands, you will find your national credit below par, according to the present rate of interest; and I believe six per cent. is the lowest rate at which you can borrow money if you conclude to go into this filibustering proposition for the campaign of 1860. I say, then, you propose to mortgage my State of Michigan for \$1,016,949, and to compel her people to pay an annual tax of \$61,016. Before I vote this mortgage, and this perpetual annual tax upon the people of Michigan, I desire to consult my constituents; and after I have consulted them, even if they should make up their minds that this was a wise scheme, I should tell them that upon that point I differ from them.

But, sir, this is not all. You propose to authorize the President to purchase the Island of Cuba for any price he may see fit. It is true the Senator from Ohio, [Mr. PUGH,] has offered an amendment placing a limit on the price, but it has not been adopted, and if it were I do not suppose it would have any effect on the negotiation. What would President Buchanan care for \$50,000,000, more or less, to accomplish his darling scheme? Give him this \$30,000,000 to start with and he will pay two hundred, or two hundred and fifty, or any other number of millions that it may suit his whim to pay. I care not for your limit—he will not regard it. I will, however, take as the basis of my calculation the lowest price named as the sum which Spain will consent to accept for Cuba; to wit: \$200,000,000. Two hundred million seems to be considered, on all hands, as the minimum price. What the maximum may be, I know not. I take as the basis of my calculation the minimum of \$200,000,000. If that be the amount, each congressional district in the United States would pay \$847,454, and the State of Michigan, as at present represented under the census of 1850, would pay \$3,389,816; but, as I have already stated, her population has more than doubled since the last census, and is rapidly increasing, so that her present proportion would be \$6,779,632. Upon this sum the annual perpetual interest would be \$406,777 92. I call it perpetual, for no sane man believes that, if this debt be created, it will ever be paid in the world. It is but the commencement of an irredeemable debt. I say, then, you propose to mortgage the State of Michigan for \$6,779,632,

and to compel her to pay the perpetual interest \$406,777 92.

Sir, before I vote for any such scheme, I want authority from him; and I advise the Senator from Ohio to listen to his constituents, and he votes for any such scheme. My wish is, if he has not heard from them, he will write them.

Mr. PUGH. I will take care of my constituents; let the Senator take care of his own.

Mr. CHANDLER. The State of Ohio will have to pay, of this purchase money, \$17,835,344, the perpetual annual tax of which, in that State, will be \$1,073,791. Of the \$30,000,000 appropriated by this bill, Ohio will pay \$2,663,475, the annual interest on which, at six per cent., will be \$160,168. The Senator says he will take care of that. I trust he will; and I can assure him that if he does not, the people of Ohio will.

Now, let us admit for the sake of the argument, that this proposition is brought forward in good faith and will be successfully terminated, what does the State of Michigan gain, what does the State of Ohio gain, what do any of the north-western States gain by the purchase of the Island of Cuba? I know something of Cuba, something of its soil, something of its climate, something of its people, their manners and customs, something of their religion, something of their cruelties. I spent a winter in the interior of the Island of Cuba a few years since, and can therefore speak from personal knowledge. I differ in my views from the honorable Senator from Louisiana, [Mr. BENJAMIN.] My personal observation does not accord with his theories. Much of the soil of the Island is rich and exceedingly productive; but it is in no way comparable to the prairies and bottom-lands of the Great West. You can go into almost any of your Territories and select an equal number of acres and you will have a more valuable State than you can possibly make out of Cuba. You have hundreds of millions of acres of land to which you can extinguish the Indian title for a song, and obtain better lands and create better States than you will ever make out of Cuba.

The Island of Cuba contains nineteen million three hundred and fifty thousand acres, and you propose to pay for it \$200,000,000; or in other words, you propose to pay for the Island of Cuba more than ten dollars an acre for every acre of land on it, and then you do not acquire an acre. You are selling infinitely better lands, and have millions upon millions of them, for \$1 25; and yet you propose to tax the people of the United States to pay ten dollars an acre for land that you do not get when you pay the money.

I notice by the report of the honorable Senator from Louisiana, [Mr. SLIDELL,] that Cuba contains, at this time, a population of one million nine thousand and sixty inhabitants, including negroes, old men, and small children. You propose to pay nearly two hundred dollars a head for every man, woman, child, and negro on the island, and then you do not own one of them. You propose to pay \$200,000,000—for what? For the right to govern one million of the refuse of the earth. You propose to pay \$200,000,000 to bring in a population that you would reject with scorn if they were now to apply for admission into the Union, free of all expense.

Do you think that proposition will pay? Do

you think it will commend itself to the people of the Northwest? Do you think it will commend itself to the people of this Union? What do you get after you pay your \$200,000,000? You acquire the right to build fortifications; to send an army to Cuba; to govern it; to create a navy to protect it; to expend through all time, from twenty-five to a hundred millions per annum, to take care of it. That is all you get. Do you think it will pay? But, as I said before, I know something of the people of this island, and something of their manners and customs.

The white population consists chiefly of creoles, or native-born Cubans. Of the slave population I should think a large majority are native-born Africans. The honorable Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BENJAMIN] spoke the other day of the great mortality among the slaves of Cuba. If he meant to apply his remarks on that point to the creole slaves, he made a vast mistake; for I never in my life saw a more healthy set of persons than the creole slaves of Cuba. They are not half so hard worked, they are better fed, they live longer than the slaves of Louisiana; and they are not as cruelly treated. This remark was made to me over and over again, "Give me anything but a Yankee master." They do not want an American master. He is energetic, he drives, he works his negroes; but the creoles are so utterly indolent themselves, that they allow their negroes to do pretty much what they please. If the Senator meant his remark to apply to the Africans, it was, perhaps correct. At the time I was upon the island, the mortality of the native Africans was estimated thus: one fifth of all shipped from the coast of Africa died upon the passage; one fifth more committed suicide within the first year after they were landed on the island; one fifth more died the first year in the process of acclimation, because they were unaccustomed to toil, unaccustomed to that mode of living. Consequently, three fifths of the entire exportation from the coast of Africa were lost in one year from the date of their exportation. In regard to the remaining two fifths, however, after becoming acclimated, they live as long as creole negroes. It will be seen that three fifths being destroyed the first year, in order to get an average of any length of time, you must rate a long life to the rest, unless you shorten the duration, perhaps to the time the Senator mentioned; but the lives of the creole negroes are as long as those of any other people in the world.

Now, as to the white population: they are ignorant, vicious, and priest-ridden. Prior to the administration of General Tacon, there was not a crime on the calendar which had not its fixed value in the Island of Cuba. I had at one time the tariff of crime there, but at the present moment I only recollect a single item. The price of assassination was two ounces of gold, or thirty-four dollars a head! You could have any man assassinated for thirty-four dollars before the administration of Tacon; and I was informed by many old Cubans you could scarcely walk out in the streets of Havana in the morning without finding one or more dead bodies, the result of the last night's assassinations and robberies. My own experience is, that the gibbet was a common sight—the gibbet, with the human skull rattling in the wind, at the corner of four roads, or at some place

where a crime had been committed and the murderer met his fate.

On the accession of Tacon to office, he increased the army to twenty thousand men, and did establish, as the honorable Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BENJAMIN] said, an absolute military despotism, which exists there to this day. But it was not as the Senator said to prevent insurrection; it was to prevent crime, and that only; and if that military despotism had not been established, and had not been ruled with an iron hand, Cuba would be to-day what it was before the administration of Tacon. As I said before, the people are ignorant and vicious. They will not labor, and they will resort to any shifts of crime to obtain subsistence. Bribery is universal, from the Governor General, who receives two ounces of gold per head for every slave landed on the island. Let a slave trader land a single negro without paying his two ounces of gold, that negro will be wrested from him within three days. Two ounces of gold per head is the regular established bribe for every slave landed on the Island of Cuba, and it is done as publicly as almost any other transaction there. I went into the barracons at Havana, and saw eleven hundred slaves within three days from the time of their landing there from the coast of Africa. They were landed within ten miles of the Moro Castle, and marched directly up to Havana, and placed in the barracons for sale publicly, under the very eye of the Captain General. Everybody was talking about it, and the ship that brought them over, lay as quietly in the harbor of Havana as any merchant ship. If you had seen, as I did, those eleven hundred miserable wretches, you would not be surprised at the mortality among them. The laws of Spain are to-day as severe against the slave trade as those of the United States; nevertheless, slaves are continually imported there, and it is done because the Captain General is bribed. It is a well known fact, that every Captain General of Cuba acquires an immense fortune in two or three years, and it is from the slave trade and that alone. From the judge on the bench, from the priest in the pulpit, to the lowest tide-waiter, bribery is the rule, and there are no exceptions. You cannot remove the dead body of your friend from the Island of Cuba without bribing the priest, bribing the captain of the Partero, bribing the judge, and bribing the custom-house officer, through whose hand it passes. I know that, because I have had to pay the bribes.

Is not this a beautiful population to bring into the Union as a State—a beautiful population to take rank with the old States of this Union? But, sir, that is not all. The Catholic religion rules supreme in the Island of Cuba; no other religion is tolerated. Even the rites of a Christian burial are denied to a Protestant upon that island. The people are superstitious and vicious; and they are bigots as well. They are devout Catholics. The Catholic Church is true to Spain; the Catholic Church is true to despotism; and the people there, to a man, are true to the Church. If the honorable Senator from Louisiana has seen hundreds, or if he has seen one hundred, Cubans who were panting for liberty, as he asserts, he has seen every one that that island produced. There are a few creole Cubans, who have been educated in the United States, that are intelligent,

that care nothing about their church, who are anxious to get their hands into the Treasury. They are anxious for plunder; they are anxious for position where they can receive bribes. True patriotism does not exist on the Island of Cuba. They love the very chains that bind them. They love their church; they love this very military despotism of which complaint is made. The men of whom the Senator from Louisiana speaks, are men the majority of whom have been banished from the island. Where was the declaration of independence which he brought before us written? Who wrote it? Where was it adopted? In my opinion, it was adopted in some tavern in New Orleans. The people of Cuba never adopted a declaration of independence. What was the fate of the gallant Crittenden when he went to Cuba to help to rescue them from oppression? What became of that young man and the fifty associates who were with him, when they went there with arms in their hands prepared to shed their blood for the redemption of the Island of Cuba? Where, then, were the patriots who were thirsting for freedom? If there was one on the island, he kept himself pretty well out of sight; and that gallant young man, ten minutes before he suffered death, wrote a letter to a friend in the United States, saying: "I did not come here to plunder; I came here in good faith to aid these people in acquiring their freedom; I supposed they were thirsting for liberty; but I have been deceived. My time has come." In a postscript he added: "I will die like a man."

Where were the liberty-thirsting Cubans then, when as gallant a soul as ever lived on the face of this earth went to his last account because he sympathized with "gallant, suffering" Cubans? Sir, the gallantry is not there. There is no such thing as a love of liberty there. Do you want these people in your Union? Are you prepared to pay \$200,000,000 to bring such a set of criminals into this Union? Do you propose to keep an army of twenty thousand men in a climate where they will be decimated every year, to govern that island? That is what Spain has to do, and that is what you will have to do if you mean to keep the people from cutting each other's throats. You will have to keep up a navy there to protect your possession, if you get it. You must spend from fifteen to twenty million dollars a year to govern the island; and in addition to that, you propose to place a perpetual annual tax of \$12,000,000 upon the people of the United States for the purchase. I ask Senators whether they consider that a game that will pay?

Suppose you get the island: what will you do with it? Your people cannot live there. The impression has gone abroad that in the interior of the Island of Cuba the climate is cool and healthy; but such is not the fact. Tropical diseases always rage there at certain seasons of the year, and the foreign population is usually decimated every year. You cannot even sleep on a mattress, during the winter, on that island. The heat is so intense that you are obliged to forego the luxury of a mattress, and sleep in a hammock or upon canvas. Besides, there are certain other luxuries that I wish to call to the attention of northern men who may propose to go there. You are compelled to sleep under mosquito bars all the year round; and if you do not find scorpions

in your boots in the morning, you will be more fortunate than I was. Lizards run about in every direction; worms annoy you at every turn. This is a beautiful place to migrate to! And you propose to pay \$200,000,000 for the island. In my opinion, it is not a paying investment.

But, sir, as I said before, this bill is not to buy the Island of Cuba, for you are advised in advance that you cannot get it. This is a mere speculating scheme for 1860. It is to be one of the planks in the Democratic platform in 1860; and I propose very briefly to review a certain other plank which you have in that platform, as there are only two left—this one is not yet in. You have destroyed all your old platforms; they are utterly annihilated. Even the Cincinnati platform of a few years has ceased to be; and I am not surprised that that platform has been destroyed. There never was a sound plank in it. It said that everything was left "perfectly free, subject to the Constitution of the United States;" but the knowing ones in that convention were perfectly aware at that time that the Constitution of the United States was virtually subverted by a decision which the Supreme Court dared not then make, and whose final enunciation depended upon the result of that election. If President Buchanan had not been elected, the Dred Scott decision would not have been made. I propose now to spend a very little time in examining this last new platform of the Democratic party. The Supreme Court of the United States was merciful in its work of destruction. The Cincinnati platform was built precisely as boys build cob-houses—to see who could first knock them down; and the missile which the Supreme Court threw at the Cincinnati platform, which destroyed it, and which will virtually overturn the Constitution of the United States when it becomes the law; that very missile was itself a Democratic platform, which the Democratic leaders made great haste to mount; and at the North they found it large enough. There was but one plank to it, but it would hold all the Democratic party there. They had become infinitesimally small and few in number before that last new platform, and are growing beautifully less day by day.

I insist that the Dred Scott decision—for it is needless for me to say that it is to that I allude—is the only Democratic platform that now exists; and if any man throughout this broad land, who holds a Government office of any value whatever, doubts it, let him try the experiment. Let him say that he does not consider the Dred Scott decision the Democratic platform, does not consider it binding on him, and, my word for it, he will be shorter by a head within three days after the announcement. Sir, it is the Democratic platform; it is the party test. Any man who does not swear allegiance to the Dred Scott decision is no Democrat. I hold in my hand an exposition of that decision, from a Democratic newspaper published in the city of Washington, which I believe is universally admitted to be good Democratic authority. It is more than that; the newspaper to which I allude distills the pure essence, the very essential oil of Democracy. I allude to the Union newspaper of this city, some of whose articles are understood to be written by the President of the United States and to be supervised by his Cabinet, and to send forth the perfectly pure Democratic doctrine. I believe that when this pure

Democratic doctrine is seen, it will be offensive not only to the people of the North, but of the South likewise. But, sir, to the article. In the Union of November 17, 1857, appeared a long article, prepared with great care, evidently intended as a lasting exposition of the position of the Democratic party. It says:

"Slaves were recognized as property in the British colonies of North America, by the Government of Great Britain, by the colonial laws, and by the Constitution of the United States. Under these sanctions, vested rights have accrued to the amount of some \$1,600,000,000. It is, therefore, the duty of Congress and the State Legislatures to protect that property.

"The Constitution declares that 'the citizens of each State shall be entitled to all the privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States.' Every citizen of one State coming into another State, has, therefore, a right to the protection of his person, and that property which is recognized as such by the Constitution of the United States; any law of a State to the contrary, notwithstanding. So far from any State having a right to deprive him of this property, it is its bounden duty to protect him in its possession.

"If these views are correct, (and we believe it would be difficult to invalidate them,) it follows that all State laws, whether organic or otherwise, which prohibit a citizen of one State from settling in another, and bringing his slave property with him, and most especially declaring it forfeited, are direct violations of the original intention of a government which, as before stated, is the protection of person and property, and of the Constitution of the United States, which recognizes property in slaves, and declares that 'the citizens of each State shall be entitled to all the privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States,' among the most essential of which is the protection of persons and property.

"What is recognized as property by the Constitution of the United States, by a provision which applies equally to all the States, has an inalienable right to be protected in all the States."

There you see the doctrine announced, that the States are under obligation to protect slave property, although it may be brought within their limits with the intention of keeping it there. The free States are compelled to protect slave property within their limits, although it may be brought there for the purpose of remaining, under the doctrine here laid down; and if the Dred Scott decision be law, or if it be hereafter regarded as a law, this reasoning is correct. If the Constitution of the United States carries slave property one inch beyond the jurisdiction of the State law creating or regulating it, it carries it everywhere; for no person can "be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law;" but we deny, *in toto*, that the Constitution of the United States does recognize or regulate or acknowledge property in slaves.

In this connection, let me allude to a remark of the Senator from Georgia, [Mr. IVERSON.] Some days ago he told us what he would deem a sufficient cause for a dissolution of this Union. That I may not misrepresent him, I will read exactly what he said. He declared:

"Sir, it is not so difficult a matter to dissolve this Union as many believe. Let the Republican party of the North obtain possession of the Government, and pass a Wilmot proviso; or abolish slavery in the District of Columbia; or repeal the fugitive slave law; or reform the Supreme Court, and annul the Dred Scott decision; or do any other act infringing upon the rights, impairing the equality, or wounding the honor of the slave States; or let them elect a President upon the avowed declaration and principle that freedom and slavery cannot exist together in the Union, and that one or the other must give way, and be sacrificed to the other, and the Union would be dissolved in six months."

Now, sir, I propose to do two or three things, which the honorable Senator from Georgia declares are good and sufficient reasons for dissolv-

ing this Union. I do not speak for the Republican party; I speak for myself. I say I do propose the reorganization of the Supreme Court. The present organization of that court is monstrous. Judge McLean has as many causes to try in his circuit as have all the five slaveholding judges put together. When he was appointed justice of that circuit, it was a howling wilderness; now there are a thousand millions of commerce within it. Then he could hold a court in every State in his circuit; now he cannot reach some of those States once in five years. I propose to reorganize that court, so as to make it conform to the business of the country. I propose that its judges shall be located so that they can at least visit every State in the district once or twice a year; and in order to do that, the court must be reorganized. Three fourths of the entire business of the courts of the United States is at the North, where you have four judges of the Supreme Court. One fourth of it is at the South, where you have five. I propose to reorganize that court; and, if the Senator from Georgia were in his seat, I would ask him how he proposes to dissolve the Union after it is done? I ask any Senator, who is blustering in the Senate or elsewhere about dissolving this Union, how he is going to do it?

We propose to do more; we mean to elect a President who entertains the same views; and if that be a just cause for dissolving this Union, again I ask, how are you going to do it? I want any man on this floor to tell me how he is going to dissolve this Union, because we, the people of the United States, see fit to exercise our constitutional privilege. We mean to annul the Dred Scott decision—no, sir, I take that back; it is no decision. We do not think it is a decision at all. The only point decided in that case was, that negroes cannot come into court. That we accept; that we cannot annul; that is decided; but the stump speeches of Chief Justice Taney, and the other judges, were mere fanfaronade, meaning nothing. It was not a decision of the court; and if we elect our President in 1860, *as we are going to do*, that decision will never be made. I do not say that that decision would not now be made. I think if a case were before the court now, it would make the Dred Scott decision legal; but the Supreme Court has always sided with the Administration in power. What did General Jackson do when the Supreme Court declared the United States Bank constitutional? Did he bow in deference to the opinions of the Supreme Court? No, sir; he scorned the opinion of the Supreme Court, and said that he would construe the Constitution for himself; that he was sworn to do it. I, sir, shall do the same thing. I have sworn to support the Constitution of the United States, and I have sworn to support it as the fathers made it, and not as the Supreme Court has altered it, and I never will swear allegiance to that. But I am not quite through with the Union article. It says further:

"The protection of property being next to that of person, the most important object of all good government, and property in slaves being recognized by the Constitution of the United States, as well as originally by all the old thirteen States, we have never doubted that the emancipation of slaves in those States where it previously existed, by an arbitrary act of the Legislature, was a gross violation of the rights of property."

There you have it declared that abolition of

slavery in seven of the old thirteen States was unconstitutional, and, according to the Dred Scott decision, it was. I ask any man of common sense—I will not ask a lawyer; I am no lawyer myself—but I ask any man of common sense, if he believes that the old thirteen States, seven of which intended to abolish slavery within a very few years, would have adopted a Constitution which prohibited them from doing the very act which they contemplated doing *instantly*? I ask any man if he believes for a single moment that the Representatives of those seven States that intended immediately to abolish slavery within their borders, would ever have assented to a Constitution which prohibited them from doing the very act which they proposed to do? No, sir, the proposition is absurd; and the judges of the Supreme Court themselves did not believe it when they uttered it. No man of common sense can believe it. It is not so.

But, sir, monstrous as is this proposition, monstrous as is the article which I have read, if the Dred Scott decision be law it is all true; and it is a mere question of time when every State of this Union will become a slave State. If the honorable Senator from Louisiana, or any other man, should see fit to take a thousand negroes into the State of Michigan after that decision shall have become the law, I defy any power short of a revolution in this Government to prevent him, or take them from him. But, sir, it is not law; it is not common sense; yet this Dred Scott decision is the only platform of the Democratic party at the present time—the only issue before the country. I beg pardon; there is another issue, not yet perfected, and that is this \$30,000,000 bribery and corruption fund. That is to be another plank in the Democratic platform. These two planks, the Dred Scott decision and Cuba, are to be the platform that is to float the party into power if it ever arrives there; the Dred Scott decision and the \$30,000,000 loan, with, perhaps, the honorable Senator from Virginia [Mr. HUNTER] astride of them; and with that platform and that candidate, the Democratic party will march to certain defeat.

But, sir, as this measure at the present time is a financial question, I propose very briefly to allude to the financial condition of the country. I look upon this as the practical method of judging of its merits. I hold in my hand a letter written by a very distinguished man, at present connected with this Government, dated March 1, 1852, and addressed to a committee of gentlemen of Baltimore. It is signed "James Buchanan." It says:

"We must inscribe upon our banners, a sound regard for the reserved rights of the States, a strict construction of the Constitution, a denial to Congress of all powers not clearly granted by that instrument, and a rigid economy in public expenditures.

"These expenditures have now reached the enormous sum of \$50,000,000 per annum, and unless arrested in their advance by the strong arm of the Democracy of the country, may, in the course of a few years, reach \$100,000,000."

Well, sir, "the strong arm of the Democracy" has been managing our affairs ever since. The President of the United States was then mistaken a few millions as to the expenditures; for the entire expenditures of 1852, including payment of the public debt, was only \$44,481,447; but let him have the advantage of his own figures. The strong arm of the Democracy has had charge of

this Government from that time to the present, and we have already reached the point that he prophesied we might reach in a few years—\$100,000,000 of expenditure. It was demonstrated to my entire satisfaction, and, I believe, to the satisfaction of the Senate, by the honorable Senator from Kentucky, [Mr. CRITTENDEN], on this day, that \$100,000,000 would not pay the expenses of Government for this year. I propose a change; I propose that we try some other plan at economizing the expenses of this Government. But let me go on with the letter. Its writer says further:

"The appropriation of money to accomplish great national objects, sanctioned by the Constitution, ought to be on a scale commensurate with our power and resources as a nation; but its expenditure ought to be conducted under the guidance of enlightened economy and strict responsibility. I am convinced that our expenses might be considerably reduced, below the present standard, not only without detriment, but with positive advantage both to the Government and the people."

If the expenditures could then be reduced below \$50,000,000 with advantage to the Government and the people, what can be done now? Is there any reason why our expenditures should be greater now than they were in 1852? There is no reason except that money may be used for purposes of corruption; and I propose to examine into some of these corruptions now and here. This letter says further:

"An excessive and lavish expenditure of public money, though in itself highly pernicious, is as nothing when compared with the dissuasive influence it may exert upon the character of our free institutions. A strong tendency towards extravagance is the great political evil of the present day; and this ought to be firmly resisted."

Sir, I propose to resist it with all the firmness God has given me. Now, let us look a little into the expenditures of this Government. I hold in my hand an official document of the Senate, printed at the last session, giving the receipts and expenditures of the Government from its formation to 1857; and I desire to present some facts which are shown by this document; and to be as brief as possible, I will take it by decades, and I will commence with the military service of the country. In 1790, the whole expenses of the Army amounted, in round numbers, to \$917,000; in 1800, \$3,272,000; in 1810, \$3,107,920; in 1820, \$4,923,027; in 1830, \$5,082,843; in 1840, \$6,504,830; in 1850, \$6,838,919; and in 1857, \$18,614,594. This last sum does not include all the expenditures of the Army for 1857; for Senators will recollect that one of the first bills we passed at the last session was a bill making an appropriation of \$5,700,000 for deficiencies in the expenses of the Army. Thus it will be seen that the Army expenses alone, from 1850 to 1857, almost quadrupled, and this in a time of profound peace. Does any Senator on this floor believe there was any necessity for such an enormous increase in the expenditures for the Army? Does any man believe that a prudent administration of the Government would not cut down the Army expenditures at least one half? Sir, the extravagance is enormous and outrageous; and it requires something more than the strong hand of the Democratic party to rectify the evil. We will take it in the strong hand of Republicanism, and then we will remedy it.

But, sir, let us look at the Navy. In 1800, the expenditures for the Navy were \$3,042,352;

in 1810, \$1,870,274; in 1820, \$2,709,243; in 1830, \$3,496,643; in 1840, \$7,562,752; in 1850, \$5,571,646; in 1857, \$14,117,434. Have we any more ships, or any more guns, or any more efficient force, to-day, than we had in 1850? I am informed that we have not. On the contrary, it is said, I know not with how much truth, that our Navy is hardly as efficient as it was at that time. At any rate, we have had no war, no extraordinary demand for excessive naval expenditures, and yet they have been reaching up until they are \$14,000,000.

There is one other account here, to which I wish to call the attention of the Senate. It is headed "miscellaneous expenditures." I do not know exactly what constitute the miscellaneous expenditures of this Government, but I notice a most extraordinary increase in them of late. I take it for granted that what cannot be charged anywhere to anything, goes down as miscellaneous. The miscellaneous expenditures of this Government in 1800 amounted to \$312,823; in 1810, \$650,514; in 1820, \$1,386,448; in 1830, \$1,436,201; in 1840, \$3,243,649; in 1849, \$3,595,853; and in 1857, \$20,442,860. I should like to know how these miscellaneous expenditures have swollen so enormously. There is another remarkable fact connected with the great increase of the miscellaneous expenditures of the Government. I notice that when any very great outrage is about to be perpetrated, the miscellaneous expenditures increase enormously. In 1849 they were \$3,595,853; and they swelled in 1850, when the fugitive slave bill was passed, to \$7,122,970. Again, when the Missouri compromise was repealed, I notice they reached the enormous amount of \$19,899,000; and a goodly portion of this great increase may be legitimately charged to the negroes. That institution has been a very expensive one to this Government. It has cost, in my estimation, all it is worth. When any great outrage was to be perpetrated, the expenditures of all branches of this Government have swollen enormously. So when the Lecompton constitution came here to be passed last winter. We have not got the account yet, but you will find an enormous expenditure in several of the Departments of this Government, which, the less said about, the better the parties interested will be satisfied.


As I said the other day, we have had a bill under consideration in the Committee on Commerce to reduce the expenditures for the collection of the revenue over \$600,000 a year, and we have not commenced the work of reform even at that. We have lopped off by that bill a thousand useless employes of the Government, scattered over the United States; but we have not probed the wound to the bottom. As I have said, that bill, if it becomes a law, will save \$600,000 a year. I propose, for a moment, to call attention to some of the outrageous expenditures connected with that Department. In the Passamaquoddy district, at Eastport, Maine, the whole amount of revenue collected for the year ending June 30, 1857, was \$14,285 33, and the expense of collecting it was \$22,357 71; and nineteen men were employed to collect \$14,000 of revenue. In Frenchman's bay district, at Ellsworth, they collected \$954 96, and the expenses were \$5,032 09; and it took ten men to collect the \$954. At Wiscasset, in Maine, you collected \$130 93; and it cost \$7,359 09, and took

eight men to collect \$130. These are samples. At Portsmouth, New Hampshire, the revenue collected was \$5,530 54; the expense of collection was \$10,984 49, and twenty-one men were employed to make the collection. At Burlington, Vermont, the revenue was \$8,581 70; the expense of collecting was \$16,285 47, and thirty-three men were employed to collect it. At Marblehead, Massachusetts, the revenue was \$250 85; the expense of collecting it \$2,228 97, and nine men were employed to collect it. At Plymouth, in Massachusetts, the revenue collected was \$395 12; the expense of collection was \$3,216 04, and six men were employed to make the collection. At Barnstable, Massachusetts, the revenue collected, was \$1,462 75; the expense of collection \$11,953 20, and nineteen men were employed to make the collection. At Nantucket, Massachusetts, the revenue collected was \$95 81; the expense of collecting it was \$2,320 73, and three men were employed in the collection. At New London, in Connecticut, the revenue collected was \$3,223 89; the cost of collecting it was \$29,789 48, and seven men were employed in its collection. At Oswego, in New York, the revenue collected was \$6,149 09; the cost of collecting it \$18,214 58, and twenty-three men were employed in its collection. At Niagara, New York, the revenue collected was \$8,284 85; the cost of collecting it \$12,296 92, and nineteen men were employed in its collection. At Buffalo, New York, the revenue collected was \$10,140 53; the cost of collecting it was \$16,896 51, and twenty men were employed in its collection. At Cape Vincent, New York, the revenue collected was \$2,098 12; the cost of collecting it \$7,138 87, and thirteen men were employed in its collection. I might continue the citations; but these will suffice.

True, we shall have lopped off these things by that bill, if it shall become a law; but I hold that these extravagant expenditures of the Government ought never to have been commenced; and I hold this Administration responsible for the enormous abuses that have crept into the collection of the revenue. The head of the Department had no right, under the law, to appoint inspectors; but he could appoint clerks and porters and boatmen, and a thousand other officers, and pay them the highest salary at his discretion; and under the abuse of that power these enormous expenditures have sprung up. You may go into any of the Departments of this Government, and you will find the same kind of abuse existing. Go into any bureau in this city, and you will find abuses. It requires an honest Administration of this Government; it requires a man who dares to take the responsibility of doing right; and then you may reduce your expenditures, as Mr. Buchanan suggested in the letter I have quoted, in my opinion, below \$50,000,000; but we have tried the Democratic party; we have weighed them in the balance, and found them wanting. We do not propose to try them again. We propose to thrust out the corrupt, the lavish men, who now control the Government, and put in honest men, who will retrench in good earnest; not men who will write letters recommending retrenchment, but men who will take hold and do the work of retrenchment.

I have placed the expenditures of the Government this year at \$95,000,000. I know not how much will be appropriated, but I know that if the

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 015 999 716 9