

vestigation, and they brought forward this proposition, and said that the demands of the country were such that we should vote for that appropriation. Before voting upon it I also asked the advice and opinion of the distinguished member of the Committee of Ways and Means from Massachusetts, [Mr. HOOPER.] He said that he regarded it as a fair compensation for what might be received. He said also that now was an opportunity which we might never have again for enlarging the operations of the navy-yard at Charlestown. And I thought that this was very good authority for me to act upon in the absence of personal knowledge of the facts. I had no idea, under such circumstances, that I was voting for a "swindle" on this Government; and yet the gentleman from Illinois comes forward and accuses me of so voting. Why, sir, I called to mind in giving my vote that this navy-yard lies just at the foot of Bunker Hill. I remembered, sir, that the shadows of the shaft that rises on that glorified summit are cast across that ancient receptacle of naval power; and I remembered also that it is appropriate that the operations of that navy-yard should be extended so as to be made commensurate with the proud history of that splendid State—a history that can never be forgotten to the "last syllable of recorded time."

Again, the gentleman said that I had voted for another "swindle" in this House; that I had voted to withdraw nearly one hundred thousand dollars out of the Treasury of the United States for shells and percussion caps. I must correct the gentleman in that matter. That proposition was brought up by the distinguished member from Pennsylvania, [Mr. MOORHEAD.] He moved that the claim be referred to the Court of Claims. Now, sir, I knew nothing about that claim. It must be remembered that I am a new member upon this floor. I believe that the proposition had been before the House at the last session of Congress. I supposed that the Court of Claims was the proper tribunal to investigate such claims, and I therefore voted for it. The gentleman, if he will take the trouble to look in the record, will find my vote recorded in favor of referring the claim to that court. Was there anything improper in that? Now, sir, I was somewhat astonished that a gentleman of his experience on this floor and of his reputation for ability throughout this country should find it necessary, in order to defend his own position before his constituents and the country, to come in here and mar my brief political record of four months upon this floor. Was it necessary for him to misrepresent the truth in order that he might place himself right before the country? This is the fact in relation to this case, and nothing more and nothing less can be made of it. It is a misrepresentation of facts.

Mr. KASSON. I ask the gentleman from New Hampshire to yield to me for a single moment to say, as I was one of those gentlemen who entertained doubts originally as to the propriety of the purchase of this additional ground at the Charlestown navy-yard, that those doubts were removed by subsequent personal inspection. I have been on the ground since that vote was taken, and I not only regret that a general charge against it as a swindle has been made on the floor of the House, but I desire now to say emphatically that after that inspection and after inquiring of gentlemen on the ground, I am satisfied that this purchase was needed for the use of that navy-yard, and that the price paid was as nearly what it is worth as could possibly be arrived at in almost any business transaction between man and man for the purchase of property.

Mr. PATTERSON. Sir, I may have been very generous and a little too credulous, perhaps, in voting those appropriations, but the gentleman must pardon something to the fact that I am a *novus homo* on this floor. I have but lately entered the field, sir, and may make some mistakes in my votes here. But the gentleman saw fit to drag up my brief record and hold it up here in an invidious comparison with his bright and glorious career of ten years on this floor; and there let it stand. I am willing to abide the judgment of my peers upon this floor or of my peers outside of this House on any vote which I have cast or may cast here. Sir, perhaps after I shall have had a little more experience in legislation I shall bring my votes to accord more exactly to the popular

standard of economy marked out by the gentleman, but until I have had that experience the gentleman must pardon any indiscretion on my part. Time will cure all that.

All that I have to say in relation to this matter is simply this—and I wish to make the remark as a general one, and as not referring particularly to the gentleman from Illinois—that if any man on this floor dares to charge me with having willfully voted here a corruption fund, or voted for a fraud of \$135,000, I hurl back the infamous charge with ineffable scorn and contempt into his teeth. It was an insult not to myself alone, but to all the gentlemen on this floor who voted for that measure.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. FORNEY, its Secretary, announced that the Senate had passed, without amendment, an act (H. R. C. C. No. 114) for the relief of Daniel Wormer;

An act (H. R. C. C. No. 115) for the relief of Darius S. Cole;

An act (H. R. C. C. No. 116) for the relief of William G. Brown; and

An act (H. R. No. 373) to appoint an appraiser and assistant appraiser for the port of Portland, and for other purposes.

Also, an act (H. R. No. 287) to change the name of the district and port of Presque Isle to the district and port of Erie, with an amendment, in which he was directed to ask the concurrence of the House.

Also, that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. No. 155) to incorporate the Union Gas-Light Company of the District of Columbia.

PENITENTIARY FOR THE DISTRICT—AGAIN.

Mr. WASHBURN, of Illinois. I must confess, Mr. Speaker, that I am somewhat surprised that my distinguished friend from New Hampshire should, after resting on it during the night, have come into the House this morning to deliver himself as he has done on the little episode that took place here yesterday. He need not have told us, sir, that he was a new member, because I think if he had been a little older member he would not have taken this little matter quite so much to heart. I am sorry he is disturbed. I did not intend to disturb him or to reflect upon him in any way.

But the gentleman will remember that this is a matter of his own introduction. Because I saw fit to oppose a bill proposing to take out of the Treasury \$4,000—that pitiful little sum—to buy a steam fire-engine for the city of Washington, the gentleman from New Hampshire addressed the committee conveying the idea that I had become very eloquent on a very small matter. Now, sir, I never become eloquent on a very small or on a very big matter.

Mr. PATTERSON. I wish to say, sir, that I did not speak of the gentleman. My remark was a general one; and the gentlemen from Illinois saw fit to take it up for reasons best known to himself.

Mr. WASHBURN, of Illinois. I understand that, sir. The gentleman undoubtedly meant to refer to me. He does not deny it, and he cannot escape in that way. The gentleman insinuated that while I grow eloquent on these very little things I was willing to vote for the largest and most extravagant appropriations, and particularly the ship canals. Of course that did not mean me. [Laughter.] I looked upon all this very good-naturedly. I did not suppose that there was anything intended but as mere badinage, which I took from my distinguished friend from New Hampshire with all the grace and good nature which he and everybody else knows belongs to me. [Laughter.] As to the matter of larger appropriations to which the gentleman referred, I thought it appropriate and just to refer a little to the record of my friend, to which he takes so much exception. I merely say to my friend, with all my good nature, that when I say a thing understandingly I generally stand to it. And notwithstanding that my distinguished friend from Iowa [Mr. KASSON] has come to the rescue of my no less distinguished friend from New Hampshire, [Mr. PATTERSON,] I intend to stand by my position in regard to this Charlestown navy-yard. I stand to-day just where I stood yesterday. I saw that my friend had voted—for what? He does not deny it; that

he had voted against striking out an appropriation of \$135,000 for the purchase of a piece of land for the Charlestown navy-yard, at a price that was not only extravagant and enormous, but that has since been charged to have been a "swindle." I had information about the facts and I tried to get the attention of the Committee of the Whole to my information. When the report of the debate in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union reached Boston, a letter was written to me by one of the most distinguished citizens of Charlestown, Massachusetts, and its statements were afterwards corroborated by the mayor of Charlestown, whom I saw. These men charged in the first place that this piece of ground was not necessary for any of the purposes of the navy-yard, and in the second place that the price charged to the Government was enormous. And why?

Mr. SPALDING. I rise to a question of order. I ask whether it is in order on this bill for the gentleman from Illinois to impeach the good name of the Committee on Naval Affairs?

The SPEAKER. In what respect?

Mr. SPALDING. In their recommending an appropriation to this House.

Mr. WASHBURN, of Illinois. It is the first knowledge I have had that the Committee on Naval Affairs recommended anything of the kind. I hope my friend from Ohio, who generally votes with me on everything, will let me go on.

Mr. SPALDING. In regard to this appropriation for a navy-yard I wish to say to the House that the Committee on Naval Affairs had the matter before them for two weeks, and carefully inquired into the value of this land. I myself, at first, was doubtful in regard to it. After that inquiry we considered the evidence furnished to us was to the effect that the price was a fair one for this land, and we recommended its purchase.

Mr. WASHBURN, of Illinois. I wish the gentleman would let me go on.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman insist on his point of order?

Mr. SPALDING. My friend from Illinois received his letter from a private individual which he submitted to me. I then said to him that we might have been imposed upon. I still think that the price for the land was not too great.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman makes a point of order he cannot argue the question.

Mr. SPALDING. I withdraw my point of order.

Mr. WASHBURN, of Illinois. I am glad that the gentleman has withdrawn his point of order. He knows that there was no reflection upon him, upon the Committee on Naval Affairs, or any other committee, or upon any member in this House. But I was just coming to that point in regard to the value of this land. A short time before this matter was reported to the House the owners of this land were not anxious to sell it, as they had no occasion for the money. But they were persuaded, however, to sell it from what they considered the very large price offered for it, some one hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars, I believe, at most one hundred and thirty thousand dollars, for the whole land. Now the Government comes in and pays \$135,000 for one half of it. Gentlemen of the House can judge for themselves whether, under these facts, it was not "a swindle," an imposition on the Government, as the people of Charlestown have charged.

I referred merely to the fact that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. PATTERSON] had voted for it. He had charged me, by innuendo at least, with having voted for large appropriations, while I was growing "eloquent" upon these little things. In return I pointed to him as having voted for an appropriation which I considered extravagant and outrageous, and that those who were acquainted with the subject had denounced as "a swindle." So much in regard to that.

In respect to the other matter the gentleman misunderstood me. I am surprised that he should cut out a little slip from the Morning Chronicle of the associated press report and base his remarks on that. He can see my remarks fully reported in the Globe when it comes up this morning. He alleges that I charged him with having voted for another swindle. I did not refer to this bomb-shell bill as a swindle. I stated what I believe to be true, that the bill for which he voted would in the end take \$100,000 out of the Treasury. That is all there is of that.