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Congressional History of Asa Whitney's Project for a Pacific Railroad.

I. Beginning of Whitney's work. The 28th Congress.

To find out who first conceived the idea that a railroad might be a practicable means of communication between the Mississippi valley and the Pacific coast would very likely be a pretty difficult task. It seems to be uncertain, indeed, to whom the honor belongs of having first expressed such an idea in a public way. The truth of the matter probably is that as the railroad gradually became more successful and its great possibilities as a means of transportation became more apparent, different men of foresight or imagination whose attention was attracted in any way to the west, came to realize that some day a railroad might go westward to the Oregon country. There is no use either in denying or supporting the claim which anyone may have made in later years that the idea originated with him. But it is possible to know who first presented any definite plan for a Pacific railroad to Congress. The glory that there may be in that goes to Asa Whitney, whose plan was first laid before Congress January 28, 1845.

That the idea was not wholly new and undreamed of is shown by the fact that Whitney's plan was not universally ignored or denounced as visionary, and that one of the two committees to which it was referred in Congress considered it worth-
y of a report and patient and "deliberate investigation". It was, however, characterized as "bold" by the National Intelligencer and was often met with"the smile of incredulity". The fact that twenty four years of agitation, discussion, exploration and settlement passed before the railroad was finally built shows unquestionably that most people joined the American Railroad Journal in saying that they were "in a great measure incapable of appreciating the magnificence or the utility of a railroad hence to the Pacific." By the end of the 1st session of the 32nd Congress, however, the last session in which Whitney's project was formally presented, the "smile of incredulity", so far at least, as it was caused by the notion that there would ever be a railroad to the Pacific, had undoubtedly vanished from the faces of all those who were in touch at all with the life of their time. The change had been brought about almost entirely by Whitney's work.

The purpose of this paper is to trace the history of the Whitney project in Congress. In doing this, I shall to some extent deal also with the early Pacific railroad agitation in general, since Whitney's was the center of all of it, and with the attitude toward the Whitney plan throughout the country, since it was reflected in the action of Congress. Both of these last two purposes are, however, secondary. The first has been treated in a general way by L.H. Haney in his doctorate thesis, "A Congressional History of Railways in the United States to 1850," presented to the University of Wisconsin in 1906, and

1. 28 Congress, 2 session, House Report No. 199, serial no. 468
2. National Intelligencer, May 1, 1845.
the second by Robert S. Cotterill in an article in the Mississippi Valley Historical Review for March, 1919, called "The Early Agitation for a Pacific Railroad," in which the author gives his attention especially to the attitude toward the Whitney plan throughout the country as it is shown in the newspapers of the period. My field, then, is, primarily, the Congressional history of the Whitney project.

Asa Whitney was born in 1797 and so was a man forty eight years old when he began his Pacific railroad agitation. He was a merchant of New York and was certainly a man of some means and business ability. In his second memorial to Congress he gives this account of the beginning of his interest in a Pacific railroad:

"Your memorialist would respectfully represent to your honorable body, that his attention was first called to the importance of railroads as a means for the transportation of commerce, as well as of passengers, from the Liverpool and Manchester railroad, in 1830, when he passed over the distance of (he thinks) 34 miles in 42 minutes. He then saw clearly their present importance, and predicted their future importance to us as a means of communication with the Pacific. In 1842, while on a voyage to China, on the 27th day of October, in the Chinese sea, we fell in with an English barque from Singapore. The captain gave us a Singapore paper, under date of 30th September,

6. Mississippi Valley Historical Review, Vol. V, No. 4, March 1919, pp. 396-414. This article did not appear until the present study was nearing completion.

containing the first account of peace with China. Your memorialist saw that the results of such a peace...must make a great change in the commerce with China, as also the importance to us, if we could have a more ready, frequent, and cheap communication than the present long and dangerous voyage around either of the capes; and your memorialist was led to a consideration and investigation of the whole subject."

Whitney returned to New York from China in the summer of 1844 and it was to the next session of Congress, the 2nd session of the 28th Congress, that his first memorial was presented. It was laid before both Houses on the same day, January 28, 1845—before the Senate by Daniel S. Dickinson of New York and before the House of Representatives by Zadock Pratt, also of New York. In each house it was referred to the Committee on Roads and Canals and in the Senate was ordered printed. In presenting the memorial in the House, Representative Pratt remarked that the project was well worthy of the consideration of the American people because it would give great commercial advantages to the whole nation, because it would secure our in-

10. S.doc.69, serial 451. Neither the House Journal nor the Globe states that the memorial was ordered printed in the House, but it was printed as H. doc. No.72, serial 464. Also, C.C., 28-2, p.218, and 31 Congress 1st session, H.rp .140, appendix 1, serial 583.
terests in Oregon, and because, by "furnishing a direct westerly passage from Europe to China" it would become the "highway of nations."\(^{11}\)

In this first memorial, which is shorter and not so definite as the second and third, Whitney speaks of the advantages of existing railroad systems to the country and of his own qualification to speak on the subject with which he is dealing because of the time he has spent upon it, and declares that he believes the route he proposes practicable and the results of the road incalculable. He compares the distance to China by the proposed railroad route and by the route around Cape Horn, estimating the saving in distance which the railroad would effect at 6,800 miles and in time, from 70 to 120 days. He points out the results the railroad will have, commercially, in vastly increasing the trade of the United States with the Pacific Coast and with the Orient, and, politically, in uniting the whole country and in making possible the maintenance of a naval depot on the Pacific Coast from which the United States can command "the Pacific, the South Atlantic, and the Indian oceans, and the Chinese seas."

The plan of construction which he proposes is, though not fully developed, essentially the same plan that he advocated throughout his agitation for the railroad. The government is to grant him a strip of the public land 60 miles wide the whole length of the road. The estimated coast of the road, completed and in operation, is $65,000,000, which is to be raised by the sale of the public lands granted for that purpose. The tolls

\(^{11}\) C.G.28-2, p.218.
to be charged are to be only so high as is necessary to keep the road in repair and operation. The route proposed is from Lake Michigan, between the 42nd and 45th degrees of north latitude "west to the gap or pass in the mountains [South Pass]; and thence by the most practicable route to the Pacific Ocean."

Whitney urges that the demand for labor for the construction of the road and the opening up of the lands to settlement will relieve the condition of over-population in Europe and will free our own cities from a "vast amount of misery, vice, crime, and taxation" and will make it possible to educate immigrants "to our system—to industry, prosperity, and virtue."

In conclusion he argues that without this means of communication, Oregon must develop into an independent and powerful nation.

Whitney's was not the only suggestion made to this session of Congress concerning a communication with Oregon. December 3, 1844, President Tyler, in his annual message, recommended to Congress the establishment of military posts along the route to Oregon for the protection of immigrants. January 17, 1845, Representative Wentworth presented in the House the petition of citizens of Kane county, Illinois, for armed occupation of Oregon, and the establishment of a railroad between the Mississippi and Columbia rivers. This memorial was referred to the Committee on Territories. And March 3, John Quincy Adams presented in the House the petition of James Riley praying an inquiry into the expediency of establishing a great central rail-

12. H.J.38-2, serial 462, p.15; C.G.,38-2, p.3
13. H.J.,28-2, serial 462, p.221
way from New York City, or some other city on the Atlantic coast, to the Pacific ocean. The petition was laid on the table.\textsuperscript{14}

On the last day of the session, March 3, 1845, the House Committee on Roads and Canals, through Robert Dale Owen of Indiana, the chairman, submitted a short report in which it stated that it had not had time to form a specific opinion as to the expediency or practicability of the plan but that they considered it worthy of consideration and investigation; that if undertaken, the railroad should be constructed by a grant of public lands, but that they could offer no opinion as to the proper plan for making the land available for the project.\textsuperscript{15}

The Senate Committee on Roads and Canals, of which these men were the members: A.S. Porter of Michigan, Albert S. White of Indiana, Dixon H. Lewis, of Alabama, Sidney Breese of Illinois, and D. W. Sturgeon of Pennsylvania,\textsuperscript{16} took no action upon the memorial.

\textsuperscript{14} H.J.38-2,serial 462,p.578
\textsuperscript{15} H.J.,28-2,serial 462,p.550,28-2,H.rp.199,serial 468
\textsuperscript{16} C.U.,28-2,p.12 and indec.
II. The 29th Congress.

In the summer of 1845 Whitney personally explored a part of the route which he proposed for his railroad. He went overland west from Milwaukee to the Missouri, which he struck in latitude 43\(_{1/2}\) degrees, then down the Missouri by canoe to Weston, near Fort Leavenworth, and from there in a steamer to St. Louis. He returned to Congress believing firmly in the practicability of his route and plan and in the impossibility of depending upon the Missouri river "as a means of communication with Oregon for the vast commerce of the Pacific, of Japan, of China, and of all Asia."

The attention of the 1st session of the 29th Congress was called to the matter of a communication with the Pacific by President Polk in his annual message sent to Congress December 2, 1845, in which he recommends the establishment of an overland mail. There were several vain attempts made to carry out this recommendation. The only thing in connection with these efforts to establish a mail route which is of importance in the consideration of the railroad movement is the report from the Senate Committee on Post Office and Post Roads, submitted to the Senate March 22, 1876 by James Semple of Illinois, in support of a bill which the Committee reported (S.103) to establish a post route from Independence, Missouri, to the Pacific. While there

1. 29-1, S.doc.161, serial 473.
   Also in 31-H.Rp.140, pp.29-30, serial 583
2. 3 J. 29-1, serial 469, p.17;
   H.J. 29-1, serial 479, p.24; C.G.,29-1, p.7
is no intimation in the report that the members of the Committee had ever heard of a railroad to the Pacific, the report, of which 300 extra copies were ordered printed March 24, gives arguments for the mail route which are very much the same as those put forth for the railroad: "It is probable, however, that the greatest advantage to this country which a mail route to Oregon will produce, will be the immediate and ultimate effects which it will have in strengthening the bonds of friendship and union between the people of the east and the west; in affording the means of acquiring information of the Oregon, so as to promote immigration to these regions, and ultimatively to control the vast trade of the Pacific Ocean." The report is of importance, also, because it advocates a route to the south of that which Whitney was proposing. There is included in the report a letter from W. Gilpin, of Missouri, who writes: "The road from Independence has great advantages over any other, because it may be made to embrace a mail to New Mexico; to which place there are an immense and valuable commerce, and many American residents. By this route, too, a more southern pass, as that by the head of the Arkansas, may be used, should the snows preclude the passage by the South pass during the winter." The writer goes on to give a glowing account of the possibilities of the development of commercial supremacy in the Pacific and closes with this stirring petition: "I pray that Congress may not let the voice of western commerce blow by on the wind, but rather gather its prayers and complaints, and covers its feebleness with substantial legislation, aid, and protection."
The Semple bill did not, however, pass the Senate, nor did any other similar bill pass either house.

Asa Whitney's second memorial was presented to the Senate, February 24, 1846 by Sidney Breese of Illinois. It was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered printed. This memorial was not presented to the House.

Whitney has by this time worked out his plan with greater care than he had before he wrote the first memorial. He discusses at length the route he has chosen, his plan of construction, and the advantages of the road. He declares that he knows from his own exploration that there are no physical difficulties to prevent the building of the road. The grade is gradual, the Mississippi can be bridged at Prairie du Chien, and beyond that there are no difficult streams to cross. There is sufficient timber and stone along the first part of the route; and as far west as the Missouri, the land is good. The land is poor from the Missouri to South Pass but there are no difficulties for a road, the ascent being only about 6 feet to the mile. "From the 'South Pass' to the Pacific" the memorialist "is informed that the route is feasible." The Missouri is impracticable for navigation, even to Fort Leavenworth, because of its rapidity, quicksand, changing channel, and shallowness. The route proposed is better than other routes for several reasons: there is unsettled land available; there is material for the road along the route; from the eastern terminus there is easy and
cheap communication with the Atlantic; the country near the starting point is settled so that supplies may be drawn from it and there is direct water communication with Pittsburg, where the iron must be secured; the terminus on Lake Michigan will be nearer to all the Atlantic cities than any other point and it will be central, being only four days from any part of the country; and the road may run directly west from Lake Michigan to South Pass. Moreover, this route is available for the purpose, since it passes through unsettled lands in a territory controlled by Congress and through Indian lands which may be bought.

The memorialist believes that the only possible means of building the road is a grant of public lands. A strip 60 miles wide is necessary because of the fact that for at least one-half the total distance, 2400 miles, the land is too poor to support much settlement. The government is to appoint commissioners to look after its interests. Whitney is to contract the land sales but the government commissioners are to give the title and hold the money. It will be possible to complete the road within 15 years. After it is finished the memorialist would prefer that the government should operate it since it is built from the property of the people; but if there are constitutional objections to that, he agrees that he and his heirs shall operate the road for any definite number of years, transporting government property free of charge.

For the first twenty years freight is to be carried for 2½ cent per ton per mile for a distance over 200 miles. Passengers, and freight for less than 200 miles, are to be carried
for tolls equal to one half those charged on the principal railroads of the country. Congress is to have the power to revise the tolls after 20 years so that the income from the road will be only that necessary to keep it in repair and operation. All surplus lands and money are to be held by the government during the process of construction as security for the completion of the road; any that may be left after the road is finished are to be held for twenty years to insure its operation; after the road has been in operation for twenty years, the surplus is to go to Whitney and his heirs.

The road will separate the Indians and it will be possible to make them civilized more readily. The country will be settled by immigrant labor and will become the home of an "industrious, producing, and consuming population" and the "center and most important part of the globe." The other great advantages of the road which are discussed are the same as those presented in the first memorial: Oregon will be held and the Pacific trade will be controlled by the United States. The vast English commerce with the East will pass over the road, and America will be the great highway from Europe to Asia.

Whitney concludes the memorial by declaring that since he will get no pecuniary provision until after the road is completed and in operation for 20 years, it is evident that his purpose is unselfish. It has appeared to him that the road is "a part of our destiny, and that our destiny could not be accomplished without it, and now only is the time in which it can be done; and that some one's whole efforts, energies, and life must be devoted to it. And if he can be the instrument"
to accomplish, or put in the way of accomplishment, this great work, it will be enough—he asks no more."

When Senator Breese presented the memorial he made a few remarks in support of it, saying that Whitney did not ask that an appropriation of money nor an absolute grant of land be made but only that a portion of the public lands be set apart as a fund out of which the road should be built; that the project was of great importance not only to this country but to the whole world; and that, considering the vast amount of public lands at the disposal of Congress, the amount asked for was not sufficient to excite surprise. It was on Breese's motion that the memorial was referred to the Committee on Public Lands of which he was the chairman.7

Besides the Whitney project, two other plans for a communication with the Pacific were presented to this session of Congress in memorials. One was the plan of George Wilkes, who was later a prominent New York journalist. At this time Wilkes was only 26 years old and still young in his journalist career.8

Sometime in 1845, after Whitney's plan had been put before Congress the first time, Wilkes published a book, "The


There is a biographical sketch of Wilkes also in the Washington Historical Quarterly (Seattle: Washington University State Historical Society), vol.V, p.3 January, 1914.
History of Oregon, Geographical and political," in the preface of which he said: "The project of a National Rail Road across the continent, though generally denounced as visionary and impracticable, has long been the author's favorite idea, and he claims for it that attention which every scheme deserves from its opponents. It was not his intention to advance it as early as the present time, but the rapid progress of events has precipitated his design, and a similar proposal from another source, has induced him to bring it forward now, principally from an apprehension that the grandest scheme the world ever entertained, may be prostituted to the selfish interests of a private corporation."  

Part of the book is a "Proposal for a National Railroad from the Atlantic to the Pacific." The author discusses at length and "by philosophical inquiry" the necessity of a communication with Oregon, the importance of the Oriental commerce, and the adaptability of the Pacific to steam navigation. He proposes a route to run from Chicago along the 42nd parallel to South Pass "through the Rocky Mountains and into Oregon," and estimates the length of the road at 2500 miles. The cost he estimates at $58,250,000, to be raised and appropriated by Congress, under whose direction the road is to be built. He argues that the objects of the road are national; that by its...

transactions it will have an important bearing upon foreign relations; and that the undertaking is too gigantic for individuals. Moreover, to allow the road to be built by private enterprise with government aid would be to create a monopoly liable to the most dangerous abuses, to unjustly confer great wealth upon individuals, and to run the risk of having a controlling interest in the stock held by Great Britain.

Wilkes's whole plan is very simple: let the government built the road. He suggests no definite plan for accomplishing the work but writes on and on for pages in an exceedingly verbose way.

Wilkes put his plan before Congress in a memorial which was presented in the House December 29, 1845 by William B. Maclay of New York, and which was referred to the Committee on Roads and Canals. The part of the memorial which is printed with the report of the Committee is an extract from his "Proposal" in the "History of Oregon." 14

The other plan presented was that of Robert Mills, an architect and engineer of Washington, who seems all the time to have been advocating some sort of a scheme for something with great earnestness but without very much careful consideration of practicability. His memorial was presented to the House of Representatives February 18, 1846 by Robert Smith of Illinois and it also, was referred to the Committee on Roads and Canals. On March 27th the memorial was ordered printed on the recommen--

of the Committee. The Mills plan is not for a railroad but for a paved roadway with tracks in it for the wheels of steam carriages which are to be used upon it. The road is to be wide so that ordinary vehicles may use it also. The author claims to be the first to have suggested a railroad communication with the Pacific, having advocated a railroad between the "navigable waters of the noble river disemboguing into each ocean," in a work on internal improvement published in 1819. Now, however, he is convinced of the superiority of this improved roadway for steam carriages over railroads. Too, this sort of road can be built for $6,000 a mile as against $22,000 a mile for a railroad. He considers various routes but gives the preference to a route west from the mouth of the Platte river to the "south-west pass" and on to the head of steamboat navigation on the Columbia. From this road, a branch may go to California. He would go further south still, however, and declares that the shortest and best route across the continent is from the head of steam navigation on the Rio del Norte to the head of steam navigation on the river Hiaguui, which empties into the Pacific. This road would be only 300 miles long and for building an improved roadway upon this route, the cost would be only $1,500,000. The only trouble is that the route for the most part runs through Mexican territory.

In addition to these memorials of Whitney, Wilkes, and Mills, which advocated some certain plan for a communication, at least 19 memorials for a railroad and 1 for a national road

15. H.J.,29-1,serial 479,p.430;C.G.,29-1,p.400
to the Pacific were presented to Congress in this session. Of the 19 memorials or petitions presented in the House 8, all coming from citizens of Ohio, asked for a railroad from the Missouri river to the Pacific ocean; 6, 4 from Indiana, 1 from New York, and 1 from Maine, for a railroad from the Mississippi river to the mouth of the Columbia; 2, from Indiana, a national railroad to Oregon; 1, from New York, for a railroad from the Atlantic to the Pacific; 1, from a certain Peter von Schmidt of Missouri, was for a railroad from St. Louis to the navigable waters of the Columbia; and 1, from Belmont county, Ohio, asked for a grant of lands for the construction of a railroad from Lake Michigan to Oregon. This last one was probably in favor of Whitney's project. It is the only one, so far as I have found, presented during this session of Congress, which seems likely to have been definitely in support of the Whitney plan. The other memorials seem to have supported no certain plan, but to have been the result of the desire which existed, especially in the western states, for some sort of a means of intercourse with the Pacific coast. All of these memorials presented in the House excepting three were referred to the Committee on Roads and Canals, to which the Wilkes and Mills memorials were also referred. Three went to the Committee on Territories. The one memorial which was for a national road was from citizens of Indiana and asked for a road from the Mississippi river to the Columbia. It was presented in the Senate by Edward A. Harrigan of Indiana, and was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

16. A list of these memorials is to be found in the appendix.
the same Committee which had Whitney's memorial for consideration. While it is impossible to know from the notice of it in the Senate Journal (and none of these memorials were ordered printed) it is probable that it was a duplicate of one of the memorials which was presented in the House.

Senator Benton had not yet, in this session, conceived the idea of the future importance of the railroad across the continent as the "route to India." In a speech on the Oregon question, he declared in the Senate, May 28, 1846, that while a more southern route would be the traveling road to Oregon, "commerce will take the water line of their (Lewis and Clark's) return, crossing the Rocky Mountains in latitude 47, through the North Pass...this will be the route of commerce to the end of time."\(^{17}\) And his opinion was largely adopted by one of the two committees of Congress to which the railroad question had been referred which took any action upon the subject.\(^{18}\)

July 13, Robert Smith of Illinois, from the Committee on Roads and Canals, reported to the House a bill (No. 513) to provide for a survey of the Upper Missouri, Columbia, and Clark's rivers, and the north pass across the Rocky Mountains. The bill was read a first and second time and committed to the Committees of the Whole House, where it stayed without action. The members of this Committee besides the chairman were: Henry D. Foster of Pennsylvania, Linn Boyd of Kentucky, Meredith P. Gentry of Tennessee, John S. Pendleton of Virginia, Elias B.

\(^{17}\) C.J.,29-1, p.916.  
\(^{18}\) The House Committee on Territories made no report on the three memorials on the subject referred to it.  
\(^{19}\) H.J.,29-1, serial 479,p.1073.
Holmes of New York; John Strohm of Pennsylvania; Hezekiah Williams of Maine; William S. Miller of New York. The report which they sent in with the bill has a number of interesting points.

In the first place, the Committee declared that the constitutional power of Congress "to construct a thoroughfare from a point west of the state of Missouri to the mouth of the Columbia river, for military, for post office, and for commercial purposes, is believed to be unquestionable."

The report then declared that there was no question as to the importance of American commerce and trade in the Pacific ocean and that while "the prudent and sober-minded would, probably, be unwilling to see the revenues or the property of the nation pledged, or in any wise committed to the construction of a costly railroad of some 2,800 or 3,000 miles in length, stretching across vast uninhabited prairies and lofty mountains, involving an original outlay of at least a hundred millions of dollars, and a large annual cost for superintendence and repairs, it is believed they would cheerfully assist to open an eligible avenue, if one could be assured at a small cost compared with the object sought to be realized." But, to "build a railroad from Independence, on the Missouri river, or from the shores of Lake Michigan, across the vast intervening plains and mountains, to the mouth of the Columbia river, desirable as the accomplishment of the object certainly is, cannot... be

20. H.J., 29-1, serial 479
22. Ibid, p.1
23. 29-1, H,rp 773, serial 491, p.1
consistently recommended at this time." 24 For the present, at least, the railroad is entirely impracticable. And, basing its opinion upon Fremont's reports, the Committee believes that its practicability at a later time is exceedingly questionable. "It may seriously be doubted whether the great distance, the great altitude, and the severe cold of several months of each year, can be so far overcome as to allow of the prosecution of a large and profitable traffic between the inhabitants of Oregon and of the Mississippi valley." If any method of communication is practicable it is that suggested by Colonel Benton, and the bill which the committee reports is for an examination into the feasibility of his suggestion that the Missouri be improved as far up as Great Falls, a road opened across the 150 miles to Clark's branch and that river and the Columbia also improved. "If this route, upon examination, proves impracticable, the committee greatly fear that a cheap, safe, and speedy communication with our possessions upon the Pacific, through the territories we now own, may not reasonably be expected to be obtained for many years." 25

War with Mexico had already been going on since May 13, two months. It is to be feared that the members of the Committee would hardly have deemed it necessary to try seriously to overcome the difficulties of opening a communication with the Pacific through the territories we then owned.

Senator Benton's ideas are given much space in the appendix to the report. We find in the appendix, also, notes of J.J. 26

24. 29-1, H.rp. 773, serial 491
25. Ibid, p. 6
Abert of the Bureau of Topographical Engineers, in which he suggests two possible routes for a railroad to Oregon, one starting from the mouth of the "Kanzas" river and the other from the mouth of the White Earth River, both crossing the mountains through South Pass and following Lewis's branch to the Columbia. Abert estimates the cost of the road at, at least, $44,000,000, and notes that California might probably be bought and a railroad from the Rio del Norte be made for less than half this amount. He, too, does not seriously plan for a railroad through the territory we then owned, but says that it "is doubted if the knowledge of the country is sufficient at this time to decide upon the best route, or whether our present possessions admit of a choice of the best.

"From the navigable waters of the Rio del Norte of Texas to the bay of California is about 450 miles. We know but little of the intermediate country, nor have we a right to pass over it, but it is evident that should this right ever be obtained, and a road be made in that locality, the one from the Missouri or from the Mississippi would become comparatively useless."26

The ideas presented in this report were very probably those of most of the members of Congress at this time.

On July 31, however, Sidney Breese, also of Illinois, hairman of the Senate Committee on Public Lands, brought in from that committee the first bill to carry out Whitney's project (S. 246) and a report supporting it.27 The members of the Committee which reported the bill, besides Breese, were William Wool -

26. 22-1, H.rp.773, serial 491. p.34
bridge of Michigan, Chester Ashley of Arkansas, James T. Morehead of Kentucky, and Joseph W. Chalmers of Mississippi. Three out of the five of this committee were from southern states while six out of the nine of the House Committee which had reported against the railroad were from northern states. It would seem that this early anyway, the attitude toward Whitney's plan was not sectional. The bill had been partly read before the Senate when Benton interrupted, saying that he thought it wrong to occupy the time of the Senate with such a project and that he "would not be greatly surprised to see persons soon coming forward and offering to take the government off their hands altogether." Breese declared that the bill was reported after careful consideration of the proposition by the Committee; that the subject was new but important and that the facts set forth in the report showed that it could be accomplished; that, while the bill might be open to objections, it could be perfected; and that a bill of such importance should not be condemned without consideration. Benton replied that the idea was absurd and ridiculous and the plan proposed impudent. Chalmers said that he had concurred in the presentation of the bill to the Senate, because, although he did not approve the plan, he was willing that the facts should be put before the people. The discussion was continued for a short time between Benton, Breese, Chalmers, Woolbridge, who defended the plan, and Morehead, who wanted the report printed. Benton moved that the subject be laid upon the table until the next day, but the motion was lost.
The report was then ordered printed.23

The long report declares that the power of Congress over territories makes this bill plainly constitutional and then goes ahead to set forth in detail the arguments for the road and for the Whitney plan: the route is practicable; the means proposed for the work are adequate; the road will greatly increase the value of all the public lands, promote agriculture and manufacture, effect the development of the mineral resources of the country, greatly increase internal trade and commerce in the whole country and commerce with Asia, develop the maritime and commercial power of the country in the Pacific, be a great highway of nations and consequently a source of income to the government and a means of imparting the liberal principles of our government to other countries, and strengthen the union in a moral, political, and military way. Without the road Oregon will develop into an independent and dangerously powerful state. The report then discusses at great length the commercial possibilities of all the Oriental countries. The Missouri and Columbia river route is not suited to commerce because of the transhipments required and the obstacles to navigation. The arguments for the plan are summed up in conclusion and the project recommended "to the attentive consideration of the national legislature and of the country at large." There is little argument for the plan that is new in the report, but the discussion is thorough and full, and the report was of great importance in the later

consideration of the subject.

The bill which the Committee reported did not come up for consideration again, and nothing more was done about the Whitney project in this session.

Nor was anything of much importance accomplished in the 2nd session of the 28th Congress. No memorial from Whitney was presented in either house, and although a number of memorials for a Pacific railroad were presented to Congress, no report was made upon the subject.

The memorials are of considerable interest because of the increase in the number of them and because of those which were presented in favor of Whitney's plan. It is almost impossible to tell the exact number of different memorials presented since the notices are so meager that one cannot know which are duplicates of those presented in the other house. There seem to have been 16 memorials presented in the House of Representatives in favor of the Whitney plan: 6 from Pennsylvania (5 of them from Philadelphia), 7 from Ohio, 2 from New York, and 1 from Iowa. In the Senate there were 15 which appear to be in favor of Whitney's project, of which 9 were probably duplicates of memorials presented in the House. The geographical distribution was very much the same as in the House. 8 memorials were presented in the Senate, all from New York, and 5 in the House; 2 from New York, (1 of them with 1300 signers), 1 from Buffalo, 1 from Philadelphia, and 1 from Des Moines, Iowa, in support of George Wilkes's plan. There is also a notice of 1 petition in the House, from Ohio, for an appropriation of
public lands for a railroad from the Mississippi to the Pacific. In each house, part of these memorials were referred to the Committee on Public Lands and part to the Committee on Roads and Canals. One memorial from citizens of New York, which the Globe says was thirty feet long, was presented in the Senate by Senator Dix and asked that no proposition appropriating public land for the construction of a railroad to the Pacific might receive the sanction of Congress, but that the public lands might be open freely to settlement by any citizen. This memorial went to the Committee on Public Lands.

The memorials sent in in favor of Whitney's plan are very certainly the result of addresses which Whitney was making over the country explaining his project. He seems to have begun this agitation seriously between the close of the 1st and the beginning of the 2nd session of the 29th Congress. During October, November, and December of 1846, he addressed public meetings in Cincinnati, Pittsburg, Louisville, St. Louis, Terre Haute, Indianapolis, Dayton, Columbus, Wheeling, and Philadelphia and probably in other places. All of the meetings passed resolutions supporting his project. This agitation Whitney kept up more or less continuously during the years his plan was before Congress, and it undoubtedly accounts in large measure for the many memorials which were sent to Congress in his support.

---

28. See the lists in the appendix.
George Wilkes's plan was again presented to Congress, December 21, by Senator Dix, December 22, by Representative Maclay, and again December 28, by Miller, all of New York. This memorial asked that a national railroad be constructed from the Missouri river to the Pacific ocean. In the Senate it was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and in the House to the Committee on Roads and Canals.

December 22, Senator James Semple of Illinois, who in the preceding session had brought in the bill to establish a post route from Independence to the Pacific, introduced into the Senate a resolution instructing the Committee on Roads and Canals to inquire into the expediency of incorporating a company to construct a railroad from some point on the Missouri river, west of the limits of the State of Missouri, to the mouth of the Columbia river. This resolution was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

One other plan came before this session. January 18, 1847, Elias B. Holmes, of New York, laid before the House the petition of Doctor Hartwell Carver of Rochester, New York, praying for a charter authorizing him and his associates to build a railroad from Lake Michigan to the Pacific ocean, and proposing to build the road for the government for a grant of land twenty miles in width on each side of the road. This memorial was referred to the Committee on Roads and Canals. Haney says that Carver's "right to the distinction of being the first to formulate any definite scheme for a Pacific railway seems rather
However that may be, Carver did not present his plan to Congress until two years after Whitney had presented his, and it would seem to be an attempt to improve Whitney's plan.

None of the four committees to which these various memorials and plans were referred submitted a report on the subject. The membership of the Senate Committee on Public Lands and of the House Committee on Roads and Canals was still very much the same as in the preceding session, and the reports made in that session probably still represented the opinion of these two committees. The Senate Committee on Roads and Canals was composed of Edward A. Hannegan of Indiana, Hopkins L. Turney of Tennessee, Thomas Corwin of Ohio, Sam Houston of Texas and James T. Morehead of Kentucky. The House Committee on Public Lands had members from Illinois, Indiana, Vermont, Michigan, New York, Ohio, Missouri, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. It seems that in no part of the country was there any strong opinion in favor of a Pacific railroad on any plan.

Near the close of this Congress, however, the first resolutions of the series of those passed by state legislatures approving the Whitney plan were presented. These resolutions were passed by the legislature of Indiana January 28, 1847. They were presented in the Senate, February 25, by Senator Bright and in the House, February 26, by Thomas Smith. In the House they were laid on the table and in the Senate they were read and ordered printed. 
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III. The 30th Congress.

The 1st session of the 30th Congress opened December 6, 1847. Beginning with this Congress, there is a gradual but marked increase in the attention given to Pacific Railroad plans. In the beginning this was probably the result largely of Whitney's agitation but his influence was soon replaced by what were, of course, the great causes of the growing interest—the discovery of gold in California, January 24, 1848, and the acquisition of California by the Treaty with Mexico which the Senate ratified March 10, 1848.

Whitney's third memorial was presented in the Senate, January 17, 1848, by Alpheus Felch of Michigan. It was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered printed. Over two months later, on March 27, the memorial was presented in the house of Representatives by James Pollock of Pennsylvania and referred to a select committee.

There is little that is really new in this memorial but the plan is more definitely worked out than in the two earlier papers. The strip of land 60 miles wide from Lake Michigan to the Pacific coast is to be set apart for building the railroad. No land is to be turned over to Whitney to sell until he has completed the first 10 miles of the road from his own resources. Then he is to receive \( \frac{1}{8} \) of the land along the completed part. This process is to be repeated to the end of the first
800 miles of the road. The rest of the land is then to be sold and the money held as a fund for completing the road to the coast. Whitney is to pay the government a reduced price to be set in the bill for the land when the road is near completion. During the period of construction and until the road has proved itself successful and self-supporting, the government is to hold all surplus land and money to insure the completion and operation of the road. After that, the road and machinery and the surplus land and money are to belong to Whitney and his heirs, but Congress is to have the power to fix the tolls, subject, of course, to the necessity of raising enough to meet the expenses of the road, and to regulate the transportation of mails, troops, and other government property. The length of the road is now estimated at 2,030 miles and the cost at $60,600,000, a little more than the sum which Whitney figures the land sale will bring in. The memorial contains comparison of distances between Europe and Asia by present routes and by the railroad and declares the railroad will make the whole world tributary to us, and repeats other arguments already given for the road. Most emphatically does Whitney declare the necessity of immediate action upon the plan: "but if the commencement is delayed even for a few months, the land on the first part of the route (on which all depends) will be so far taken up as to defeat it forever".

In conclusion, Whitney again recounts his devotion to the task and the progress he has made, saying that his "plan
has now been before the public more than three years, and the expression throughout the country is universally in its favor; and the press has, almost without exception, urged its adoption, and the legislatures of twelve states, by almost unanimous vote, have passed resolutions approving and declaring it 'the only feasible plan by which this great work can be accomplished.'"

Resolutions of the Legislature of Indiana approving Whitney's plan had been laid before the last session of the 29th Congress. During the 1st session of the 30th Congress, similar resolutions were presented from the following 14 states: New York, Rhode Island, Maine, Connecticut, Tennessee, Alabama, Georgia, Illinois, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Kentucky, Maryland, Ohio, and Vermont. Favorable resolutions were also passed by the Senate of Michigan and by the Senate of New Hampshire. The resolutions are all very similar, citing the importance of the railroad, especially as a highway of world commerce, and declaring that the Whitney plan is the only practicable one. The members of the Kentucky Legislature are not wholly convinced of the feasibility of any Pacific railroad scheme but declare that they "know of no plan less obnoxious to objection that the appropri—

3. See list with dates and references in appendix. Most of these resolutions were laid on the table.
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5. Ibid. The failure of the House of Representatives of New Hampshire to pass the resolutions is explained in this way in the statement which accompanies the Senate resolutions: "One gentleman of the House of Representatives having taken ground calculated to give the project a party tendency, Mr. Whitney at once requested the stay of further proceedings."

The Robinson report and Whitney's pamphlet both imply that favorable resolutions were passed by the whole legislature of Michigan but the Pollock report gives only the Michigan Senate in its list. The resolutions must have passed only the Senate, else they would have been presented to Congress.
ation of public lands now unproductive and inaccessible." 6

Whitney had addressed most, if not all, of these legislatures. He seems to have turned his efforts to this work with the state governments rather than to general public agitation during the fall of 1847 and the spring of 1848, for we find that as these resolutions are being passed there is a decrease in the number of private memorials in his support sent to Congress. During this session but 5 memorials for his project were presented, all in the House; 4 were from Ohio, 1 from Vermont; 3 were referred to the Committee on Roads and Canals and 2 to the select committee on Whitney's memorial. There is another evidence, however, that public attention was directed to Whitney's project. 4 memorials were presented in opposition to it. Of these, 3 came from Wisconsin, and 1 from Wheeling, Virginia; 2 were presented in the Senate, 1 of them referred to the Committee on Public Lands and 1 to a select committee on the Whitney project appointed June 27 (see below); and 2 in the House, of which 1 went to the Committee on Roads and Canals and 1 to the select committee. 7

Robert Hills now had another plan. In a memorial presented in the House of Representatives January 17, 1848 by Frederick P. Stanton of Tennessee, and in the Senate February 15, by Ambrose H. Sevier of Arkansas, he proposes to open communication
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with the Pacific by building a telegraph line from Laredo, on the Rio Grande, 700 miles above the Gulf, to the Gulf of California. Then he says: "The route of the Rio Grande is one of, if not the most important point of communication with the Pacific that could be presented for adoption, whether regarded for its economy or its domestic value, from its being in our midst, where every step of the route would enhance the value of the public and private lands through or near which it would pass—a route that would be open all the year round, and, passing through a high and healthy region, would be soon filled by an enterprising, industrious population, and thus secure for all purposes of commerce and personal travel; for there is no question but that a permanent road way would soon follow the telegraphic line, and thus the tide of immigration would set in this direction, and the whole country be soon populated, and commerce spread its sails from our side of the Pacific, far over its placid surface, to gather rich harvests from foreign lands." The road would be opened by individual enterprise. In the memorial, Mills takes no consideration of the fact that the route he advocates lies entirely in Mexican territory.

The memorial was referred in the House to the Committee on Post Office and Post Roads, and in the Senate it was referred to the Committee on the Library and ordered printed. The former Committee was discharged from further consideration of the memorial and it was laid on the table, March 29. The Senate Committee on the Library, to whom it was referred on motion of Sevier, and for which reference there is no apparent reason un-
less it be that this Committee was made up of southern men (Pearce of Maryland, Mason of Virginia, and Davis of Mississippi) whom Sevier thought would favor the route proposed, made no report on the plan. Mills seems to have been of very slight importance in the development of the Pacific railroad movement.

Hartwell Carver brought his scheme again before Congress in this session. January 27, 1848, the memorial of Carver and his associates for a charter "for a railroad from some point on Lake Michigan to the Pacific ocean, with two different terminations on the Pacific, with a donation of land sufficient for the width of the road, stone, timber, and iron ore, and coal for constructing the road, from any land now belonging or may hereafter belong to the government, before said road shall be completed," was presented in the House by Elias B. Holmes of New York and referred to the Committee on Roads and Canals. April 28, this Committee was discharged from further consideration of the memorial and it was referred to the select committee on the Whitney memorial. May 3, Carver's memorial for a charter was again laid before the House, by Dudley Harvin of New York, and referred to the Committee on Roads and Canals.

George Wilkes sent to this session a memorial praying Congress to adopt measures for the construction of a national railroad from the Missouri river (instead of Lake Michigan, the
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terminus he proposed before) to the Pacific. His memorial was presented in the Senate by Daniel S. Dickenson of New York on February 9 and referred to the Committee on Roads and Canals: 13 and in the House, February 16, by William B. Maclay of New York, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands. 14 This latter committee was discharged from further consideration of the memorial April 26, and it was referred to the select committee on Whitney's plan. 15

Four other memorials concerning a Pacific railroad were presented to Congress in this session. 1, from Benjamin S. Henning praying the aid of the government in exploring the route of a proposed railroad between the Mississippi river and the Pacific ocean, was presented in the Senate March 27, 1848 by John A. Dix of New York, and was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Post Roads. Of the other three, all presented in the House, 1, from an Iowa City meeting, petitioned for a railroad from the Mississippi to the Pacific, 1, from Charles B. Collins, of Chicago, for a railroad from the Missouri river to the Pacific; and 1, from John Plumbe, of Boston, for a railroad from Lake Michigan to the Pacific. All three went to the Committee on Roads and Canals.

The House select committee on Whitney's memorial, appointed March 28, was made up of the following men: James Pollock of Pennsylvania, Robert Toombs of Georgia, Robert McClelland of Michigan, Henry W. Hilliard of Alabama, James Dixon of Connecticut.
out, Abraham W. Venable of North Carolina, John L. Taylor of Ohio, William B. Maclay of New York, and Joseph A. Woodward of South Carolina. May 3, McClelland, from this committee, reported a bill (H.R.No.468) to carry out the Whitney project. The bill was read a first and second time and referred to the Committee of the Whole House. June 23, Pollock, the chairman of the committee, brought in a report to accompany the bill, and the report was also referred to the Committee of the Whole and was ordered printed. No further action was taken upon the project in the House in this session.

The report opens with this paragraph:

"The proposition, at first view, is a startling one. The magnitude of the work itself, and the still greater and more magnificent results promised by its accomplishment, that of revolutionizing, morally and commercially, if not politically, a greater part of the habitable globe, and making the vast commerce of the world tributary to us, almost overwhels the mind. But your committee, on examination, find it a subject as simple as it is vast and magnificent, and see no insurmountable difficulties in the way of its successful accomplishment."

It then gives a brief statement of the plan, emphasizing the fact that the only question Congress needs to decide is whether it is expedient for it to sell the public land at a reduced price for the purpose of building the railroad, since the constitutional power to do this is undeniable. Next

it takes up the matter of route and declares that "no other route than the one proposed would furnish the amount of land demanded," and that, since Whitney has all the responsibility of the successful accomplishment of the project, he should be free to select the route. The Breese report is quoted to prove the practicability of Whitney's route.

The price Whitney is to pay for the lands has been set in the bill at 10 cents an acre, making a total of $7,795,200, which the Committee believe is more than their present value, and "far beyond what the government can in any other way expect to receive". Whitney's plan is the only feasible one. "No company, however large their means, could carry on such a work on any other plan." There would be no land monopoly, since the government holds the land until they pass into the hands of the purchaser to whom Whitney sells them. 10 miles of the road is to be completed before any land is turned over to Whitney and then the government is to hold the land along 5 miles of each 10 of the road. The land which remains in the hands of the government is constantly increasing in value, so that even if the road should not be completed, the government would suffer no loss.

A large extract is quoted from the Breese report on the results the building of the road will have. And this is the conclusion of the report:

"The committee believe there is no objection that is or can be urged to this great enterprise that has not been made to every novel undertaking of any magnitude in the history of the inventions and improvements of our country.... The enter-
prise of Mr. Whitney...presents no point of difficulty that may not be overcome by the skill, science, and labor within the reach of his command. And the committee believe, that different from all vast enterprises, this has been examined, investigated, and decided upon by the people of the nation almost by a unanimous voice. No subject within the knowledge of your committee has ever received expressions of public approbation so strong...your committee believe it to be almost the unanimous desire of the people that this plan may be adopted without delay, and your committee, viewing the subject in all its great and highly important bearings, concur in the opinions formed by the legislatures and the people, and recommend its immediate adoption by Congress. The committee would further remark...that a few months delay might, and probably would, defeat this great work forever. The lands on the lake are fast being disposed of, and when sold, there will be great, if not insurmountable, difficulties in the commencement of this work."

The report has a large appendix, (pp.18 to 77), containing Whitney's memorial, statements to prove the impossibility of using the Missouri as a commercial route, a discussion of the possibilities of Asiatic commerce taken from the Breese report, a letter of Whitney's to DeBow's Commercial Review on the distances by various routes, and a number of statements and tables on European and Asiatic trade.

The Senate Committee on Public Lands, to which Whitney's memorial had been referred, had as members: Sidney Breese of Illinois, Thomas Corwin of Ohio, Alpheus Felch of Michigan,
Joseph R. Underwood, of Kentucky, and Solon Borland of Arkansas.
June 26, 1848, Senator Borland submitted the committee's report on Whitney's plan, which was:

"That, although they are fully convinced of the incalculable benefits which would result from the construction of such a road, not only to the people of the United States, but of the world, they were unable to agree upon any plan of operations by a bill such as that proposed by Mr. Whitney. The information possessed by the committee was too limited to justify immediate action. They, therefore, have deemed it proper to dispose of the subject by submitting and recommending the adoption of a joint resolution to require the Secretary of War to cause a survey and exploration of routes for a railroad from the Mississippi to the Pacific ocean." The resolution reported (Senate joint resolution, No. 29) was read and passed to a second reading; the report was ordered printed. No further action was taken upon the resolution.

June 27, the day after the Borland report was submitted, John M. Niles of Connecticut, introduced into the Senate a bill (S. 297) to carry out the Whitney plan. He declared that the general expression of the country in favor of the project demanded some action from Congress but that the Committee on Public Lands had failed to report a bill to carry out the plan. Senator Breese replied that on account of the magnitude of the subject, the Committee were not yet prepared to report a plan but were
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waiting to prepare one which would insure success. The bill was referred to a select committee: John M. Niles of Connecticut, Thomas Corwin of Ohio, Dixon H. Lewis of Alabama, John Bell of Tennessee, and Alpheus Felch of Michigan. 24

July 7, Niles, from the Committee, reported the bill back to the Senate with amendments. 25 July 29, Niles moved that the previous orders be postponed and that the Senate take up the Whitney bill. He declared that action on the bill was necessary in this session because the lands was fast being taken up and so the plan would soon be impracticable. John P. Hale of New Hampshire spoke in opposition to the bill, on the ground that it put an immense mass of land into the hands of speculators. Colonel Benton declared that he would never vote for giving a hundred millions of acres of land to any man, that surveys, explorations, and careful consideration were necessary and that he "would not be astonished if Mr. Whitney should come here with a large bill for damages against Congress—damages for going to all the States of the Union for recommendations."

Senator Bell of Tennessee defended Whitney and urged favorable action upon the bill in this session. Benton then moved to lay Niles's motion upon the table, the yeas and nays were taken and Benton's motion carried, 27 to 21. 26 This was the last time Whitney's project was considered in either house in this session.

Senator Breese, however, made another effort to get Cong-

ress to authorize the survey of possible routes for a Pacific railroad. July 28, he introduced a resolution for a select committee to inquire into the expediency of the publication by the government "of the results of the recent exploring expedition of J. C. Fremont to California and Oregon;" and also "of providing for continuing and completing the surveys of the said Fremont in Oregon and California, with a view to develop the geography of those countries, and to discover the practical lines of communication by railroads or otherwise between the valley of the Mississippi and the Pacific Ocean: the results of said further explorations to be published under the direction of Congress, as a national work, without copyright." This resolution was agreed to and the following committee appointed Sidney Breese of Illinois, Solon Borland of Arkansas, John H. Clarke of Rhode Island, Henry Dodge of Wisconsin, Thomas Metcalf of Kentucky.

August 1, Breese, from the committee, reported favorably upon the resolution and the report was ordered printed.

In its report the committee declared that it "entertained no doubt" of the expediency of continuing the Fremont explorations. "The committee think that they do not err when they assume it as an indisputable position, that the public interest and the wishes of the people require further examinations...into the practicability of railroads and other communications between

27. Fremont's third expedition, which set out in the spring of 1845 and was ended by the opening of hostilities in California.
these countries (Oregon and California) and the valley of the Mississippi, to which the public attention has been lately, and is now, so much excited."

A appropriation of $30,000 for continuing Fremont's work was made as an amendment to the Civil and diplomatic appropriation bill, August 5, but accepting the recommendation of the conference committee on the bill, (August 12) the House refused to concur in the amendment and the appropriation was not made.

The most significant things about the action taken on the subject of the Pacific railroad in this session are the movement for more surveys before final action and Breese's change from his position in support of Whitney's plan in the 29th Congress to that of advocating further surveys. Both are probably the natural result of the acquisition of California and the intervening territory. With the opening of so many possible new routes it was inevitable that there should be a desire to inquire into their possibilities before accepting Whitney's plan with its northern route proposed to meet conditions as they existed before the conquest of Mexican territory.

The 2nd session of the 30th Congress began December 4, 1848. No memorial from Whitney, nor any supporting or opposing his plan, was presented during the session except favorable resolutions from the Connecticut Legislature which were presented in the House December 12.\textsuperscript{32} But December 11, Representative Polloch offered a resolution that House Bill No. 468, the Whitney bill from the select committee of the first session, be made the special order of the day for the first Tuesday in January and continue to be the first order from day to day until disposed of. Debate arose on the resolution and it was laid over.\textsuperscript{33} The matter did not come up again until January 29, 1849, when Polloch moved that the rules be suspended, to enable him to move that the House proceed to the consideration of the resolution. The motion to suspend the rules was decided in the negative, since 2/3 did not vote in favor.\textsuperscript{34} No other attempt was made to get the bill before the House.

Whitney’s plan also came up in the Senate on January 29, when Senator Niles moved to take up Senate Bill No. 297, the Whitney bill from the first session, which had been introduced by Niles and reported back from a select committee. Niles motion was agreed to. Senator Foote of Mississippi then presented an amendment to change the route of the road so that the western terminus would be California instead of Oregon, which was ordered printed. Senator Borland of Arkansas moved to
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amend by striking out all after the enacting clause and substituting a provision for further surveys. This amendment also was ordered printed. Further consideration of the bill was then postponed, and it did not come up again at this session.  

George Wilkes presented his memorial again in the session, still praying for the construction by the government of a railroad from the Missouri river to the Pacific. The memorial was presented in the Senate, December 18, by Dickinson, and referred to the Committee on Roads and Canals. It was presented twice in the House, the first time December 22, by Tallmadge of New York, when it was referred to the Committee on Roads and Canals; and the second time January 10 by John A. Rockwell of Connecticut, when it was referred to a select committee on the subject of a communication with the Pacific which had been appointed December 27 (see below). A memorial supporting Wilkes's plan, from citizens of Lancaster county, Pennsylvania, was presented in the House by Tallmadge, January 19, and was referred to the select committee; and there is notice of two other memorials in favor of national railroad from the Missouri to the Pacific, one from Buffalo, New York, presented in the Senate and referred to Committee on Roads and Lands and the other from Pennsylvania, presented in the House and also referred to the Committee on Roads and Canals.
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Hartwell Carver, too, was back again. His memorial for a charter was presented in the House by Hunt of New York, January 25, and was referred to the Committee on Roads and Canals. Two memorials in favor of Carver's petition, one from Attica and one from Troy, New York, were presented in the Senate and referred to the Committee on Roads and Canals.40

Several new memorialists, offering to build a Pacific railroad, came forward in this session. December 28, 1848, Representative Fries presented in the House the memorial of A.L. Frazer of Steubenville, Ohio, who proposed to construct a railroad from Saint Louis to the Pacific ocean, and asked that he might have a sufficient quantity of public lands placed at his disposal. His memorial was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.41 January 8, Borland presented in the Senate the memorial of William Bayard and Company, for a charter for a railroad from the Mississippi river to California, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.42 The same memorial was presented in the House, January 9, by Isaac E. Holmes, of South Carolina, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.43 February 6, Representative Truman Smith of Connecticut laid before the House the memorial of Henry Betts, of Peekskill, New York, who prayed for authority to build a railroad from the Missouri river to the Pacific and asked a grant of public land
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to aid in the work. The memorial was referred to the Committee on Roads and Canals.\textsuperscript{44} February 19, Representative Blackmar of New York presented the memorial of citizens of Wayne County, New York, for a right of way for a railroad from the Mississippi to the Pacific, which went to the Committee on Roads and Canals.\textsuperscript{45}

Much more significant than these plans, however, are the memorials for a southern route. January 24, 1849, Senator Houston presented the petition of Ebenezer Allen and other citizens of Texas praying that the Galveston and Red River Railway Company be granted the privilege of extending their railroad, already chartered by the State of Texas, through the territory of the United States to the Pacific ocean. The memorial was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered printed.\textsuperscript{46} It was presented in the House the next day by Representative Pilsbury and referred to the Committee on Roads and Canals.\textsuperscript{47}

The memorial declares that "the vast acquisition of territory by the United States...has attracted the attention of the commercial world to the importance and practicability of a communication between the Atlantic and Pacific oceans on some line within our national boundary." Then it speaks of the results such a communication would have in developing the resources of the country and placing commercial relations between Europe and Asia in the control of the United States. Concerning the route it says: "the most feasible and practical route for a railroad connecting the two oceans, will be found through
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the state of Texas, commencing at a suitable point on the Gulf of Mexico; and after crossing the Rio Grande, above the Passo del Norte, proceeding to and along the valley of the Gila, and passing the head of the Gulf of California attain the Pacific coast at or near the bay of San Diego....The entire length of this...railway would not exceed 1,250 miles; and from the reports of military officers and others, in whose judgment reliance can be placed, the route is not impeded by mountains or any serious obstacles." The country along the route is fertile. The memorialists do not oppose Whitney's plan. "To attain this object (railroad communication with the Pacific) two routes alone have been, or as your memorialists believe, can be suggested, viz: the one referred to herein, and the other, the northern route, proposed by Mr. Whitney, having its eastern terminous at Chicago, or on the upper Missouri. Your memorialists propose no comparison of advantages between these two routes, however confident they may be of the superior advantages of the one they recommend. They do not come into competition or rivalry with each other. The completion of this does not necessarily affect the construction of the other; nor will the privileges here sought by your memorialists, vest in them a monopoly, or hinder the granting of similar or even more advantageous privileges to any other persons or companies." By the act of Texas chartering the company, which the memorialists ask the federal government to extend through the territory to California, the company is granted a right of way through the public lands, 100 yards wide, and the use of metal, timber, and
other material necessary in the construction or maintenance of the road, from contiguous public lands, the "company paying a reasonable compensation to the State for such privilege."

Work on the railroad is to commence before June 1, 1850, and 100 miles is to be done before June 1, 1853.

February 20, Senator King of Georgia presented the memorial of Dennis Keenan, Jr., for a grant of land for the construction of a railroad and telegraph line from Point Isabel (just north of the mouth of the Rio Grande) to the Pacific ocean. The memorial was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.48

Besides these two petitions from people who proposed to construct a railroad on a southern route, three petitions were presented praying the construction of a railroad from Memphis, Tennessee, to the Pacific. Of these three, from Arkansas, presented in the Senate, two were laid on the table and one was referred to the Committee on Public Lands. This (January and February of 1849) is the first time that a definite request for a road on the Memphis route was made to Congress. One memorial from Arkansas, presented in the House and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, asked for a survey and the construction of a railroad from Fort Smith to the Pacific.49

It was in this session that Senator Benton first brought forward his plan for a central, national highway. February 7, 1849, he introduced in the Senate a bill (S.451) setting apart

49. See list of memorials in appendix.
75% of the proceeds of the public lands in Oregon and 50% of the amount of the sales of all other public lands in the United States to defray the expenses of locating and constructing a central national road from St. Louis to San Francisco, with a branch to the Columbia. A strip of land a mile wide was to be reserved forever for the right of way. A railroad was to be built where practicable; where a railroad was not practicable a macadamized road was to be built. Other roads might be made in the future, the mile strip being always reserved for that purpose. In introducing the bill, Benton made a long speech in which he declared that since Fremont's explorations "there is nothing more to be learned or known, that there has been brought to our knowledge everything that is necessary to be known to enable us to act." He then attacked all private schemes for opening a road as stock-jobbing concerns which he would never tolerate. The bill was read twice and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, of which Benton was chairman. March 1, the Committee reported the bill back without amendment, but no further action was taken upon it.

This session also marks the beginning of the agitation in Congress for a railroad across the Isthmus of Panama or across Tehauntepec. December 11, the memorial of W.H. Aspenwall, J.L. Stephens, and H. Chauncey for a contract to transport government property over a railroad they planned to build across Panama, was presented in both the Senate and the House. Al-
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though committees of both houses reported bills to carry out the request of the petition and there was a good deal of discussion on the subject, neither house acted favorably upon the plan.52

There is notice of four memorials concerning a road across Tehauntepec. In a memorial presented in the Senate by Bradbury, of Maine, Jan. 9, Wells and Company ask the aid of Congress in the construction of a railroad across Tehauntepec. The memorial was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered printed53. February 6, Senator Foote of Mississippi brought in the memorial of P.H. Hargous, who also wanted to build a railroad across Tehauntepec, for which he had the permission of the Mexican government. His memorial was ordered printed too.54

February 17, Foote presented the memorial of Jesse E. Dow and others who proposed to build a plank road across Tehauntepec. Dow claims that he is the first projector of a railroad across the continent, saying that "while he seeks not to be placed amid the ancient discoverers of continents and

52. See the chronological outline in appendix for detailed steps in the consideration of this plan. The possibility of a Panama railroad had been greatly increased by the treaty with New Granada of June 10, 1848, which gave to citizens of the United States, equal rights of transit across the isthmus with Granada's own citizens.


the venerated pilgrims of the ocean, he deems it nevertheless due to truth and his own honor to declare, in the legal phrase of the Patent Office, that he is an original and he believes the first, projector of a central railroad from the Mississippi valley to the Pacific ocean, and that, before anyone had made a public profession of their faith, to his knowledge, he had estimated the cost, and promulgated the plan of such a road."

Now, he would build a plank road across Tehauntepec as a temporary means of communication.55 And February 24, Senator King of Georgia presented a petition in relation to a macadamized road across Tehauntepec.56

No favorable action was taken on any of these memorials.

Although Senator Benton had declared that there was nothing more to be known about the possible routes to the Pacific, not everyone seemed to agree with him. December 11, Representative John A. Rockwell of Connecticut gave notice of a motion for leave to introduce a joint resolution authorizing surveys for a route for a railroad or canal between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.57 December 18, he introduced the resolution (H.Joint Res.No.42), it was read a first and second time, and referred to a select committee. Several memorials on the subject were referred to the Committee before February 20 when
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it reported the resolution back with an amendment and accompanied by a 678 page report. The resolution went to the Committee of the Whole House and the report was ordered printed. No further action was taken on the resolution.

The report proper is 31 pages long. The committee enumerates the various routes across the isthmus and continent proposed and then gives this statement of its opinion: "The committee are not prepared to say to what extent, if at all, the aid of the government of the United States should be rendered to these various projects, or any of them. As, however, in the present great want of accurate knowledge in relation to most of these routes, it is not possible to determine which is the most desirable for the United States, and should receive the aid of the government, the committee have deemed it important that full and accurate surveys should be made of the different routes, as being entirely essential to an intelligent consideration and decision of the question.

Without, therefore, expressing any decided opinion as to the course which ought to be eventually pursued in relation to any of these different routes, they have thought that they could best discharge the duty assigned them by collecting and presenting, in a distinct form, the information within their reach, in relation to all the principal routes between the two oceans, to which public attention is now directed."

The various routes are discussed in turn and the last

nine pages are given over to criticism of Whitney's plan. Whitney's estimate of the length of the road is far short of what it would be—about 4,000 according to Fremont, as against Whitney's estimate of 2,000. All the profit from the enormous amount of land would go to Whitney, who would probably not build his road much beyond the Mississippi. The road will be hindered by physical difficulties along the route selected. There is no evidence that the receipts would be sufficient to keep the road in repair: there would be no local business and the trade of the Atlantic cities or Europe would not take this route, because it would be more expensive than that by ship.

The appendix to the report contains a great amount of material, much of it of no especial value, for our subject, anyway. But there are included memoirs of J.H.Alexander, Robt Mills, and Col. J.J.Abert which are important. Alexander, who was a well known Maryland scientist and engineer, discusses various routes between the two oceans, including Whitney's route and a route he suggests from St.Louis or Independence to San Diego. While the considers the San Diego route far superior to Whitney's, he does not condemn the latter absolutely, but places it above the isthmus routes. He advocates government construction of the railroad to San Diego, which is to run from St.Louis or Independence along the line of the

Santa Fe Trail, along the "heads of the Osage and Neosho, the valley of the Arkansas in part, and the upper waters of the Cimarron and two Canadians, by or through the town of Santa Fe to the Rio Grande del Norte or River of Texas, thence down this river, to where the Sierra Madre is pierced by the sources of the Gila, and down the valley of this last to the head of the Gulf of California and so over to San Diego." In comparing the San Diego and Whitney routes he declares that the former will cost less, be shorter, and the road over it can be constructed in 7 years instead of 15 which Whitney plans; that all the good points of the northern route are equally true for the southern; that the "upper line would pass through a country and climate, inhospitable, austere; domineered over by wild tribes, the Snakes and the Neg-Peries, whose very names symbolize their barbarity and guile. The Santa Fe line goes over a territory fertile, and peopled aboriginally with a milder race, where the soil produces, as along the Rio Grande, two crops in the year: where, for more than two centuries, the labor of the missionary and merchant have met, each with their return; a country of coal and of gold."

Robert Mills now advocates a route with two eastern termini, one at St. Louis and one at Memphis, and its western terminus at San Diego, with a branch to San Francisco. He still suggests no definite plan or exact route.

Col. Abert declares that he favors a southern route, that lack of appropriation for the road has made government surveys
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impossible, that a road may be built over any of the isthmus routes but that they would make trouble for the government and be only temporary expedient. The route he proposes is "from the Mississippi river through about the middle of Texas, and by the valley of the Gila to San Diego, on the Pacific." A branch road may be built to Santa Fe and may have two branches at the eastern end, one to St. Louis and one south through Nacogdoches.65

Besides all these plans looking toward the construction of a railroad, there were a number of petitions presented for a road to the Pacific. January 3, 1849, Senator Sebastian brought in resolutions from the General Assembly of Arkansas asking Congress to make survey and open a national road from Fort Smith to Santa Fe. January 8, Senator Houston introduced a series of resolutions the second of which provided that a special committee should inquire into the expediency of "making a military road between San Francisco and some suitable point on the navigable water of the Mississippi, and (2) the use of such a portion of the military force as would be necessary to complete it at the earliest possible moment. The resolutions were read and ordered printed, but no further action taken.66

At least 19 memorials were presented asking Congress to open a safe, commercial road to the Pacific and a number of efforts were made to get a road opened. Most of the petitions

Resolutions given. Printed 30-2, S. misc. doc. 12, serial 533.
came from the west and are an evidence of the greatly increasing interest in the Pacific regions during this period.67

January 31, Senator Jefferson Davis of Mississippi brought in from the Committee on Military Affairs, a joint resolution (S.joint res.54) for the survey of routes from the Mississippi valley to the Pacific, accompanied by a report, which was ordered printed.68 The report emphasizes the political necessity of a speedy means of communication with the Pacific coast and approves the request of the chief of the topographical engineers for $50,000 for surveys in the west. Although no further action was taken on this resolution, the army appropriation bill (H.R.No.695) for the year ending June 30,1850 which was passed by both houses and approved March 3, 1849, contained an appropriation for $50,000, "to defray the expenses of topographical surveys of routes from the valley of the Mississippi to the Pacific ocean."69

The movement for surveys was, then, victorious over Whitney's plan. Whitney seems already falling behind. His plan was primitive and made for a condition in which only Oregon was the coast possession of the country. With the opening up of California and the underlying country, his project gradually but steadily became obsolete.

67. See chronological outline for details as to these memorials.
69. C.G.,30-2,p.X:XXVI. H.J.,30-2,serial 536,p.667. The bill was introduced December 29,1848 in the House, passed it Jan.25, amended in the Senate, some amendments rejected in House March 2 conference comm.asked for by Senate; the report accepted in both houses and the bill passed and approved on March 3.
IV. The 31st Congress

President Taylor, in his annual message at the opening of the 1st session of the 31st Congress, dated December 4, 1849 but not transmitted until December 24 because of the delay in electing the Speaker of the House, seems to have expressed the general attitude toward a Pacific railroad when after declaring that private enterprise should be encouraged to build a Panama railroad, he said: "The great mineral wealth of California, and the advantages which its ports and harbors, and those of Oregon, afford to commerce, especially with the islands of the Pacific and Indian oceans, and the populous regions of Eastern Asia, make it certain that there will arise in a few years large and prosperous communities on our western coast. It therefore becomes important that a line of communication, the best and most expeditious which the nature of the country will admit, should be opened within the territory of the United States from the navigable waters of the Atlantic on the Gulf of Mexico to the Pacific. Opinion, as elicited and expressed by two large and respectable conventions which lately assembled at St. Louis and Memphis, points to a railroad as that which, if practicable, will best meet the wishes and wants of the country. But while this, if in successful operation, would be a work of great national importance, and of a value to the country which it would be difficult to estimate, it ought also to be regarded as an undertaking of vast magnitude and expense, and one which must, if it be indeed practicable, encounter many difficulties in its construction and use. Therefore, to avoid failure and disap-
pointment; to enable Congress to judge whether, in the condition of the country through which it must pass, the work be feasible; and, if it be found so, whether it should be undertaken as a national improvement or left to individual enterprise; and, in the latter alternative, what aid, if any, ought to be extended to it by the government, I recommend, as a preliminary measure, a careful reconnaissance of the several proposed routes by a scientific corps, and a report as to the practicability of making such a road, with an estimate of the cost of its construction and support."

Three general tendencies which have appeared before are prominent in the message: (1) to regard the Pacific railroad as expedient and necessary, (2) to favor further investigation before action; and (3) to look to the south for a practicable route.

In instructions to Colonel Abert of the Topographical Engineers, July 11, 1849, for carrying on the surveys of routes from the Mississippi to the Pacific for which $50,000 had been appropriated March 3, 1849, Secretary of War Crawford said that for the present operations would be confined principally to the country between the Mississippi and the Rio Grande. In his report dated November 20, 1849 and included in the report sent by the Secretary of War to the President at the beginning of the 1st session of the 31st Congress, Colonel Abert reported that Lieutenant Simpson, who had been sent with an expedition
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from Fort Smith to Santa Fe, in order to explore in that direction a route for a road, had made a report which was ready for any call that Congress might please to make: that another expedition from Fort Leavenworth to Oregon had been sent out under Captain Stansbury, who was instructed to return by a route south from Fort Hall to Salt Lake and on south to St. Joseph's spring on the route from Santa Fe to Los Angeles and then last to Santa Fe, and who was not expected back for some time; and that one officer was engaged in compiling from the best authorities a map of the country between the Mississippi and the Pacific. He recommended an appropriation of $20,000 for military and geographical surveys west of the Mississippi.

December 24, Senator Sebastian of Arkansas submitted a resolution calling for the Simpson report, which was agreed to January 3. January 8, the report was transmitted to the Senate by the Secretary of War and January 14, on the recommendation of the Committee on Printing, the report with the map which accompanied it, was ordered printed and 2500 extra copies of it were ordered printed, also: 2000 for the use of the Senate and 500 for the use of the topographical bureau.

February 21, the same report was sent to the House, in response to a call of February 6, made by a resolution offered by Robert W. Johnson of Arkansas. In the House, it was referred
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to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered printed.  

In this report Lieutenant Simpson declares that while the route from Santa Fe on the south side of the Canadian river is practicable for a railroad and has the advantages of a comparative freedom from snow and a good available supply of material and water, yet to his mind "the time has not yet come when this or any other railroad can be built over this continent." Before he made this expedition, he believed in the practicability of a railroad communication, but in passing over only $\frac{1}{3}$ of the distance he has already seen enough to considerably reduce his high ideas. The work might some day be accomplished, "but that it can be commenced now, and be brought to a successful period within ten or twenty years, I do not believe." All that he believes possible now toward the object is the fostering of military roads. "In a word, to my mind the order of means in respect to the establishment of this railroad is, first, the creation of centres of population wherever along the route they can be created: second the development of the resources of these several points by this population:, and, third, the taking advantage of these resources to aid in the prosecution of the road."

Along with the Simpson report there was sent to the House the report on Captain R.B. Marcy, the military officer in command of the Fort Smith to Santa Fe expedition, on the same subject. The report was later (September 12) ordered
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printed by the Senate, also. Captain Marcy favored the route which he had been over for a railroad. "I am... of the opinion, that but few localities could be found upon this Continent which (for as great a distance) would present as few obstacles to the construction of a railway as upon this route." "From all I can learn of the other routes to California, I am induced to believe that, should our government at any future time determine upon making a national road of any description across the continent, the southern route we have traveled is eminently worthy of consideration. We find upon none of the northern routes as much water, timber, or rich fertile soil as upon this?"11

April 3, the Secretary of War sent to the Senate, upon a call made February 25, the report of General Persifor F. Smith upon California. May 6, the report was ordered printed and 5000 extra copies of it ordered printed for use of the Senate. General Smith emphasized the importance of the Pacific trade and the necessity of a communication with the Pacific and said concerning the means of communication: "As facility, rapidity, and security of communication are the requisites, a railroad, if practicable, is most appropriate." But, "whether it be a railroad or a common road, it should pass the Rocky Mountains about latitude 38 degrees, reach the valley of Humboldt's river, and follow that direction until it sends off a branch to
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Oregon by the Willamette valley, and the other by the head of the Sacramento and the valley of that river to San Francisco bay." If the southern route were chosen, two roads would be necessary; by this route, only one is needed for most of the way.\textsuperscript{13}

During October, 1849, the two great railroad conventions at St. Louis and at Memphis had been held. January 3, 1850, Vice President Fillmore laid before the Senate the memorial to Congress of the St. Louis convention for the adoption of measures for constructing a national railroad and electric telegraph from the Mississippi river to the Pacific ocean. On motion of Benton, the memorial was laid on the table.\textsuperscript{14} The memorial was presented in the House January 28 by the Speaker, Howell Cobb of Georgia, and referred to the Committee on Roads and Canals.\textsuperscript{15} The convention had made no decision as to the proper plan of construction of a Pacific railroad, but in spite of Benton's opposition, it had declared for a railroad from San Francisco to Council Bluffs, with branch lines to Chicago, Memphis, and St. Louis.\textsuperscript{16}

February 25, Representative Stanton of Tennessee presented in the House the memorial of the Memphis convention, and moved to refer it to a select committee, but debate arose on the motion, it was laid over, and did not come up again.\textsuperscript{17}
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Stanton presented the memorial again April 26. This time it was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, of which Stanton was chairman. August 1, the chairman of the committee brought in a bill (H.R.No.368) providing for certain surveys, accompanied by a report. The report was ordered printed. The bill was referred to the Committee of the Whole, where it remained without being taken up. The report proper is very short, merely endorsing the opinion of the Memphis convention as it is presented in its memorial, which is printed with the report. The memorial declares that the building of the Pacific railroad by the government through states and territories is constitutional because it is a work of national defense. If the southern route is practicable, it is desirable because it makes possible commerce with northern Mexico. However, the convention wants surveys made of all routes and favors the best route, wherever it is. It believes that the route which is especially worthy of attention is that from San Diego, up the Gila valley, on through the Paso del Norte to some point (logically, Memphis) between the mouth of the Ohio and the Red river. This route is best for the national defense; it is open all the year round, will protect the Mexican border and is convenient to the Memphis navy yard. It is best for commerce because it draws from a wide territory. The convention also fav-
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ors all possible encouragement of a project to build an isthmus railroad or canal. The bill which the Committee reported provided for certain surveys to determine the possibility of the isthmus communication as well as for surveys of the land routes.

In resolutions of the General Assembly, Missouri came out strongly in this session of Congress for Benton's central national highway. The resolutions were presented in the Senate January 3, 1850 by David R. Atchison and in the House, February 12, by James B. Bowlin. In the Senate they were laid on the table and ordered printed; in the House they were referred to the Committee on Public Lands. The resolutions say that the people of Missouri are vitally interested in the early completion of the road, that it is necessary for commercial, military, and political reasons and that an isthmus road is undesirable because of the necessity of transhipment, slow and expensive passage, uncertainty, and foreign control. It then sanctions Benton's scheme and echoes his speech of the previous session and his praise of St. Louis as the commercial center of the west.

Bowlin also expressed himself personally to be in accord with Benton's opinions in a series of resolutions which he presented to the House February 25, 1850, moving that the rules be suspended to allow him to introduce them. The rules were not suspended but the resolutions are printed in both the Journal and the Globe. Bowlin declared in the resolutions that it
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is both expedient and competent for the government of the United States to build a railroad or thoroughfare without the limits of a state for military and commercial purposes; that the connexion made between the Mississippi and the Pacific ought to be "in as central a portion as to territory and population as is compatible with a due regard to the best and most practicable route; that the road should be national in design, character, and construction; should belong to the government of the United States and be "forever disconnected with individual interests or speculations...free to all people of the confederacy. The fourth resolution echoes Benton's attack on Whitney: "That it would be grossly unjust to the people of the United States, and derogatory to the dignity of the republic, to employ the national resources of the people in constructing a magnificent work of this kind and have its locality and proprietorship in the hands of any individual or individuals, subject to the influences of private interest, upon any terms, conditions, or stipulations whatever--the whole people being the safest guardians of works constructed from their means."

The resolutions go on to declare that the public lands are the proper means for the work and that its construction and completion should be hastened; and that the states should be granted land for branches; and that the government should at once establish a telegraph line and military posts from St.Louis to San Francisco. The last resolution provides for the appointment of a select committee of 13 to consider the subject and report a bill upon it. The resolutions were not
brought in again, however, and so were never formally before Congress.

Of the plans for a Pacific railroad which came before this session of Congress in definite form, only one originated within Congress itself. This was the plan of Senator Isaac Walker of Wisconsin, who on March 15, 1850, asked and obtained leave to introduce a bill (S.154) "to provide the incipient measures necessary for the construction of a railroad from the Mississippi river to the Pacific ocean." The bill was referred to the Committee on Roads and Canals and was not reported back by that Committee. The bill provides for an appropriation for the expenses of a detachment of the topographical engineers, "to select, survey, locate, and mark, on the most proper and eligible ground," a right of way 300 feet wide for a railroad from some suitable point on the Mississippi river to some suitable coast on the Pacific ocean." The land on each side of the road, three townships wide on each side, is then to be surveyed and, excepting lands with known deposits of precious metals or stones, and excepting two sections of each township which are to be reserved for school purposes, are to be granted in 160 acres lots to actual settlers who are citizens of the United States or have declared their intentions to become citizens; are heads of families or are 21 years old, and own no other land in the country, and who occupy and cultivate the land for one year. In presenting the bill Walker spoke of the impossibility of building a railroad through

a vast, unsettled country, of the great possibilities which this land grant would open up to settlers, possibilities which would "attract the attention of the hardy enterprise and adventure of this entire Republic, and concluded with these remarks which seem directed especially against Whitney: "Many schemes or plans for the construction of this great work have been suggested, but all have seemed to look to vast individual speculations only. None of them have aimed at the accomplishment of a general good to a great class and that class the poor but enterprising— as well as the good of the Government. My plan has nothing of individual speculation for the capitalist in it; but while it avoids this, it secures the end, and at the same time, secures incalculable blessings to a large, deserving, and meritorious class of our fellow-citizens, with no sacrifice to the interests of the Government, but with a manifest promotion of them all."25

Whitney himself presented no memorial to Congress in this session nor in the one following it. December 24, 1849, however, Senator Dickenson, presented resolutions of the Chamber of Commerce of New York City approving Whitney's project, which were referred to the Committee on Roads and Canals and ordered printed.26 The same memorial was presented in the House, December 31, by Representative Phoenix and referred there also to the Committee on Roads and Canals. And January 21, 1850, Senator Cooper presented a second series of reso-
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olutions from the General Assembly of Pennsylvania supporting Whitney's plan. They were laid on the table and ordered printed.\textsuperscript{28} February 13, 1850, John L. Robinson of Indiana laid before the House "resolutions and petitions unanimously adopted and numerously signed by large and respectable public meetings, and highly respectable names and firms, since the two conventions were held at St. Louis and at Memphis, all declaring Mr. Whitney's to be 'the only feasible plan, the only one that would not involve constitutional, sectional, and other difficulties sure to impede and finally stop the progress of the work' requesting their Senators and Representatives and praying Congress to pass a law without delay to carry out Mr. Whitney's plan;' which were from meeting's held in the fall of 1849 at Cincinnati, Louisville, Dayton, and Zanesville, and from citizens of New York and Philadelphia—in all 11 petitions. All of them were referred to the Committee on Roads and Canals.\textsuperscript{29} In addition to these petitions 3 others supporting Whitney, 2 from Ohio, and 1 from Indianapolis, Indiana, were presented. 1 was referred also to the Committee on Roads and Canals in the House; the other 2 went to the Senate Committee on Roads and Canals.

Besides the Whitney plan, a number of others were brought into Congress. Hartwell Carver's memorial for a charter and government aid for a railroad from Lake Michigan to the Pacific ocean was again presented: in the Senate, January 28, by Senator Dickinson,\textsuperscript{31} and in the House February 15 by Repre-
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sentative Schermerhorn of New York. In each house, it was referred to the Committee on Roads and Canals. No memorials supporting his plan were presented during this session.

The other plan than Whitney's which seems now to have the most support, however, is that of P.P.F.Degrand of Boston, whose memorial was presented in the Senate January 14, by Daniel Webster, and referred to the Committee on Roads and Canals. The next day it was ordered printed, and on June 19, Webster presented some additional documents to accompany it, which, too, went to the Committee on Roads and Canals. A memorial which seems from the notice of it to have been that of Degrand was presented in the House January 22, by Representative Winthrop and referred to the Committee on Public Lands. 5 other memorials approving the Degrand plan were presented, 2 from New York, 2 from Massachusetts and 1 from Maine. 2 of them were referred to the Senate Committee on Roads and Canals; 2 to the House Committee on Roads and Canals, and 1 to the House Committee on Public Lands.

Degrand asks for a charter for a railroad and telegraph line, to be constructed from St.Louis to San Francisco. The capital for the project is to be 100 million dollars, of which 98 millions in United States 6% stock are to be loaned to him by the government after he has raised 2 millions. He is to be given a strip of public land 10 miles wide on the

north side of the road, land for the right of way and depots, and the right to take material from the public lands. In the papers which accompany the memorial, most of them speeches of Degrond or resolutions and papers of a Boston Committee of which he was a member, the advantages of this road and plan are set forth. The whole scheme seems to be very visionary and without a firm foundation in facts. Much time is given to criticism of Whitney's plan. In an "Address to the people of the United States", Degrond says: "Another plan which is before the public contemplates to create the money by the sale of the land. But, by following that plan, the land cannot be sold until after the road is built, and the money to build the road cannot be tangible until the land is sold. The plan is therefore radically defective. If it be adopted and adhered to, fifty years will not suffice to bring the road to completion." In a rather childish letter to the New York Chamber of Commerce, he and his associates of Boston, estimate that it will take 850 years to build the road under Whitney's plan. Degrond plans to complete his road in 5 years. He accepts the evidence in Benton's central national highway speech of February 7, 1849, as proof of the practicability of the route and in a speech in Boston said that he gloried in the anticipation of the time when he and his hearers should set out "on the Grand Central railroad from St.Louis to San Francisco, in company with our friend T.H.Benton, to pay a visit to his daughter [Mrs. Fremont]."

Several other plans for building the road were intro-
Several other plans for building the road were introduced, which received little attention, however, and seem of slight importance. One of these was presented to the House January 21, by Representative Duncan. It was a memorial of citizens of Massachusetts, praying for a general banking law of the United States, by means of which to secure the immediate construction of a railroad to the Pacific. No more is given concerning its details, but the Committee on Ways and Means, to which it was referred, seems to have been disgusted with it, for on the motion of Bayly of Virginia, from the Committee, the Committee was discharged from further consideration of the memorial on January 24, and it was laid on the table. Another plan was that of William Archer of Washington, D.C. who prayed for the survey and location of a railroad from Washington to the Pacific, which, according to his plan would have three tracks the whole way, and not take a dollar from the national treasury. This plan was presented in both houses January 21; in the House by Thaddeus Stevens and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means; in the Senate by Stephen A. Douglas, and referred to the Committee on Roads and Canals. The same memorial, or a similar one by Archer, was presented to the Senate again May 28 by Dickinson and referred to the Committee on Finance, but June 5, on motion of Dickinson, Archer was given leave to withdraw it. Then it was presented again September 17, by Senator

Cooper of Pennsylvania and again referred to the Committee on Finance. Nothing was done with it, however. In addition to these plans, 21 other memorials on the subject of a Pacific railroad were presented to Congress during this session, including resolutions of the Tennessee Legislature for surveys and appropriation of land and of the California Legislature for the immediate construction of a national railroad from the Pacific to the Mississippi. Most of the memorials in both houses were referred to the Committee on Roads and Canals, although some in each house went to the Committee on Public Lands.

All these memorials, along with the numerous petitions and plans for a mail route or a military escort to Oregon, and the agitation for a Panama railroad which still continued in Congress, are evidences of the constantly increasing interest in the Pacific coast regions. One plan which is worthy of note is that of Col. Fremont, now a member of the Senate from California, who, near the close of the session, on September 12, introduced a bill (S.334) for opening a road across the Sierra Nevada on the line of the Rio de los Americanos and Carson's river and the pass at their head, as the commencement of opening a common travelling road to California. The bill was referred to the Committee on Roads and Canals, which did not report it back to the Senate.

The committee in each house to which most of the memorials and plans for a Pacific railroad had been referred,
in each case brought in a bill to carry out Whitney's plan, accompanied by a report supporting it.

The bill (No.156) and report of the House Committee on Roads and Canals was brought in Mar.12,1850 by John L.Robinson of Indiana, the chairman. The other members of the Committee were all northern men excepting two, one from Kentucky and one from Virginia. The bill was referred to the Committee of the Whole House and the report was ordered printed. On motion of Robinson the Committee on Printing was instructed to inquire into the expediency of printing an extra number of copies of the report. March 19, Representative Fuller of Maine, from the Committee on Printing, reported in favor of printing 5000 extra copies of the report. Immediately Representative Bowlin got the floor and made the hour speech allowed condemning the Whitney project. After declaring that Congress persistently refused to give public lands to new states for improvements he said:"But let a speculator spring up, who only knows the existence of the public domain, through the archives of the country, and project a scheme as wild and as fanciful as the daydreams of the enthusiast, and modestly ask you to donate to him for a nominal sum, upon an extended credit, seventy eight million of acres of the public domain, and the example was before them that he could command the report of a committee to present his scheme of individual speculation, and it only remained to be seen whether the people's money was to be employed to give

extended and extraordinary circulation to his visionary schemes of wealth and aggrandizement." He went on to deny that Whitney's motive was unselfish and to declare that the pretended safeguards to the government would only work a penalty upon the government, that "it was due to the committee that reported [the bill] to say, that it was not drawn by them, and he was only astonished that its enormities had escaped their observation, or that the Democratic portion of the committee were not able to arrest its progress to this House", and that he was alarmed that such a scheme could meet with favor in a Democratic committee.

Bowlin then enumerates 10 points of objection to the plan, if all of which were with foundation, would be sufficient to prove it a menace to the country, indeed. It is "monstrous" to give the power of the choice of route to one man. "You would see states--free, sovereign, independent states--rivaling each other in syncophancy to your congressionally-created idol." The grant is of a corporate character which would protect Whitney in any fraud in the courts; the power of Congress to control the tolls on the road is barren; the details of the sale of the land only take expense off Whitney; the plan is unconstitutional; the power of Congress to repeal the act is of no effect, all the benefit would go to Whitney; the power to amend the act is no power at all; the government puts itself under Whitney's control by binding itself to extinguish the title to Indian lands along the route, but this clause is deceptive because Whitney has no intention of going on with the road after the good lands are passed; and the stock
would be held by European capitalists.

Bowlin's objections might seem more real if had not attacked the bill so prematurely and so unreasonably. Robinson tried once to stop Bowlin on the ground that a speech on the merits of the bill was out of order on a motion to print extra copies of the report, but his objection was overruled. After Bowlin finished, Robinson got the floor and then yielded it so that the House could go into Committee of the Whole, when the speaker assured him that the matter would be the first order the next day. 42

The next day Robinson replied to Bowlin's speech. He said that Bowlin's only precedent for his rude attack on a motion to print extra copies of a report was in Benton's attack on a like bill in the 29th Congress. Bowlin "is following in the footsteps of his illustrious colleague; and this, I apprehend, is the secret of all his opposition to this bill; hence he has discovered in every section of it, corruption and fraud—a real 'wooly horse'. I imagine, that if the plan adopted by the committee had made the eastern terminus of this road at St. Louis, or if it had presented a plan affording any margin for Presidential capital, we should not now hear the thunder of the gentleman from Missouri." A government railroad, which Bowlin advocates, would be a "political monstrosity". Robinson then explains the Whitney bill, declaring that it puts no land monopoly in Whitney's hands and leaves no possible chance

of loss to the government. "Let him fail even when and where you choose, or he chooses, and the Government must be benefited by what he had done; for, as far as he has completed a road at all, it will be worth much more than the lands paid for it, to say nothing of the settlement and population superinduced along its line." The bill is the work of former committees, two of the Senate and two of the House, although the original draft was drawn by Whitney. Speaking of Whitney personally, Robinson says: "In relation to the person, I will only add, that if we ever get a Pacific railway, no matter on what plan, we will be more indebted to the industry, and indomitable zeal and energy of Mr. Whitney for it, than any other one man." In reply to Bowlin's attack on the character of the Democracy of the members of the Committee, Robinson declares that only one Democratic member of the Committee, Parker of Virginia, voted against the bill. Of the four Democratic members present (not St. Louis harbor Democrats either), three voted for the bill.

In spite of Robinson's efforts, however, the question of agreeing to the recommendation of the Committee on Printing that 5000 extra copies of the report be printed was laid on the table on motion of George W. Jones of Tennessee, by a vote of 83 to 51.43 No further action was taken upon the bill. This tilt of Bowlin and Robinson seems to have been the result of Bowlin's hostility to the Whitney plan, probably based as Robinson says, on the fact that it left St. Louis out of the way. Bowlin's objections seem violent and ill-considered--they did

not need to be carefully thought out and valid to put down Whitney's project this late in its life.

The Robinson report is the one most wholly and completely given over to praise of Whitney and his plan of all those made during the history of the project. It gives Whitney the credit for the origination of the Pacific railroad project, which is now "decreed in the public mind". We are indebted to Whitney "for the origination of the project, for the maturity of the first plan, for the large amount of practical information that is brought to bear upon the subject, and for awakening public attention to its importance....Your committee have been forced to observe that all the excellencies of other and more recent projects are embraced in Mr. Whitney's, and apparently borrowed from his original conceptions; while their defects and objectionable features... are entirely obviated by Mr. Whitney's plan." 44

The "grand objects of this enterprise" are then presented again, the same as those which had already been set forth, with the addition of that of securing the peace of the world by this "great and common interest of nations," which would demand a "perpetuity of the most amicable relations "between all states. The plan has widespread and unanimous support. Being a private enterprise, it avoids the great dangers in such an undertaking by the government. Whitney's plan is the only one which shows the means of building the road. The St.Louis and Memphis conventions "have pointed out no means of executing

44. 31-1, H.rp.140, serial 583.
their respective plans, except by dependence on the national treasury...Your committee have reason to believe that the government itself...would sink under the attempt to build this road on any other plan than that of Mr. Whitney." The success of Whitney's plan depends on his choice of the route, he has made sure that the route is practicable: "whereas the respectable persons who composed the conventions of St. Louis and Memphis, and many others equally respectable who have taken an interest in this subject, but who, nevertheless, probably understand very little of the practical economy of such a work, may have honestly pronounced in favor of a route as utterly impracticable as a road to the moon." The southern routes have the fatal defect of lack of fuel and water for long distances. Whitney's eastern terminus, on Lake Michigan, is better for all parts of the country than any other. The great principle of the Whitney plan, the use of the public lands instead of capital upon which interest must be paid, is its crowning feature; rates would be only so high as necessary to keep up the road: "no other plan of road, whether by government or otherwise, could ever afford this benefit to commerce." The objections which are made to the plan are not valid. The lands can hardly be given away now, why object to selling them to Whitney for 10 cents an acre, which is double their present value? The government control over the road will be adequate: all the risk, which is considerable, is Whitney's. There can be no objections to Whitney himself. "No one acquainted with Mr. Whitney can doubt that he is a practical man, or suspect that he is
likely to be mistaken in his views on this subject. What others
know about it, he has taught them."

It is necessary for Congress to act now. "At four sess-
ions of Congress his project has been favorably reported on, and,
at the last Congress, by the unanimous voice of select committ-
ees of both branches, which would doubtless have passed into a
law, but for the hurried pressure at the close of a short sess-
ion.

"In the meantime, the lands necessary to this enterprise
are being rapidly taken up, and the chances of being able to
carry it on greatly diminished. Mr. Whitney retired from the
last Congress disheartened, and has only been persuaded by the
urgent solicitations of public meetings in several quarters,
and by the promptings of numerous eminent men of the country,
to make one more effort here. He is here, probably, for the
last time."

In conclusion we have for the first time presented to
Congress the threat that if Whitney's road is not built across
the United States, Great Britain will take up Whitney's help
and build the road across Canada.

The appendix to the report contains much valuable ma-
terial on Whitney's project, including the first three Whitney
memorials, the bill reported by this committee, resolutions
of the various state legislatures and public meetins, a state-
ment of the population, resources and products of Asia, and
a circular letter of Whitney's dated February 24, 1849, in which
he consents to the construction of a southern branch of the
road "running southerly to the waters of the Red river, at a point not exceeding 250 miles westerly from Vicksburg, and then by the Paso del Norte, or some other practicable pass, to San Diego or San Francisco, on the Pacific coast, along that route which shall be found practicable." This is the amendment which Senator Foote proposed to the Niles bill January 29, 1849 but which was not acted upon. In the pamphlet explaining his project which Whitney published in 1849, "A Project for a Railroad to the Pacific," he again indorsed this amendment publicly, and the House bill of this session leaves the choice of route open, authorizing Whitney to construct the road from any point that he may designate, upon Lake Michigan or the Mississippi river, through the public land of the United States, on a line as nearly straight as the face of the country will admit, to some point on the Pacific ocean, where a suitable harbor may be had.

The chairman of the Senate Committee on Roads and Canals, Bright of Indiana, brought in a Whitney bill (S.333) and report September 12, 1850. The bill was read and passed to a second reading and the report was ordered printed. No further action was taken on the bill. This committee had as its members: Jene D. Bright of Indiana, David R. Atchison of Missouri, Albert C. Greene of Rhode Island, Henry S. Foote of Mississippi, and Presley Spruance of Delaware.

45. P.31.
46. The bill is in 31-1, H.rp.140, pp.43 to 50.
The committee reports that "after duly sifting, weighing, and comparing the reasons for the different routes and the different plans, your committee have come to the conclusion that the plan submitted by Mr. Asa Whitney of New York, is the one which ought to be adopted." The plan is generally approved throughout the country: "the opinion of the country is almost universally concentrated on this plan." The advantages of the Whitney plan over others are enumerated: there are no constitutional difficulties; there is a positive gain of $8,000,000 from the sale of the land to Whitney; the capital to build the road is created by the increased value which the road gives to the lands; there is no necessity of tolls to pay interest on capital; the value of government land is increased by the road; public interest is safeguarded by the bill—if Whitney gets rich from it he will have deserved to; Whitney's route is the only one with available lands, timber, and other material, and is the most direct and practicable route from the Atlantic cities to the Pacific; there will be no party strife and no stock-jobbing; and the road will completely revolutionize the commercial life of the world and make the heart of our country the centre of the world. The plan must be adopted now if it ever is to be because the lands are being taken up. "Your committee are aware that there is a portion of the people of the country who would prefer a more southern route; but as there has been no plan in that direction submitted which does not look to the public treasury or to the credit of the government for means; it should not, as your committee think, conflict in any way with this plan, which provides and creates its own means out
of that which in any other application would not be likely to produce any direct benefit to the nation."

But for all these reports, nothing further was done in either house toward adopting Whitney's plan in this session of Congress. And this session marks the end of any really serious effort to get the plan adopted.

There is very little of importance in the study of the Pacific railroad in the 2nd session of the 31st Congress.

In his annual message, December 2, 1850, President Fillmore referred to the recommendation concerning the opening of a communication with the Pacific which President Taylor had made to the preceding session, repeating and emphasizing that recommendation.49

In the annual report of the Secretary of the Interior, A. H.H. Stuart, which was sent to Congress with the President's message, the Secretary spoke of the need of a communication with the Pacific, entirely within our own territory. "Whether this can best be accomplished by a railway, a turnpike, or a plank road, or by a combination of the different modes of improvement, can only be determined after a careful survey of the country and its resources shall have been made...The gigantic character of the work...admonishes us of the necessity of adopting every precaution in ascertaining the best means of effecting the object...I therefore...suggest the propriety of authorizing an immediate examination of the country, and such surveys as may be necessary to determine the practicability and probable cost of the work."50

50. 31-1,S.ex.doc.1,p.30,serial 587
    Also in 31-1,H.ex.doc.1,serial 595
December 23, in the House, Edward Stanly of North Carolina moves that the rules be suspended to enable him to introduce a resolution to grant the use of the hall of the House to Asa Whitney to explain his project. The motion was decided in the negative, since it did not get the 2/3 vote necessary for passage. January 13, 1851, Representative Alexander H. Stephens of Georgia made a similar motion for a similar purpose; the motion carried, 129 to 54, and the resolution to grant the use of the hall to Whitney was agreed to.\textsuperscript{51} February 5, 6 memorials from citizens of Philadelphia approving Whitney's plan were presented in the House and referred to the Committee on Roads and Canals. February 24 a memorial from John Plumbe, in behalf of the settlers of California, opposing Whitney's project, was laid before the Senate.\textsuperscript{52}

Benton's central national highway scheme was introduced again December 16, 1850 and referred to the Committee on Roads and Canals. Benton made another long and oratorical speech upon it when he introduced the bill (S.373) but the bill was not reported back to the Senate.\textsuperscript{53} A memorial of an Iowa City meeting for the construction of a military road from Council Bluffs to Sacramento City presented in the Senate January 6, was reported upon adversely by Jefferson Davis from the Committee on Military Affairs, January 15.\textsuperscript{54} Two other plans for roads were presented: one a memorial from citizens of Pennsylvania

\textsuperscript{52} See lists of memorials in appendix.
\textsuperscript{53} S.J.,31-2, serial 586, p.38. C.G.,31-2,pp.56-58 (speech and bill given)
for a macadamized turnpike road from the Atlantic to the Pacific; and the other, a House bill (No.492) for a post road from Fort Smith to San Diego, reported from the Committee on Post Office and Post Roads. No further action was taken upon either plan.

Carver once more brought in his memorial. It was presented in the Senate January 6, 1852 by Dickinson and referred to the Committee on Roads and Canals. In the House it was presented January 11, by Schermerhorn and referred to the Committee on Public Roads. Two memorials, one from John Plumbe and one from the Legislature of California both of which petitioned for a railroad from the Mississippi to the Pacific, were the only others on the subject brought in during this session.

No committee of either house reported upon the subject of the Pacific railroad in this 2nd session of the 31st Congress.

56. Ibid.,p.444.
59. See lists of memorials in appendix.
V. The last of the movement.

32nd Congress.

Asa Whitney presented a fourth memorial to Congress, during the 1st session of the 32nd Congress. December 18, 1851, it was laid before the House of Representatives by Alexander H. Stephens of Georgia and referred to the Committee on Roads and Canals. It was presented in the Senate February 12, 1852 by Hannibal Hamlin of Maine and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Post Roads.

Whitney gives a short history of the plan and then explains it. The only change in the plan is that he now would build the road in 12 mile instead of 10 mile sections. He mentions the approval which the plan has had from state legislatures and public meetings. And now it has been approved also in England. Whitney "has recently returned from a visit to England, where his project has been discussed and thoroughly examined, from the crown ministers to all classes—where engineers and men of science of the highest standing have given it their endorsement and support—where it has been pronounced 'a new science in civilization and settlement'—where capitalists have declared it a sure investment, and a certain and available plan of means, and the only available plan of means for this work, whether built on our own or on British territory—and where the necessary amount of means to commence and

2. S.J.,32-1, serial 610, p.326.

The memorial was not ordered printed by either house, but it is printed as a part of the report of the House Comm. on Roads and Canals,32-1,H.rp.101 pp.6-10,serial 656.
successfully prosecute the work with vigor, has been tendered to your memorialist, and will be at his disposal as soon as it may be required." A letter from Sir Roderick Murchison, President of the Royal Geographical Society, to "one of the ministers of the crown" is included in the memorial. The writer says that he has presided over meetings both of his society and of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, at which Whitney's project has been fully discussed and that the more his scheme is considered the more it obtains assent; that Whitney fears that "the unoccupied land on the northwestern shore of Lake Michigan (where his eastern terminus is proposed to be) may be sold and occupied beforehand. In that case the scheme as dependent on the United States must drop."

Whitney once more discusses the great commercial possibilities of the road, its political necessity, and the advantage of the demand for labor which it will create. In conclusion he declares that he has devoted himself to the cause for nearly ten years and "has now done all that within him lieth for the accomplishment of this great object." If Congress will act in favor of it in this session he is ready to go to work; "but if against it, then will your memorialist feel himself absolved from the pledges which he has made to the people of the United States."

One memorial against Whitney's project was presented in this session, again from John Plumbe, in behalf of settlers and miners of California. It was referred to the Committee on Post office and Post Roads.  

3. See list of memorials in appendix.
Hartwell Carver still is working for his plan, too. His memorial was presented again in this session, in the Senate, March 24, 1852 by Mallory of Florida, and was referred also to the Committee on Post Office and Post Roads. To the same Committee was referred the memorial of Ovid F. Johnson and his associates, proposing to construct a railroad and line of telegraph from New Orleans to San Francisco, which was presented June 9, by Senator Rush, of Texas. A memorial of A.W. Paul and others, proposing to construct a railroad from the Missouri river to the Pacific ocean, was presented in the Senate, March 3, by Wade of Ohio, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands. On March 31, on motion of Felch it was referred to the Committee on Roads and Canals.

Congress in this session had another memorial from Robert Mills, who sent in a plan for a railroad and telegraphic communication to the Pacific ocean, which Borland of Arkansas put before the Senate, May 5, and Frederick P. Stanton of Tennessee, before the House, May 25. In the House it was referred to the Committee on Roads and Canals. In the Senate it went to the Committee on Public Lands. In this memorial Mills proposes a route with two eastern termini, St. Louis and Memphis, to meet at Van Buren, Arkansas, then on to El Paso, along the Gila valley, and to San Diego. The government should construct the road.

Three other memorials for a Pacific railroad were pre-

4. S.J., 32-1, serial 610, p. 301.
5. Ibid, p. 461.
    H.J., 32-1, serial 632, p. 730.
The memorial is printed in 32-1, S.rp. 344, serial 631.
sented in the Senate. One, for a railroad from Lake Michigan to the Pacific to be built by the government, was presented by Senator Shields of Illinois; one was from a Settlers' and Miners' Convention held at Sacramento, California, and asked for a railroad from the Mississippi valley to the Pacific; the other was from citizens of Pennsylvania, for a railroad to the Pacific. All were referred to the Committee on Roads and Canals.

Three committees reported on a Pacific railroad during the session: the House Committee on Roads and Canals, and the Senate Committees on Post Office and Post Roads and Public Lands. John L. Robinson of Indiana was again chairman of the House Committee on Roads and Canals to which Whitney's fourth memorial had been referred. January 30, 1852, he brought in a bill (H.R.No.186) to carry out Whitney's project, and a report upon the subject. The bill was referred to the Committee of the Whole House, but no further action was taken upon it. It was the last Whitney bill reported to the House. The report was ordered printed. The Committee urges the speedy adoption of Whitney's plan "as the only constitutional and feasible plan for the accomplishment of this vastly important work perhaps for ages to come, if ever." The committee again presents the arguments for the plan and again strongly approves the plan. It still maintains that Whitney should be the judge of the route, but "to meet the desire so often expressed for a more southern..."

8. See lists of memorials in appendix.
route, another section, No. 20, has been added to the bill, which sets apart the same amount of land for a road to commence not north of Memphis, and run thence to the Rio del Norte and to the Pacific, on precisely the same terms and conditions as specified in the bill for Mr. Whitney, provided any party will so undertake it."

April 1, Rush of Texas, chairman of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Post Roads, which had Whitney's memorial under consideration, reported a bill (S. 334) to set apart and sell a portion of the public lands for the construction of certain railroads to the Pacific ocean. The plan, as explained by Rush, was to set apart and sell to Asa Whitney a portion of the public land to enable him to construct a railroad from Lake Michigan or the Mississippi river to the Pacific ocean; and also to set apart and sell to Samuel L. Selden, Robert T. Scott, and their associates, a portion of the public lands to enable them to construct a railroad from a point on the west bank of the Mississippi river, not north of Memphis, to run thence to the Rio del Norte and the Pacific ocean, at Santiago or San Francisco, or some other suitable point. No further action was taken upon the bill.\footnote{S.J., 32-1, p. 326, C.G., 32-1, p. 941.} Borland, from the Senate Committee on Public Lands, reported on Mills's memorial May 5. The committee still favored surveys instead of definite action, saying that so far its recommendations for surveys had not been adopted and "no information of a character or in an amount sufficient to determine a proper route, and justify Congress in tak-
ing definite action for its location and construction, has yet
been obtained." The committee does not endorse Mills's views
but make his memorial an appendix to the report.\footnote{11}

This session marks the end of the attempt to get Cong-
ress to take favorable action upon Whitney's project. The pro-
ject had been formulated when only Oregon belonged to the Unit-
ed States, and that not absolutely at first, and there was lit-
tle actual demand as well as little actual planning for a rail-
road to the Pacific. With Whitney's agitation, with the con-
quest of California from Mexico, and with the discovery of gold
in California, public attention was turned toward the question
of opening a communication with the Pacific. Whitney did much
to spread the belief in the practicability of a railroad for
that purpose. But the very thing which made it possible for
him to interest people in his plan, the opening up of Califor-
i a, doomed that plan to failure. With so many possible routes
opened up, it was not likely that Congress and the whole coun-
try would take up a route proposed when it was the only poss-
ible one, especially when that route was so far north as Whit-
ney's was, and when the plan for building it put the whole ac-
complishment in the hands of one man and involved what seemed
a virtual gift to that one man of a vast amount of public land.

Whitney tried to get his plan through by modifying his
route, and finally by consenting that another road on a south-
ern route should be built on the same plan as his. But the

\footnote{11. S.J.,32-1, serial 610,p.612.
Report printed, 32-1, S.rp.344, serial 631, 17 pp.}
feeling that further investigation was necessary before action was strong, the demand for the public land was constantly increasing, the sectional rivalries over the eastern terminus of the road were all the time developing and becoming more bitter, and Whitney's project declined and disappeared, as it was inevitable that it should do.
EXPLANATION OF MAP A.

Proposed routes for a Pacific Railroad.

I. Whitney's original route:

1st Memorial: "Railroad to commence at some point to be fixed upon as the most desirable on the shores of Lake Michigan, between the 42nd and 45th degrees of north latitude; thence west to the gap or pass in the mountains; and thence by the most practicable route to the Pacific Ocean."

2nd Memorial: "Your memorialist . . . passed over and examined the country for about seven hundred miles of the proposed route . . . From Green Bay to Milwaukee . . . from thence to the Mississippi . . . (which) can be bridged at or near Prairie du Chien." Struck Missouri in latitude 43-1/2 degrees.

3rd Memorial: "from the lake to the ocean, on a straight line . . . from the lake to the pass in the mountains . . . thence to the mouth of the Columbia river, or to Puget sound."

Niles bill, 30-1 and Robinson bill, 31 Congress, 1st session, "from any point upon Lake Michigan or the Mississippi river . . . through the public lands . . . , on a line as nearly straight as the face of the country will admit, and where the streams may be bridged to some point on the Pacific ocean where a suitable harbor may be had.

4th Memorial: "from Lake Michigan to the Pacific ocean."

II. Foote amendment (presented Jan.29,1849.)

"After crossing the Missouri River where it can be bridged, a branch shall be constructed, running south to the waters of the Red River and to the pass, or some more southern pass, (if any,) to San Diego or San Francisco. " (Whitney Project, p.31.)
III. Plan of 32nd Congress.
Robinson bill, 32 Congress, 1 session.
Whitney to build on his northern route. Some one else may build on same terms on route "to commence not north of Memphis, and run thence to the Rio del Norte and to the Pacific."

Rusk bill, 32 Congress, 1 session. Whitney to build by his route and others by a route "from a point on the west bank of the Mississippi river, not north of the neighborhood of Memphis, Tennessee, to run thence to the Rio del Norte and the Pacific ocean, at Santiago or San Francisco, or other point suitable for the purpose." C.G. 32-1, p.941.

IV. Other routes:
1. From Fort Leavenworth, via Santa Fe and the Gila river, to San Diego.
2. From Memphis to the line of the preceding route.
3. From Galveston to the line of the preceding route at "the pass."
4. From St.Louis up the Kansas and Platte Rivers to "the South pass."

Whitney's Project, pp.25 to 30 and map.
CHRONOLOGICAL OUTLINE.

28th Congress, 2nd session.
Senate Journal, serial 448.
House Journal, serial 462.
Congressional Globe.

1844.

Dec. 2. President Tyler's annual message. Recommended establishment of military post on route to Oregon.
H. J., p. 15.
C. G., p. 3.

1845.

H. J., p. 221.

S. J., p. 114.
C. G., p. 204.
(Printed, Sen. doc. 69, serial 451.)

H. J., p. 283.
C. G., p. 218.
(Printed, H. doc. 72, serial 464.)

(H. of rp. 199, serial 468.

Mar. 3. House. Adams (J. Q., of Mass.) -- petition of James Riley, inquiry into expediency of establishing a great central railroad from New York City or some other Atlantic city to the Pacific ocean. Laid on table.
H. J., p. 578.
1845.

Dec. 2. Message President Polk—recommends establishment of overland mail to Pacific.
  S.J., 17
  H.J., 24
  C.G., 7

  H.J., 139

  H.J., 169

1846

  C.G., 196
  For a national railroad from some point on the Mississippi to the mouth of the Columbia.
  H.J., 234.

Jan. 15. House. Morris—memorial of citizens of Belmont County, Ohio, grant of land for construction of a railroad from Lake Michigan to the Columbia river.
  H.J., 256
  C.G., 212

  H.J., 284
  C.G., 236

  C.G., 236
  H.J., 284
Feb. 9  House. Cathcart-petition of A. Wilcox and 65 citizens of Koscinski county, Indiana, national railroad from the Mississippi to the mouth of the Columbia.
   H.J., 371
   C.G., 355

   H.J., 385
   C.G., 368

   H.J., 430
   C.G., 400

   H.J., 446

   S.J., 161
   C.G., 414
   (29-1, S.doc.161, serial 473).

Feb. 26  House. Preston King-memorial of citizens of Lowville, Lewis county, N.Y., appropriations to construct national rr. from the Mississippi to Oregon to Comm. on Territories.
   H.J., 464

   C.G., 439

   H.J., 473
   C.G. 441
Mar. 2 Senate. Semple from Comm. on Post office and Post Roads, bill (S.103) to establish post route from Independence to the Pacific. Read and passed to second reading. Report and documents ordered printed.

S.J.,171
C.G.,442

(Bill did not pass)

Mar. 3 Senate. Niles—motion that 3,000 extra copies of Semple report be printed. On motion of Calhoun, subject referred to Comm. on Printing.

S.J.,176
C.G.,449

Mar. 4 Senate. Hannegan—memorial of citizens of Indiana, construction of a national road from some point on the Mississippi to the mouth of the Columbia. To Comm. on Public Lands.

S.J.,177
C.G.454

Mar. 4 Senate. Atherton, from Comm. on Printing, recommended passage of motion of March 2 to print 3,000 extra copies of Semple report. Motion passed.

S.J.,179
C.G.,455

Mar. 5 House. Starkweather—petition of 36 citizens of Wayne County, Ohio, for national railroad from the Missouri river to the Pacific. To Comm. on Roads and Canal.

H.J.,494
C.G.,463

Mar. 9 House. Pettit—memorial of Andrew L. Robinson and 43 others of Carroll county, Indiana, steps toward construction of a railroad from the Mississippi to the mouth of the Columbia. To Comm. on Territories.

H.J.,503
C.G.,473

Mar. 10 House. Starkweather—petition from citizens of Wayne county, Ohio, national railroad from the Missouri to the Pacific ocean. To Comm. on Roads and Canals

H.J.,511

Mar. 16 House. Brinkerhoff—memorial of citizens of Richland County, Ohio, national railroad from the Missouri to the Pacific. To Comm. on Roads and Canals.

H.J.525
Mar. 16 House. Starkweather—3 memorials of citizens of Stark county, Ohio, railroad from the Missouri to the Pacific. To Com. on Roads and Canals.
H.J., 525

H.J., 541

H.J., 541
C.G. 528

H.J., 610

April 9 House, Bowling, petition of Peter von Schmidt, establishment of a railroad from St. Louis to some navigable point on the Columbia. To Comm. on Territories.
H.J., 655
C.G. 672

May 11 House. Robert Mills, from the Com. on Roads and Canals, resolution (given) that the Comm. on Engraving be instructed to inquire into the expediency of providing a map to accompany the memorial of Robert Mills. Not adopted.
H.J., 783
C.G. 789

H.J., 1073
(29-1, H.rp. 773, serial 491)
(No further action on bill)
July 17 Webster-Ashburton Treaty ratification exchanged.

July 31 Senate. Breese, from Comm. on Public Lands. bill (S.246) to carry out Whitney plan. Report Bill read and passed to second reading. Report ordered printed without the maps.
S.J. 461
(29-1, S.doc.466, serial 478)
(No further action on bill)
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Dec. 15 Senate. Dix—resolutions of the Chamber of Commerce of New York in favor of a grant of public land to aid in the construction of a railroad from Lake Michigan to the Pacific. To Comm. on Public Lands.
S.J.,46
C.G.,32

Dec. 21 Senate. Dix—memorial of George Wilkes, that national railroad be constructed from the Missouri to the Pacific, together with eight other memorials of a similar character, all numerously signed. To Comm. on Public Lands.
S.J.,57–8
C.G.,54

Dec. 22 Senate. Semple—resolution, considered by unanimous vote and agreed to: "That the Committee on Roads and Canals be instructed to inquire into the expediency of incorporating a company to construct a railroad from some point on the Missouri river, west of the limits of the state of Missouri to the mouth of the Columbia River."
S.J.,63
C.G.,61

H.J.,85

H.J.,99
C.G.,97
1846


1847

S.J .. 77
C.G .. 104

Jan. 5 Senate. Corwin—memorial of citizens of Dayton, Ohio, that a portion of the public land be applied to the construction of a railroad from Lake Michigan to the Pacific. To Comm. on Public Lands.
S.J .. 82
C.G .. 111

Jan. 5 Senate. Sturgeon—2 memorials from citizens of Philadelphia, that a portion of the public land may be appropriated to aid in the construction of a railroad from Lake Michigan to the Pacific ocean.
S.J .. 82
C.G .. 111

Jan. 5 House, Ingersoll—memorial from citizens of Philadelphia, Congress to set apart during the present session the land asked by Asa Whitney. To Comm. on Public Lands.
H.J .. 135
C.G .. 161
Again the same notice, Jan. 11, & Jan. 20
H.J .. 162, 198.

S.J .. 93
C.G .. 164

Jan. 16 Senate. Dix—memorial of citizens of New York, of like import with the foregoing. To Comm. on Public Lands.
S.J .. 107
C.G .. 199

------------
Jan. 18 Senate. Corwin—memorial of citizens of Dayton, Ohio, of like import with the foregoing. To Comm. on Public Lands.

S.J., 107.
C.G., 199

Jan. 18 House. Elias B. Holmes—memorial of Doctor Hartwell Carver, charter for a railroad from Lake Michigan to the Pacific, grant of land 20 miles on each side of the road. To Committee on Roads and Canals.

H.J., 181
C.G., 213


H.J., 180
C.G., 213


H.J., 181
C.G., 213


S.J., 115
C.G., 213


H.J., 204


S.J., 128
C.G., 245


S.J., 132
C.G., 255
   H.J., 231-2
   C.G., 266

   H.J., 236

   H.J., 245

   H.J., 300

Feb. 4 Senate. Dix—two memorials from citizens of New York portion of public land to be set apart for a railroad from Lake Michigan to the Pacific. To Comm. on Public Lands.
   C.J., 320
   S.J., 164

Feb. 6 Senate. Allen—memorial of citizens of Wadsworth, Ohio, of like import with the foregoing. To Comm. on Public Lands.
   S.J., 170
   C.G., 334

   H.J., 309

   H.J., 517
   Also by Brinkerhoff, Feb. 9
   H.J., 323

Feb. 10 House. Hastings—proceedings of a public meeting held in Iowa City, Iowa. Jan. 13, 1847, relative to a railroad from the Mississippi to the Pacific, on Asa Whitney’s plan. To Comm. on Roads and Canals.
   H.J., 327
   C.G., 391
   H.J., 375.

   H.J.386

   H.J.386
   C.G.472

   S.J., 213
   C.G., 462

   H.J., 418

   S.J., 226
   (29-2, S.doc.194, serial 495).

   S.J., 226
   C.G.505

   H.J., 429
   C.G.518

--------
Dec. 8 Senate. Dix—resolutions of the New York Legislature in favor of Whitney project. Laid on table & printed.

S.J., 40
C.G., 12
(30-1, S.misc.doc. 1, serial 511)

Dec. 9 Senate. Clarke—resolutions Rhode Island Legislature favor Whitney project. Ordered printed.

S.J., 42
C.G., 15 (30-1, S.misc.doc. 4, serial 511)


S.J., 43.
C.G., 19
(30-1, S.misc.doc. 5, serial 511)


H.J., 106
C.G., 42


S.J., 59
C.G., 51
(30-1, S.misc.doc. 18, serial 511)

Jan. 4, House. Leffler—resolutions of an Iowa City meeting in favor of a railroad from the Mississippi to the to the Pacific. To the Committee on Roads and Canals.

H.J., 190
C.G., 103


H.J., 246
C.G., 179
S.J.,112 (30-1,S.misc.doc.28,serial 511) C.G.,182

H.J.,247

Jan.17 Senate Turney-resolutions Tennessee Legislation favor Whitney project. To Com. on Roads and Canals and printed.
S.J.,113 (30-1,S.misc.doc.29,serial 511) C.G.,182

H.J.,279

Jan.27 House. Elias B.Holmes of New York-memorial of Dr. Hartwell Carver, for a charter for a railroad from Lake Michigan to the Pacific; two different terminations on the Pacific; donation of right of way and materials from the public lands. To Comm. on Roads and Canals.
H.J.,306 C.G.264

H.J.,323 (30-1,H.misc.doc.17,serial 523) C.G.,268

H.J.,338

Feb.9 Senate. Dickinson-memorial of George Wilkes, adoption of measures for the construction of a national railroad from the Missouri river to the Pacific. To Comm. on Roads and Canals.
S.J.,160 C.G.,327

Feb.15 Senate. Sevier-memorial of Robert Mills, proposing a new route to the Pacific. To Comm. on Library and printed with maps.
S.J.,175 (30-1,S.misc.doc.51,serial 511) C.G.,361.
   H.J. 423

   S.J., 188  
   C.G., 387 (30-1, S.misc.doc.58, serial 511)

   S.J., 197  
   C.G., 410 (30-1, S.misc.doc.76, serial 511)

   H.J., 486

   S.J., 200  
   C.G., 423 (30-1, S.misc.doc.77, serial 511)

   H.J., 542  
   C.G., 459

   H.J., 542-3  
   C.G., 459 (30-1, H.misc.doc.47, serial 523)

   H.J., 545  
   C.G., 459

   H.J., 546.  
   C. ., 459

   S.J., 212  
   C.G. 466
   H.J.586
   C.G.505 (30-1,H.miss.doc.47,serial 523)

   H.J.,596
   C.G., 521 (30-1,H.miss.doc.55,serial 523)

Mar.27 Senate. Johnson of Md.,resolutions of Maryland Legislature favor of appropriating public land to make a railroad from Lake Michigan to the Pacific. Laid on table.
   S.J.,236
   C.G.540


Mar.27 Senate. Dix—petition of Benjamin S.Henning, praying aid of government in exploring route for proposed rr. communication connecting the waters of the Mississip--i with the Pacific. To Comm. on Post Office and Post Roads.
   S.J.,235
   C.G. 540

   H.J.620
   C.G.541.
   Comm.appointed Apr.6, H.J.p.655

Mar.28 House. Evans of Md.—resolutions Maryland legislature favorable to Whitney plan. Referred to the Select Comm. this day directed to be appointed on subject, and ordered printed.(30-1,H.miss.doc.No.68,serial 523)
   H.J.620
   C.G.548

   H.J.626, (See Jan.17)
Apr. 13 House. Crowell—petition Alpheus Wright and others, citizens of Tallmadge, Summit County, Ohio, favor Whitney plan. Prayed action at this session. To the select Comm. on Whitney plan.
H.J., 679
C.G., 624

Apr. 17 Senate. Allen—resolution Ohio Legislature favor Whitney plan, and memorials from Wadsworth, Ohio, and from Summit County, Ohio, numerous signed, favor of Whitney plan. Laid on table and printed (only Leg. resolutions)
S.J., 282
C.G., 639 (30-1. S.misc.doc.124, serial 511)

April 18 House. On motion of Nathan Evans, ordered, that Comm. on Public Lands be discharged from further consideration of resolutions of Georgia and New Jersey legislatures, relative to Whitney plan, and that it be referred to the select Comm. on same.
H.J., 701.

H.J., 718
C.G., 675.

H.J., 722

Apr. 26 House. Comm. on Public Lands discharged from Wilkes petition and it to select Comm. on Whitney plan.
H.J., 726 (See Feb. 16)

H.J., 740

H.J. 744
(30-1, H.misc.doc.75, serial 523)
Apr. 28  House. Comm. on R. & C., on motion of Holmes, discharged from Carver mem and it to select comm. on Whitney. (See Jan. 27)  
H.J., 746

May 3  House, Marvin—another Carve memorial. To Comm. on Roads and Canals.  
H.J., 758

May 3  House. McClelland, from select committee appointed to consider Whitney plan, reported bill to carry it out. Referred to the Com. of the Whole and ordered printed. 
(H.R. bill no. 468) 
H.J., 755 
C.G., 716

May 8  Senate. Upham—resolution Vermont Legislature favor Whitney plan. Laid on table and ordered printed.  
S.J., 321 
C.G., 737

H.J., 793 
C.G., 764 (30-1, H. misc. doc. 55, serial 523)

June 3  House. Sawyer—named Whitney bill in list of important bills still to come up.  
C.G., 814

H.J., 881

June 19  Senate. Hale—petition from the inhabitants of Rosen- dale, Wis., remonstrating against granting land to Whitney. To Com. on Public Lands.  
S.J., 395-6. 
C.G., 853

June 23  House. Pollock, from select comm. on Whitney plan, report to accompany bill previously reported (May 3) Referred to Comm. of the Whole, and ordered printed. No further action.  
H.J., 947 
C.G., 868 
(Printed. 30-1 H. rp. 733, serial 526)
June 26 Senate. Borland, from Comm. on Public Lands, to whom Whitney mem. was referred, reported joint resolution (S.joint resolution No.29) providing for a survey and exploration of one or more routes for a rr. from the Miss.river below the Falls of St.Anthony, to the Pacific Ocean, under the direction of the Sec.of War. Gave notice of certain amendments to resolution to be proposed when it came up for consideration. Resolution read and passed to second reading. Report ordered printed S.J.,419
C.G.,873
(30-1,S rp.191,serial 512)
(No further action in 30-1)(S.297)

June 27 Senate. Niles, by unanimous consent, introduced bill to carry out Whitney plan. Discussion, Niles and Breese. Referred to select committee: Niles, Corwin, Lewis, Bell, Felch.
S.J.,422
C.G.,875 (See S.J.455 and 510 for further action)

June 29 House, Darling-number citizens of Ceresco,Wis. versus Whitney plan. To Comm. on R. & C.,
H.J.,513, 970

June 30 Senate. Walker-petition of citizens of Wis.,against appropriation of lands, for rr.,Lake Michigan to Pacific. To the Select Comm.
S.J.,432.

S.J.,455
C.G.,905

July 26 Senate. Breese-resolution for surveys (see July 28) submitted
S.J.,455.

July 28 Senate. Breese-res. for select comm. to consider expediency of continuing Fremont surveys to discover practical rr.route. Agreed to. (Resolution printed in full) Committee: Breese,Borland, Clarke, Dodge, Metcalfe. Res.submitted July 26, S.J.496. Taken up for consideration July 28 and agreed to-comm.appointed by Vice Pres.on motion of Breese.
S.J.,504, C.G.,1008
July 29 Senate. Niles moved to take up Whitney bill of Select Comm. Benton moved to lay motion on table; done 27 to 21. Yeas and nays desired by 1/5 of Senators present, taken.

S.J., 510-511
C.G., 1011

(No further action on bill)

Aug. 1 Senate. Breese, from Select Comm. on continuing Fremont explorations, reported. Report ordered printed. (30-1, S.rp. 226, serial 512)

S.J., 519
C.G., 1024

Aug. 5 Senate. Amendment to civil and diplomatic appropriation bill appropriating $30,000 for continuing Fremont explorations. concurred in, 18 to 16, Bill passed. Yeas and nays taken, on motion of Johnson of Md.

C.G., 1044
S.J., 539

Aug. 8 Senate. Niles proposed Whitney bill as amendment to bill granting State of Ala. right of way of donation of public lands for making a rr. from Mobile to mouth of Ohio river. After some discussion withdrew amendment.

C.G., 1051

Aug. 8 House. Committee on Road and Canals discharged from several petitions (listed) on Pacific rr. and laid on table.

H.J., 1198

Aug. 12 House by accepting recommendation of conference com. refused to concur in Senate amendment to civil and diplomatic appropriation bill for continuing Fremont exploration, 29 to 128.

H.J., 1263
C.G., 1059.
   S.J., 51
   C.G., 20

Dec. 11 House. Polloch—resolution (given) that House Bill No. 468, W. bill, be made special order of the day for the first Tuesday in January, and continue from day to day until disposed. Debate arose and resolution laid over one day.
   C.G., 25
   H.J., 64
   (See H.J., 328 for further action)

   H.J., 77

Dec. 11 House. Thompson of Ind—resolution (given) for select comm. on expediency of law for reconnoissance of route for rr. from Miss. valley to the Pacific. Debate arose, laid over.
   H.J., 72
   C.G., 26

Dec. 11 House. Rockwell (of Conn.) notice of motion for leave to introduce joint resolution authorizing surveys of a route for a canal or railroad between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.
   H.J., 71
   C.G., 25


   H.J. 85
Dec. 14 Senate. Benton, from Comm. on Military Affairs, to which Aspinwall mem. on Panama rr. had been referred, reported bill (S. 352) for carrying out request of memorialists. Read 1 and 2 time. On motion of Benton made special order for Monday next.
   S.J., 64
   C.G., 40
   (30-2, S.misc. doc. 1, serial 533)

   S.J., 65
   C.G., 45

Dec. 18 Senate. Discussion of Panama rr. bill. No action
   S.J., 68
   C.G., 49

Dec. 18 House. Cummins—resolution (given) for investigation by Com. on Military Affairs into expediency of constructing military road from Westport, Mo., or some other suitable point, to some suitable point on Bay of San Francisco. Agreed to.
   H.J., 109

Dec. 18 House. Rockwell of Conn.—joint resolution (H.joint res.No. 42) to authorize survey of routes for canal or rr. between Atlantic and Pacific oceans. Read 1 & 2, and referred to select committee (See.Dec.27)
   H.J., 111
   C.G., 56 (Comm.appointed Dec.23,H.J.147)

   S.J., 69
   C.G., 59
   (30–2, S.misc.doc.6, serial 533)

   H.J., 122

Dec. 21 Senate. On request of Cameron. Tues. week named by Douglas as next date for discussion of Panama rr. bill.
   C.G., 78
Dec. 22. Senate. Johnson of Md.—resolution (given) calling on President to furnish Senate copy of official dispatch from Mr. Wheaton to the Secretary of State, dated at Berlin, Dec. 17, 1845, concerning a communication between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, and the Mediterranean sea, with maps. Laid over.

S.J., 79
C.G., 86


H.J., 146-7
C.G., 95


H.J., 147
C.G., 112

Dec. 27 Senate. Res. submitted by Johnson Dec. 22 taken up. Johnson stated that communication had since been received obviating necessity of adoption of rrs.; on his motion, res. laid on table. (Letter on Panama canal)

S.J., 86
C.G., 101

Dec. 28 House. Fries—memorial of A.L. Frazer, of Steubenville, Ohio, proposing to construct a rr. from St. Louis or some other suitable point, to San Francisco and asking a donation of public lands for the same. To Comm. on Public Lands.

H.J., 163-4.
C.G., 120

1849
Jan. 2 Senate. Davis of Miss., from Com. on Military Affairs, 3 additional documents of Panama rr. Ordered translated and printed.

(30-2, S. misc. doc. 6, serial 533)
S.J., 94
C.G., 130

Jan. 3 Senate. Sebastian, mem. from the General Assembly of Arkansas, setting forth the advantages of a national road from Fort Smith to Santa Fe, by way of the valley of the Canadian, and asking for an act to survey and open road. To Com. on Military Affairs.

S.J., 96
C.G., 143
Jan.8 Senate. Borland—petition from William Bayard and Co., for a charter right of way and grant of lands for a rr. from the Miss. river to California. To Comm. on Public Lands.

S.J.,108
C.G.,181

Jan.8 Senate. Houston—resolution (given) for special com. on building rr. to Pacific for military road. Read and ordered printed.

S.J.,109
C.G.,182 (30-2, S.misc.doc.12.533)

Jan.9 Senate. Bradbury—memorial of Wells and Co., aid of Congress in construction of rr. across Isthmus of Tehauntepec. To Com. on Military Affairs and ordered printed, after motion of Bradbury to refer to Comm. on Post Office and Post Roads was refused.

S.J.,112
C.G.,190 (S.misc.doc.13, serial 533)

Jan.9 House. Levin—res(given) that Com. on Engraving be directed to contract for 10,000 copies of Fremont's map. Agreed to.

H.J.,222
C.G.,190


H.J.225,
C.G.204


H.J.,226

Jan.15 Senate. Dickinson—petition from citizens of Buffalo, N.Y., national rr. from the Mo. to the Pacific. To Com. on Roads and Canals.

S.J.,126
C.G.,253

Jan.16 House. King of Ga.—from Com. on Naval Affairs, report on Panama rr. with bill (H.R.No.721). Bill read 1st and 2nd; referred to Comm. of the Whole. Report ordered printed. (30-2 H.rp.26, serial 545) King's motion to print 10,000 extra copies of report & map to Comm. on Engraving & Printing. Motion to make bill special order of the day objected to and not entertained.

H.J.,207
C.G.,268
    H.J.271  
    C.G.,285

    H.J.,269  
    C.G.,285

Jan.19 House. Tallmadge—mem. of Francis A. Carpenter and others, citizens of Lancaster county, Pa., asking adoption of plan proposed by George Wilkes, for foundation of a rr. from the Missouri to the Pacific. To select comm. for the survey of routes for canal or rr. between the Atlantic and Pacific ocean.  
    H.J.,282  
    C.G.,306

Jan.23 Senate. Dickinson—petition of Hartwell Carver and his associates, for a grant of land, and a charter for constructing a rr. from Lake Michigan to the Pacific Ocean. To Com. on Roads and Canals.  
    S.J.,141  
    C.G.,324

Jan.24 Senate. Houston—petition from Ebenezen Ellen, and other citizens of Texas praying for a right of way for a rr. from the Rio Grande to the Pacific. To Com. on Public Lands and ordered printed (30-2,S. misc.doc.33, serial 533)  
    S.J.,146  
    C.G.,338

    H.J.,536, 314.

Jan.25 Senate. Borland—memorial of 200 citizens of Arkansas, for construction of a rr. from Memphis, on Miss. to the Pacific Ocean. To Com. on Public Lands.  
    S.J.,528, 149  
    C.G.,357

H.J., 536, 314
C.G., 338

Jan. 29 Senate. Niles-motion to take up Whitney bill (S.297) agreed to after discussion. Amendment, changing route to Cal. instead of Oregon, presented by Foote and ordered printed. Amendment of Borland to strike out all after enacting clause and substitute provision for survey of routes, ordered printed. Further consideration postponed to Monday next. No further action.

C.G., 381
S.J., 160


S.J., 160
C.G., 382

Jan. 29 House. Polloch—after objection was made to his request for general consent to take up and consider a resolution that Whitney bill be special order for 1st Tues. in January, H.J., 328, and continue from day to day until disposed of, moved that rules be suspended for purpose of considering resolution. Vote on suspension of rules decided without a division in negative. So resolution not received.

H.J., 328
C.G., 388

Jan. 30 Senate. Resumed consideration of Panama rr. bill. Adjourned without a decision.

S.J., 167
C.G., 398.

Jan. 30 House. Thompson of Ky., from Com. on Printing, to whom was referred motion to print 10,000 extra copies of the King report on Panama rr., reported resolution that printing be done, and moved previous question. Burt moved that resolution be laid on table, decided in negative by vote of Speaker. Unanimous vote to order main question. Resolution adopted, 96-36. Yeas and nays taken on the vote; also on vote on resolution.

H.J., 339, 40.
C.G., 402.
Jan. 31 Senate. Davis of Miss. from Com. on Military Affairs, joint resolution (S.R. 54) for survey of routes from Miss. valley to the Pacific, report, ordered printed. Resolution read first time and made special order for Wednesday next. Feb. 7. (No further action)
S.J., 169
C.G., 409
(30-2, S.rp. 276, serial 535)

S.J., 171
C.G., 411

Feb. 6 Senate. Foote—petition of P.H. Hargons, Tehauntepec route rr. to be built by petitioner. Ordered printed. (S.misc.doc. 50, serial 533)
S.J., 186
C.G., 455

Feb. 6 Senate. Bell—memorial of Wm. A. Bradley and others, aid in construction of a road and mail route from St. Louis to Pacific. Explanation by Bell—stage coach relays. To Com. on Post Office and Post Roads.
S.J., 185
C.G., 455

Feb. 6 Senate. Resumed consideration of Panama rr. bill.
S.J., 182 (No further action)
C.G., 451

Feb. 6 House. Truman Smith—petition of Henry Betts of Peekskill, N.Y., praying authority to build and grant of public land to aid in construction of rr. from the Mo. to the Pacific. To Com. on Roads and Canals.
H.J., 380

Feb. 7 Senate. Benton on National Central Highway; on leave, bill (S. 451, given) for construction, read twice, to Com. on Military affairs.
S.J., 192
C.G., 470

Feb. 9 Senate. Dickinson—petition from citizens of Troy, N.Y., favor Dr. Hartwell Carver project. To Comm. on Roads and Canals.
S.J., 198
C.G., 488
Feb. 12 Senate. Sebastian—petition of Wm. Pelham and others, construction of rr. from Memphis or some other point on Miss. to the Pacific. Laid on table.

S.J., 205
C.G., 504


S.J., 225
C.G., 550

Feb. 17 Senate. Feb. 17. Foote—memorial from Jesse E. Dow and others, proposing to open route to Pacific by plank road over Tehauntepec, on condition of contract to transport mails, etc. To Com. on Post Office and Post Roads. Ordered printed. (30-2, S.misc.doc.56, serial 533)

S.J., 225
C.G., 550

Feb. 17 Senate. Rush, from Com. on Post Office and Post Roads, bill (S.467) to establish mail route between Miss. river and California, Pres. to determine points. Read 1 and ordered to 2 reading, report to be printed.

S.J., 226
C.G., 550
(No further action on bill)

Feb. 17 Senate. Houston, on leave, introduced bill (S.472) authorizing Galveston and Red River Railroad Company to construct and extend railway to the Pacific. Read 1, 2, and referred to Comm. on Territories.

S.J., 227
C.G., 551
(No further action)


H.J., 475

Feb. 20 Senate. King—memorial from Dennis Keenan, Jr., grant of land for the construction of a rr and magnetic telegraph from Point Isabel to the Pacific Ocean. To Com. on Military Affairs.

S.J., 232
C.G., 560
Feb. 20 House. Rockwell of Conn.—report from select com. on joint resolution (H.R. 42) to survey canal and rr. routes between Atlantic and Pacific. Resolution reported back with amendment. To Comm. of the Whole. Com. on Printing ordered to inquire into expediency of printing extra copies, and Com. on Engraving, expediency of engraving maps attached. (30-2, H.rp.145, serial 546)

C.G., 566

Feb. 19 House. Phelps, petition of citizens of Lafayette county, Missouri, establishment of regular commercial communication between valley of the Miss. and California.

H.J., 477
C.G., 572

Feb. 20 House. Richardson—2 petitions citizens Mount Sterling and Perry County, Illinois, safe and regular comm. communication between Miss. valley and Cal. To Com. on Military Affairs.

H.J., 491


C.G., 591

Feb. 26 Senate. Dix—petition from citizens of Attica (N.Y.) favor Carver project. To Com. on Military Affairs.

S.J., 258
C.G., 593

Feb. 27 Senate. Borland—two petitions from citizens of Arkansas, railroad from the Miss. to the Pacific. Laid on table.

S.J., 265
C.G., 600

Mar. 1 Senate. Benton, from Com. on Military Affairs, reported bill (S.451) for Central National Road without amendment. (No further action)

S.J., 283
C.G., 625

Mar. 1 Senate. Benton—motion to take up consideration of Panama bill. On motion of Atherton, Benton's motion laid on table.

C.G., 626
Mar. 2  House. Johnson of Ark—petition of citizens of Arkansas, survey of route from the Miss. via Fort Smith, Santa Fe or El Paso to the Pacific. To the Com. on the Judiciary.
H.J. 609
C.G., 666
In 31 Congress. 1st session
Senate Journal, serial 548
House Journal, serial 566
Congressional Globe.

1849.

Dec. 24 President Taylor's annual message, dated Dec. 4, sent to Congress. Recommendation to attention of congress of need of overland communication to the Pacific.
H.J., 169-182
S.J., 16-29
(31-1, H.ex.doc.5, serial 569, pp. 7-9)
(31-1 S.ex.doc.1, serial 549,)
C.G., 31-1, p. 70

Dec. 24 Senate. Rusk (Thomas J., Texas)—memorial of William Bayard, that he be authorized to contract with the government for establishing a direct line of overland communication from St. Louis to San Francisco. To Com. on Post Office and Post Roads and printed. (S.misc.doc.2, serial 563)(Roads-relay; no mention of rr.)
S.J., 13
C.G., 74

S.J., 13
C.G., 74

Dec. 24 Senate. Sebastian (Wm. K., Arkansas)—submitted resolution (given) calling for Simpson report on Fort Smith to Santa Fe route.
S.J., 15
C.G., 74

Dec. 27 Senate. Jones—3 petitions of citizens of Iowa, praying the construction of a railroad from the Missouri river to the Pacific. To Com. on Public Lands.
S.J., 32
C.G., 86

Dec. 31 Home. Green—two memorials of citizens of Missouri, establishment safe and regular commercial communication between California and the Mississippi valley. To Com. on Military Affairs.
H.J., 197


H.J., 199
C.G., 91


H.J., 199.

Jan. 3. Senate. Vice President (Fillmore)—memorial of St. Louis Convention, held October, 1849, praying the adoption of measures for constructing a national railroad and electric telegraph from the Mississippi river to the Pacific ocean. Laid on table on motion of Benton.

S.J., 548, 47
C.G., 97


S.J., 47
C.G., 97


S.J., 51
C.G., 99


H.J., 235
C.G., 108


S.J., 66
C.G., 123
S.J.,66
C.G.,126

Jan.9 Senate. Vote on motion to print Simpson report reconsidered. (see Jan.8). On motion of Sebastian, question of printing referred to Com. on Printing.
S.J.,68

Jan.14 Senate. Webster—petition of P.P.F. Degrand and others, proposing to construct a railroad and establish a line of telegraph from St. Louis to San Francisco, praying an act of incorporation, a loan of United States stock, and a right of way through the public land. To Com. on Roads and Canals. Webster's motion to print, with map, referred to Com. on Printing.
S.J.,71
C.G. 149 To Com. on Public Lands. Remarks by Webster.

Jan.14 Senate. Borland (Solon, Arkansas) from Com. on Printing, report on motion to print Simpson report—agreed to and ordered the report be printed; 2000 extra copies for use of Senate—500 for use of topographical bureau. Maps. (See Jan.9)
(S.ex.doc.12,serial 554)
S.J.,76
C.G.,150

Jan.14 Senate. Report of Borland, from Com. on Printing, that memorial of Panama Railroad Company be not printed, concurred in. (See Jan.9)
S.J.,76
C.G.,150

Jan.15 Senate. Vote (see Jan.14) on printing memorial of Panama Railroad Company reconsidered and on motion of Smith (Truman, Conn.) subject recommitted to Com. on Printing.
S.J.,80

Jan.15 Senate. Report of Borland, (see Jan.14) from Com. on Printing, that Degrand petition be printed. concurred in. (S.misc.doc.doc.28,serial 563)
S.J.,80-1
C.G.,158.
Jan.21 House. Duncan—memorial of citizens of State of Massachusetts, praying for a general banking law of the United States by means of which to secure the immediate construction of a rr. to the Pacific. To Comm. on Ways and Means.
   H.J.,369

   H.J.,369

Jan.21 Senate. Douglas—memorial of William Archer. To Com. on Roads and Canals. 3 tracks the whole way; not a dollar from the national treasury.
   S.J.,548, 93
   C.G.,p.196

   S.J.,93
   C.G.,196

Jan.21 Senate. Borland, (see Jan.15) from Com. on Printing, reported in favor of printing memorial of Panama Railroad Company. Ordered printed.
   S.J.,94
   C.G.,197
   (S.miss.doc.30,serial 563)
   (Jno.W.Ludlow,president of Company, whish is successor of Aspinwall, Stephens, and Chauncey, who are still connected with company)

   S.J.,96
   C.G.,209

Jan.22 House. Winthrop—petition of citizens of Boston, Mass.,charter to construct a rr. and telegraph line from St.Louis to San Francisco.(Degrand?). To Com. on Public Lands.
   H.J.,384
H.J.,397

Jan.24 House. On motion of Bayly (Thos.H.,Va.) Comm.on Ways and Means discharged from further consideration of memorial of William Archer (see Jan.21) Laid on table. Bayly said plan was a visionary matter and any other reference was not necessary.
H.J.,397
C.G.,220

Jan.28 Senate. Dickinson—memorial of Hartwell Carver and his associates, praying an act of incorporation and the aid of the govt. to enable them to construct a rr. from Lake Michigan to the Pacific ocean. To Com. on Roads and Canals.
S.J.,110
C.G.,230

Jan.28 Senate. Clay—petition of citizens of Lexington, Ky., that Columbus, Ky., may be eastern terminus proposed rr. to Pacific. To Com. on Roads and Canals.
S.J.,113

Jan.28 House. Speaker (Howell Cobb of Ga.)—memorial of Thomas Allan and others, a committee of a meeting assembled at St.Louis, Mo., praying that measures be taken by Congress for the location and construction of a national rr., electric telegraph and a line of military posts across the central part of the continent, from the Mississippi river to the Pacific ocean. To Com. on Roads and Canals.
H.J.,406
C.G.,228

Jan.28 House. Chandler—resolutions Pennsylvania Legislature relative to Whitney plan. Laid on table and printed. Also by Moore; also by Fridley—to Comm. on Roads and Canals and printed. (H.misc.doc.21,serial 581, Favorable)
H.J.,411.

Jan.29 House. William J. Brown—proceedings of a meeting held at Indianapolis,Ind., in relation to the construction of a rr. on Asa Whitney's plan to the Pacific. To Com. on Roads and Canals.
H.J.,428.
Jan. 29 House. Robert W. Johnson (Arkansas)—notice of motion for leave to introduce resolution calling for Simpson report on Fort Smith to Santa Fe route and other information.

H.J., 426


H.J., 434
C.G., 261


H.J., 471

Feb. 6 House. R.W. Johnson, Ark., on motion of Secy. of War called upon for Simpson report and any other information he may have on route from Fort Smith to Santa Fe. (See Jan. 29)

H.J., 474
C.G., 294

Feb. 7 Senate. Vice President (Fillmore)—petition of G.P. Walker and other citizens of Iowa, construction of a rr. from Miss. valley to Pacific ocean. To Comm. on Roads and Canals.

S.J., 135
C.G., 309 S.P. Walker


H.J., 511
C.G., 341

Feb. 13 House. Robinson (Indiana)—sundry memorials of citizens of Philadelphia, Pa. of New York City; and the proceedings of meetings held at Dayton and Zanesville, and of the Chamber of Commerce of Cincinnati, Ohio; and also the proceeding of a meeting held at Louisville, Ky., relative to the plan of Asa Whitney and praying and recommending its adoption. To Comm. on Roads and Canals.

H.J., 519.
C.G., 352. "Resolutions and petitions unanimously adopted and numerously signed by large and respectable public meetings, and highly respectable names and firms, since the two conventions were held at St. Louis and at Memphis, all declaring Mr. Whitney's plan to be.
Feb. 13. House. Robinson (cont)
'the only feasible plan, the only one that would not involve constitutional, sectional, and other difficulties sure to impede and finally stop the progress of the work,' requesting their Senators and Representatives and praying Congress to pass a law without delay to carry out Mr. Whitney's plan.

Resolutions adopted at a large public meeting called by the Chamber of Commerce at Cincinnati, October 12, 1849, Chamber of Commerce at Louisville, Ky., Nov. 22, 1849, Chamber of Commerce at Dayton, Ohio, Dec. 1, 1849, Chamber of Commerce at Zanesville, Ohio; Dec. 6, 1849.

The Petition of R.F. Fairchild and 25 others, of N.Y.
The Petition of C. Tucker and 103 others of N.Y.
The Petition of J.W. Rychman and 470 others of N.Y.
The Petition of John Broadhead and 22 others of Phila.
The Petition of J.R. Chardon, B. Richardson and Son and 35 others of Philadelphia.
The Petition of Col. James Page and 61 others of Phila."

Feb. 15 Senate. On motion of Hamlin (Hannibal, Maine) Com. on Commerce discharged from further consideration of memorial of Panama Railroad Company. To Com. on Naval Affairs.

S.J., 156
C.G., 370

Feb. 15 Senate. Borland asked and obtained leave to bring in a joint resolution (S.R. 9) concerning a communication between the Mississippi river and the Pacific. Read 1st and 2nd times and referred to Com. on Public Lands.

S.J., 156
C.G., 371
(No further action. Index to S.J.)

Feb. 15 House. Crowell—petition of citizens of Youngstown, Ohio, survey and location of a rr. from the Mississippi valley to the Pacific. To Com. on Public Lands

H.J., 537
C.G., 369. Congress to appropriate strip of land 36 miles wide, from Lake Michigan to the Pacific Ocean, for the construction of a rr. and appointing directors, with certain salaries, for the management thereof.
   H.J. 538
   C.G. 369

   S.J. 164
   C.G. 390

Feb.21 House. Secretary of War transmitted, in compliance with request of Feb. 6, Simpson report and map on Fort Smith to Santa Fe route. To Com. on Military Affairs and printed. (H.ex.doc.45, serial 577)
   H.J. 591
   C.G. 409

Feb.25 Senate. Pearce—resolution (given) calling on Secretary of War for information on California. Agreed to.
   S.J. 175
   C.G. 416

Feb.25 House. Bowlin (James B., Missouri)—motion that rules be suspended to allow him to offer resolution (given) on power of Congress to build Pacific rr. Motion lost for lack of 2/3 in favor.
   H.J. 602
   C.G. 413

Feb.25 Senate. Resolution of Pearce, calling on Secretary of War for information on geology and topography of California agreed to. (See Pr.3)
   S.J. 175

Feb.25 House. Stanton, Frederick P. (Tennessee)—memorial of Memphis Convention praying Congress to cause to be surveyed the several routes for a rr. from the valley of the Mississippi river to the Pacific ocean. Stanton moved to refer it to select committee. Debate arising thereon, it was laid upon the table under the rule.
   H.J. 608
   C.G. 414

Feb.27 Senate. Benton—memorial of the directors of the Pacific Railroad Company of Missouri, grant of land and right of way. Laid on table. Motion of Benton to print referred to Com. on Printing.
   S.J. 178
   C.G. 428 (Notice of motion to print or reference of motion to print not given)
S.J., 178
C.G., 428, To Com. on Public Lands.

Feb. 27 Senate. Corwin—petition of citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, favor Whitney project. To Com. on Roads and Canals.
S.J., 180
C.G., 429.

H.J., 616.

H.J., 617
C.G., 428.

S.J., 183
C.G., 425.

Feb. 28 Senate. In recommendation of Borland, from Comm. on Printing, memorial Pacific Railroad Company ordered printed.
S.J., 185-6
C.G., 436
(S.misc.doc.59, serial 563, Road from St. Louis to western line of Cass county, Mo., Company chartered by Missouri.)

Mar. 4 House. Bowlin—petition Mississippi and Pacific Railroad Company. (Same as Pacific Railroad Company? wanted same.) To Com. on Public Lands.
H.J., 629
C.G., 499.

Mar. 7 House. Hammond, from Com. on Engraving, reported resolution (given) that Com. on Engraving be authorized to contract for 1450 sets of maps and drawings accompanying report on Fort Smith to Santa Fe route, cost not to exceed $320. Read, considered, and agreed to.
H.J., 642
C.G., 473.
Mar. 8 House. Horace Mann (Mass.)—petition of H.A.S. Dearborn and others, favor Degrand project. To Com. on Public Lands.

H.J., 648
C.G., 493

Mar. 13 House. Robinson (John L. of Indiana) from Com. on Roads and Canals, reported bill (No. 156) to carry out the Whitney project. Report. Bill read first and second time—committed to the Com. of the Whole. Bill and report ordered printed. On motion of Mr. Robinson, Com. on Printing ordered to inquire into expediency of printing extra number of copies of report.

(H rp.no 140, serial 583) (No further action—H.J. index.)

H.J., 662
C.G., 511

Mar. 15 Senate. Walker (Isaac P., Wisconsin) asked and obtained leave to bring in bill (S. 154) to provide the incipient measures necessary for the construction of a rr. from the Mississippi river to the Pacific ocean. Read 1st and 2nd times by unanimous consent and referred to Com. on Roads and Canals.

S.J., 214 (No further action—index S.J.)
C.G., 539–540.

Bill given. Remarks of Walker. To Com. on commerce.


C.G., 549. Hour speech by Bowlin (Missouri) in opposition to bill. (Speech not given here)


Mar. 19 House. Rumsey (N.Y.)—proposal of William Bayard to carry the mail overland to California. To Com. on Post Office and Post Roads.

H.J., 687

Mar. 20 House. Report of Com. on Printing on printing extra copies of Robinson report, first order of day. Question of agreeing to report laid on table on motion of Jones (Geo.W., Tenn.)

H.J., 690
Mar.22 Senate. Bell-resolutions Tennessee Legislature on subject of constructing rr. across the continent—selection of a suitable route for the same. Laid on table and printed.
S.J.,229
C.G.,584
(S/misc.doc.75,serial 563. Surveys before action taken. Centrality ought to be important consideration in selection of route.)

Mar.26 Senate. Sebastian-memorial of citizens of Arkansas, construction of a rr. from the Mississippi river to the Pacific ocean. To Com. on Indian Affairs.
S.J.,236
C.G.,601. Advantages of Memphis to Monterey route over Whitney or isthmus routes.

H.J.,712

H.J.,721

Apr.3 Senate. Report of Sec. of War on geology and topography of Cal. submitted. Question of printing to Com. on Printing. (See Feb.25)
S.J.,246

Apr.4 Senate. Clay—memorial signed by members of the General Assembly of Kentucky, that Columbus, Ky. be made eastern terminus of a rr. to Pacific ocean. To Com. on Roads and Canals and printed.
S.J.,254
C.G.,638
(S/misc.doc.84,serial 563, Govt. asked to cause route to be surveyed and to have report on advantages and disadvantages of this and other routes made.)

Apr.8 Senate. Vice President (Fillmore)—resolutions adopted at a convention held at Philadelphia, Pa., favor adoption of measures by Congress for construction of a rr. to connect navigable waters of Mississippi with Pacific ocean. To Com. on Roads and Canals.
S.J.,260
C.G.,655
Apr. 3 House. Hall—petition of citizens of Missouri, that St. Joseph's, Mo., may be made the starting point of the Mississippi and San Francisco railway. To Comm. on Public Lands.

H.J., 755

Apr. 26 House. Frederick P. Stanton—memorial of the Memphis convention, praying survey of the several routes for a rr. from the Mississippi valley to the Pacific ocean. To Com. on Naval Affairs.

H.J., 852.

May 1 Senate. Resolution (given) calling on the Secretary of War for Marcy report on Fort Smith to Santa Fe expedition submitted by Borland, considered and agreed to.

S.J., 316

C.G., 884


H.J., 880

May 6 Senate. Borland, from Com. on Printing, report on printing report of Sec. of War on Cal., made (April 3) instant. Report ordered printed and 5000 extra copies. (See April 3)

S.J., 324

May 13 Senate. Report of Sec of War in reply to call for Marcy report laid before Senate and read. (See May 1)

S.J., 331

C.G., 984. Report stated that Marcy report had been transmitted to House and printed but would be submitted to Senate in manuscript as soon as practicable if required.


H.J., 950

(H.ex.doc.67, serial 577)

May 28 Senate. Dickinson—memorial of William Archer, proposing plan for creating fund for construction of a rr. from Washington to San Francisco. To Com. on Finance.

S.J., 364
June 4 House. Anderson—joint resolutions Tenn. Leg., favor of the appropriation of public lands for the construction of a rr. from the Mississippi to the Pacific ocean. To Com. on Roads and Canals. H.J., 984

June 5 Senate. On motion of Dickinson, ordered that William Archer have leave to withdraw his memorial presented May 29. (May 28, none May 29)
S.J., 373

June 7 House. Friedley—petition of Dr. Jacob Dewees, of Washington County, Pa., relation to a rr. from the Atlantic States to the Pacific ocean. To Com. on Roads and Canals.
H.J., 989
C.G., 1151. Montgomery county.

S.J., 391
C.G., 1191

June 14 House. On motion of Burt, ordered that Com. on Military Affairs be discharged from further consideration of memorial of General Assembly of Arkansas for national highway from Fort Smith to Santa Fe and California, and that it be referred to the Com. on Roads and Canals. (See Mar. 27)
Was referred to Com. on Roads and Canals.
H.J., 1007

Aug. 1 House. Frederich P. Stanton, from Com. on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred memorial of Memphis Convention reported a bill (No. 368) providing for certain surveys, accompanied by a report. Read 1st and 2nd times and referred to the Com. of the Whole. Bill and report ordered printed.
H.J., 1217
C.G., 1491.
(H.rp. 439, serial 585)
(No further action on bill. Index, p. 1662)

Sept. 12 Senate. On motion of Davis of Mississippi ordered that Marcy report be printed as part of S. ex. doc. no. 64. Serial 562.
S.J., 624
C.G., 1809.
Sept. 12 Senate. Bright, from Committee on Roads and Canals, submitted bill (S.333) to carry out Whitney project. Read and passed to second reading. Report ordered printed.
S.J., 625
C. 1809
(S. rep. 194, serial 565)
(No further action. Index to S.J.)

Sep. 12 Senate. Fremont—bill (S.334) for opening road across the Sierra Nevada on the line of the Rio de los Americanos and Carson's river and the pass at their head, as commencement of opening a common traveling road to California. To Com. on Roads and Canals.
S.J., 625.
C.G., 1809, bill given.
(No further action. Index to S.J.)

Sept. 16 House. Gilbert—joint resolutions of Cal. legislature, relation to a national rr. from the Pacific ocean to the Miss. river. Laid on table and ordered printed.
H.J., 1471
(H.Misc.doc. 51, serial 582. Importance of immediate construction. Surveys of the several routes)

Sept. 17 Senate. Cooper—memorial of William Archer proposing plan for creating fund for construction of a rr. from Washington to San Francisco. To Com. on Finance. S.J., 639

Sept. 21 Senate. On motion of Sebastian, ordered that Com. on Indian Affairs be discharged from further consideration of petition of citizens of Arkansas for a rr. to the Pacific ocean. S.J., 658
31st Congress, 2 session.
Senate Journal, serial 586
House Journal, serial 594
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Dec. 2 President Fillmore's annual message. Importance of opening line of communication between the Mississippi valley and the Pacific—recommendation of Taylor in last annual message repeated.

S.J., 14
H.J., 16
C.G., 4

Recommended surveys. S.ex.doc.1, serial 587, p. 30
H.ex.doc.1, serial 595.

Dec. 16 Senate. Benton asked and obtained leave to bring in a bill (S. 373) to provide for the location and construction of a central national highway from the Mississippi river, at St. Louis, to the Bay of San Francisco. Read 1st and 2nd times referred to Com. on Roads and Canals and ordered printed.

S.J., 38
C.G., 56-58. Benton's speech and the bill given. (No further action. Index to S.J.)

Dec. 19 Senate. Jones, (George W., Iowa) memorial of John Plumbe, praying the construction of a national railroad from the valley of the Mississippi to the Pacific ocean. To Com. on Roads and Canals.

S.J., 46
C.G., 94. Plumbe claims to be the first advocate of this road—7 years ahead of any else in memorializing Congress for a road to connect Atlantic and Pacific.

Dec. 23 House. Stanly (Edward, North Carolina) moved that the rules be suspended to enable him to introduce a resolution (given) to grant use of hall of the House to Asa Whitney to explain his project, on such evening as he may designate.

Decided in negative—2/3 not in favor of suspending rules.

H.J., 82
C.G., 113

Dec. 30 Senate. Givin—resolutions of the legislature of California, favor of construction of a national rr. from the Mississippi river to the Pacific ocean.

To Com. on Roads and Canals and printed. S.J., 55
(S.misc.doc.4, serial 592, immediate construction surveys)

S.J., 65
C.G., 178

Jan. 6 Senate. Dodge of Iowa—resolution of Iowa Legislature, favor construction of a military road from Council Bluffs to Sacramento City, To Com. on Roads and Canals.

S.J., 66
C.G., 178

By Jones, also—to Com. on Military Affairs.


H.J., 131
C.G., 225

Jan. 13 House. Alexander H. Stephens (Georgia) moved that rules be suspended to enable him to introduce resolution (given to grant use of this hall to Asa Whitney, to explain his railroad project, on Saturday evening next. Decided in affirmative, yeas 129, nays 54—yeas and nays called for—taken. So rules suspended. Resolution agreed to by House. Stephens moved to reconsider and to lay motion to reconsider on table. Done. H.J., 136-8


Jan. 15 Senate. Davis of Miss., from Com. on Military Affairs, adverse report on res. Iowa Legislature for military road to Sacramento. Printed. (S.rp.240, serial 593)

S.J., 86
C.G., 250

Jan. 20 Senate. Resolution (given) submitted by Givin calling on Secretary of War for copy of Whipple report on route from San Diego to the Colorado, agreed to.

S.J., 95
C.G., 285

---------
Feb. 1 Senate. Whipple report transmitted by Secretary of War. Ordered printed on motion of Davis of Miss. (S. ex. doc. 19, serial 589)
   S.J., 137
   C.G., 410

   H.J., 226
   C.G., 436
"Six different petitions, signed by 780 highly respectable and influential firms and names of Philadelphia; praying the immediate adoption of Mr. Whitney's plan for a railroad to the Pacific, as the only feasible and unconstitutional mode of accomplishing the great and desirable object."

Feb. 19 Senate. Resolution (given) of Downs (Solomon U., La.) calling on Secretary of War for report of Sidell on rr. route surveyed from Great Bend, on Red river, to Providence, La., on Mississippi, submitted for consideration.
   S.J., 193
   C.G., 611

Feb. 24 Senate. Givin—memorial of John Plumbe, in behalf of the settlers and miners of Sacramento, Cal., remonstrating against the granting of a charter to Asa Whitney for the construction of a rr. to the Pacific. To Com. on Roads and Canals.
   S.J., 210
   C.G., 671

Feb. 26 Senate. Downs resolution calling for Sidell report agreed to. (See Feb. 19)
   S.J., 219
   C.G., 709

   H.J., 360

   S.J., 228
   (S. ex. doc. 42, serial 591. Route surveyed for rr. from Lake Providence on the Miss. to Fulton, Ark. on Red River as"but the first link of a line to the Pacific." Entire practicable".)
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S.J.,125

Jan.30 House. Robinson (John L., Indiana) from Com. on Roads and Canals reported a bill (No.186) to set apart and sell to Asa Whitney of New York, a portion of the public lands, to enable him to construct a rr. from Lake Michigan, or the Mississippi river, to the Pacific ocean. Accompanied by report. Bill read 1st and 2nd time.

Robinson moved that it be committed to the Comm. of the Whole, and bill and report printed.

Dunham moved that it be referred to Com. on Public Lands. Question put on Robinson's motion; agreed to.

H.J.,296
C.G.,437.
(H.rp.101, serial 656)
(No further action on bill. Index H.J.)


S.J.,201
C.G.,541

Mar.3. Senate. Wade - memorial of A.W. Paul and others proposing to construct a rr. from the Missouri river to the Pacific ocean. To Com. on Public Lands.

H.J.,241
C.G.,665
Mar. 4 Senate. Givin—memorial of John Plume, in behalf of the settlers and miners of the city and county of Sacramento, California, remonstrating against the adoption of Asa Whitney's scheme. To Com. on Post Office and Post Roads.
S.J., 247

Mar. 5 Senate. Givin—resolutions adopted by the Settlers' and Miners' State Convention, held at Sacramento City, Cal., urging the immediate construction of a rr. from the valley of the Mississippi to the Pacific. To Com. on Roads and Canals.
S.J., 247

S.J., 298.

S.J., 301

Mar. 31. Senate. On motion of Felch, Com. on Public Lands discharged from further consideration of memorial of A. Anderson and of A.W. Paul (see Jan. 19 and Mar. 3) and they were referred to Com. on Roads and Canals.
S.J., 323.

Apr. 1 Senate. Rush (Texas) from the Committee on Post Office and Post Roads, reported bill (S.334) to set apart and sell a portion of the public lands for the construction of certain railroads to the Pacific ocean. Read and passed to 2nd reading.
S.J., 326.

C.G., 941—Statement of Rush—he does not fully concur in the bill he is instructed by the majority of the committee to report. Objection principally that a bill more likely to pass and effect the object of building the road could be framed. A matter of vast importance to the whole country.

Explanation of the bill: To set apart and sell to Asa Whitney a portion of the public lands to enable him to construct rr. from Lake Michigan on the Mississippi river to the Pacific ocean; also, to set apart and sell to Samuel L. Selden, Robert T.
Apr. 1 Senate. (Cont)
Scott, and their associates, portion of the public lands, to enable them to construct a rr. from a point on the west bank of the Miss. river, not north of Memphis, Tenn., to run thence to the Rio del Norte and the Pacific ocean, at Santiago or San Francisco, or some other suitable point.

Givin gave notice that when bill came up for consideration he would move to strike out the name of Asa Whitney, and of every other individual named in it.

Rush replied that there was an error in the title and that the latter part of the bill provided for a route south and has no names in it at all.
(No further action. Index S.J.)

Apr. 20. Senate. Stansbury report on Great Salt Lake valley transmitted by the Secretary of War. Laid on table.
S.J.,363
C.G.,1127
(Ordered printed in special session preceding and 5500 extra copies ordered printed Feb.9,1852 by resolution submitted by Douglas. S.J.,192)
(S.ex.doc.3, serial 608)

May 5 Senate. Borland—memorial of Robert Mills, proposing a plan for a rr. & telegraphic communication to the Pacific ocean. To Com. on Public Lands.
S.J.,390
C.G.,1240
(Printed in S.rp.344, serial 631)

May 6 House. Freeman (John D., Miss.) from the Com. on Public Lands reported favorably S.72, granting land to Mississippi for rr. from Brandon, on eastern border of Miss. "in the direction of Montgomery, Alabama;" also H.R. No.61, granting land to La., Miss. and Arkansas for construction of certain railroads. To Com. of Whole and printed.
S.J.,678
(No further action on bills. Index)
C.G.,1271-1274—speech of Freeman in favor of these bills as beginning of southern road to Pacific and in condemnation of Whitney plan

H.J.,730
June 9 Senate. Rush—memorial of Ovid F. Johnson and his associates, proposing to construct a rr. and line of telegraphs from New Orleans to San Francisco. To Com. on Post Office and Post Roads.

S.J. 461

July 7 House. Letter from acting secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Secretary of War, enclosing an estimate of the amount required to complete the surveys of routes from the valley of the Mississippi to the Pacific ocean. To Com. on Military Affairs and printed.

H.J. 870

(H.ex.doc.117, serial 648. To finish surveys called for by act of Mar. 3, 1849)

Aug. 18 Senate. Borland from Com. on Public Lands, report on Mills memorial (see May 5) Ordered printed.

S.J. 612

(§.rp.344, serial 631)
### Resolutions of State Legislatures in Favor of Whitmer's Project.

Considered and plan urged—not wholly favorable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Cong. Doc.</th>
<th>No. Serial Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Feb. 28, '47</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>30-2</td>
<td>S.doc. 104425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>30-2</td>
<td>S.doc. 1511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dec. 13, '47</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>30-1</td>
<td>S.misc.doc. 4511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dec. 20, '47</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>30-1</td>
<td>S.misc.doc. 5511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>Dec. 13, '47</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>30-1</td>
<td>S.misc.doc. 1511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conn.</td>
<td>Dec. 20, '47</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>30-1</td>
<td>S.misc.doc. 1851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dec. 12, '47</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>30-2</td>
<td>S.misc.doc. 5511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>favor C.G. p.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenn.</td>
<td>Jan. 17, '48</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>30-1</td>
<td>S.misc.doc. 29511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mar. 13, '48</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>30-1</td>
<td>S.misc.doc. 56511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>30-1</td>
<td>S.misc.doc. 56511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ill.</td>
<td>Mar. 1, '48</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>30-1</td>
<td>S.misc.doc. 76511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mar. 3, '48</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>30-1</td>
<td>S.misc.doc. 77511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mar. 3, '48</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>30-1</td>
<td>S.misc.doc. 55511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn.</td>
<td>Mar. 13, '48</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>30-1</td>
<td>H.misc.doc. 47523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan. 21, '50</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>30-1</td>
<td>S.misc.doc. 29563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mar. 15, '48</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>30-1</td>
<td>S.misc.doc. 29563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mar. 28, '48</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>30-1</td>
<td>H.misc.doc. 24581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mar. 22, '48</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>30-1</td>
<td>H.misc.doc. 55523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mar. 27, '48</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>30-1</td>
<td>H.misc.doc. 68523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apr. 17, '48</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>30-1</td>
<td>S.misc.doc. 124511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apr. 28, '48</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>30-1</td>
<td>H.misc.doc. 75523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May 8, '48</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>30-1</td>
<td>H.misc.doc. 75523</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Senate only
- 31-1, H.rp.
- 140, p.54
- 31-1, H.rp.
### Appendix C.
Memorials to Congress favor Whitney Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Memorialists</th>
<th>Committee referred to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>H.R.</td>
<td>Dec.29,1846</td>
<td>Ingersoll</td>
<td>Citizens of Philadelphia</td>
<td>Roads &amp; Canals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>H.R.</td>
<td>Jan.5,1847</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>H.R.</td>
<td>Jan.11.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>H.R.</td>
<td>Jan. 20.</td>
<td>Ingersoll</td>
<td>Citizens of Philadelphia</td>
<td>Public Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>H.R.</td>
<td>Jan. 18.</td>
<td>De Mott</td>
<td>Citizens of Philadelphia</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323</td>
<td>H.R.</td>
<td>Feb. 9.</td>
<td>Brinkerhoff</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-1</td>
<td>H.J.</td>
<td>513</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.J.</td>
<td>502</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| 486  | H.R.  | Mar.2, 1848| Root       | Citizens of Newark,Ohio       | Roads &amp; Canals                      |
| 619  | H.R.  | Mar.27,    | Giddings   | Citizens of Cleveland         | &quot;                                   |
| 679  | H.R.  | Apr.13.    | Crowell    | Citizens of Summit Co., Ohio  | Select Com. on W.                   |
| 740  | H.R.  | Apr.27.    | Crowell    | Citizens of Summit Co., Ohio  | Roads &amp; Canals                      |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>House presented</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Memorialists</th>
<th>Committee referred to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>printed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(S. misc. doc. 3, serial 563)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S180</td>
<td>S.</td>
<td>Feb. 27</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>Citizens of Cleveland</td>
<td>S. Roads &amp; Canals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S31</td>
<td>S.</td>
<td>June 12</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Citizens of Licking Co., Ohio</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-2</td>
<td>S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.J.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>586.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H.J.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>594.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D.

Memorials against Whitney Plan or any Similar Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Memorialists</th>
<th>Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>395</td>
<td>S. June 19, 1848 Hale</td>
<td>Citizens of Rosendale, Wis.</td>
<td>Public Lands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>881</td>
<td>H.R. June 10</td>
<td>Wm. G. Brown</td>
<td>Citizens of Wheeling, Va.</td>
<td>Select Com. on W.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>970</td>
<td>H.R. June 29</td>
<td>Darling</td>
<td>Citizens of Ceresco, Wis.</td>
<td>Roads &amp; Canals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432</td>
<td>S. June 30</td>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>Citizens of Wisconsin</td>
<td>Select Com. on Niles bill</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30-2.
None.

31-1.
None.

31-2.
S.J. 586.
H.J. 594.


32-1.
S.J. 610.
H.J. 632.

S247  S. Mar. 4, 1852 Gwin  John Plumbe, S. Post Office for settlers & Post Roads and miners of California.
## Memorials for a Pacific railroad, not specifying Whitney plan.

(* probably in favor of Whitney plan.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>p.</th>
<th>House Date</th>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Memorials of Plan citizens</th>
<th>Referred to Comm.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td>H.R. 1-22-46</td>
<td>Cathcart Elkhart Co. Ind.</td>
<td>Cong. to construct road to Oregon.</td>
<td>R. &amp; C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>446</td>
<td>H.R. 2-21-46</td>
<td>Hamlin Maine</td>
<td>*R.R. from Miss. R. to mouth of Col.</td>
<td>R. &amp; C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>S. 3-4-46</td>
<td>Hannegan Indiana</td>
<td>Natl. R.R. Miss. to mouth of Columbia.</td>
<td>Pub.L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>494</td>
<td>H.R. 3-5-46</td>
<td>Stark-weather Wayne Co. O.</td>
<td>Mo.R. to Pacific.</td>
<td>R. &amp; C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>525</td>
<td>H.R. 3-16-46</td>
<td>Brinkerhoff Richland Co. Ohio.</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>R. &amp; C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>525</td>
<td>H.R. 3-16-46</td>
<td>Stark-weather Stark Co., Ohio.</td>
<td>3 mem. Stark</td>
<td>R. &amp; C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>541</td>
<td>H.R. 3-19-46</td>
<td>Tilden Summit Co. O.</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>R. &amp; C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>541</td>
<td>H.R. 3-19-46</td>
<td>Stark-weather Stark Co.O.</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>R. &amp; C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>655</td>
<td>H.R. 4-9-46</td>
<td>Bowlin Peter von Schmidt, St. Louis, Mo.</td>
<td>St. Louis to Col. R.</td>
<td>Terr.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Memorials for a Pacific Railroad, not specifying Whitney plan.

(* probably in favor of Whitney plan.)

29-2
S.J., serial 492.
H.J., serial 496

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P.</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Memorials of citizens</th>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Referred to Comm.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wilkes &amp; Wilkes others, 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>S.</td>
<td>12-21-46</td>
<td>Dix</td>
<td>Wilkes &amp; 1200 citizens NY.</td>
<td></td>
<td>R. &amp; C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>H.R.</td>
<td>12-22-46</td>
<td>Maclay</td>
<td>same as above</td>
<td></td>
<td>R. &amp; C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>S.</td>
<td>1-4-47</td>
<td>Cameron</td>
<td>Dayton, Ohio * Land grant for R.R. Lake Mich. to Pac.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pub.L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>S.</td>
<td>1-5-47</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>Dayton, Ohio * Land grant for R.R. Lake Mich. to Pac.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pub.L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>S.</td>
<td>1-25-47</td>
<td>Cameron</td>
<td>Carbon Co. * &quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>R. &amp; C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pa.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>S.</td>
<td>2-4-47</td>
<td>Dix</td>
<td>2 Mem. N.Y. * Land grant for R.R. Lake Mich to Pac.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pub.L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>S.</td>
<td>2-6-47</td>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>Wadsworth, O. * &quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pub.L.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E.

Memorials for a Pacific Railroad, not specifying Whitney plan.
(* probably in favor of Whitney plan.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>House Date</th>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Memorials of citizens</th>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Referred to Comm.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>H.R. 1-4-48</td>
<td>Laffler</td>
<td>Iowa City, Ia.</td>
<td>R.R. Miss.R. to Pac. R.&amp; C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>H.R. 1-17-49</td>
<td>Stewart</td>
<td>Pa.</td>
<td></td>
<td>R.&amp; C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>S. 2-12-49</td>
<td>Sebastian</td>
<td>Wm. Pelham &amp; others.</td>
<td>R.R. Memphis to Pac. On table. &quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>S. 2-26-49</td>
<td>Dix</td>
<td>Attica, NY.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E.

Memorials for a Pacific Railroad, not specifying Whitney Plan.
(* Probably in favor of the Whitney plan.)

31-1
S.J. serial 548.
H.J. serial 566.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>p.</th>
<th>House Date</th>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Memorials of citizens.</th>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Referred to Comm.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>198 H.R.</td>
<td>12-31-49</td>
<td>Thompson</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>*R.R.Gt.Lakes to Pac. Ch.of Comm.</td>
<td>R.&amp; C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 S.</td>
<td>1-3-50</td>
<td>Fillmore</td>
<td>St.Louis Convention</td>
<td>Natl R.R. Miss R. to Pac.</td>
<td>R.&amp; C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 S.</td>
<td>1-3-50</td>
<td>Atchison</td>
<td>Gen.Ass. of Missouri.</td>
<td>Central R.R. Mo. to Pacific.</td>
<td>R.&amp; C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113 S.</td>
<td>1-28-50</td>
<td>Clay</td>
<td>Lexington, Ky.</td>
<td>Columbus, Ky. to Pac.</td>
<td>R.&amp; C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135 S.</td>
<td>2-7-50</td>
<td>Fillmore</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Miss. Valley to Pac.</td>
<td>R.&amp; C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>434 H.R.</td>
<td>1-30-50</td>
<td>Schenck</td>
<td>Miamisburg, Ohio.</td>
<td>Miss R. to Pacific.</td>
<td>R.&amp; C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>471 H.R.</td>
<td>2-6-50</td>
<td>Cable</td>
<td>Nine Eagles, Iowa.</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>R.&amp; C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>511 H.R.</td>
<td>2-12-50</td>
<td>Bowlin</td>
<td>MO.Legis.</td>
<td>San Fran.</td>
<td>Pub.L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>608 H.R.</td>
<td>2-25-50</td>
<td>Stanton</td>
<td>Memphis Conv. Survey &amp; R.R. Miss R.to Pacific.</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133 S.</td>
<td>2-23-50</td>
<td>Bradbury</td>
<td>Waterville, Me.</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>R.&amp; C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>648 H.R.</td>
<td>3-3-50</td>
<td>Mann</td>
<td>H.A.S.Dearborn          &amp; others.</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>Pub.L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>712 H.R.</td>
<td>3-25-50</td>
<td>Root</td>
<td>Lorain Co.O.</td>
<td>Miss. Valley to Pac.</td>
<td>R.&amp; C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254 S.</td>
<td>4-4-50</td>
<td>Clay</td>
<td>Ky.</td>
<td>Columbus, Ky. to Pac.</td>
<td>R.&amp; C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260 S.</td>
<td>4-3-50</td>
<td>Fillmore</td>
<td>Phil., Pa.</td>
<td>Miss R. to Pacific.</td>
<td>R.&amp; C.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Memorials for a Pacific Railroad, not specifying Whitney Plan.

**Appendix E.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>p.</th>
<th>House Date</th>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Memorials of citizens.</th>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Referred to Comm.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>755</td>
<td>4-8-50</td>
<td>Hall</td>
<td>Mo.</td>
<td>St. Joseph to San Francisco.</td>
<td>Pub.L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>852</td>
<td>4-26-50</td>
<td>Stanton</td>
<td>Memphis Conv. Surveys.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Naval Aff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>830</td>
<td>5-6-50</td>
<td>Hall</td>
<td>Mo.</td>
<td>Survey of Route St. Jo, to San Fran.</td>
<td>Pub.L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>934</td>
<td>6-4-50</td>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>Tenn. Legis. Miss.R. to Pacific</td>
<td></td>
<td>R. &amp; C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>989</td>
<td>6-7-50</td>
<td>Friedley</td>
<td>Dr. J. Dowees. Atlantic to Pac.</td>
<td></td>
<td>R. &amp; C.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**31-2**

| S.J. serial 586. |
| H.J. serial 594. |


**32-1.**

| S.J. serial 610. |
| H.J. serial 652. |
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<tr>
<td>House Journal</td>
<td></td>
<td>30-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wells Memorial</td>
<td>Jan.9, '49</td>
<td>30-2</td>
<td>S.Misc.Doc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hargan's memorial</td>
<td>Feb.6, '49</td>
<td>30-2</td>
<td>S.Misc.Doc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dow memorial</td>
<td>Feb.17, '49</td>
<td>30-2</td>
<td>S.Misc.Doc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockwell report</td>
<td>Feb.20, '49</td>
<td>30-2</td>
<td>H.rp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspinwall memorial</td>
<td>Dec.11, '48</td>
<td>30-2</td>
<td>S.Misc.doc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama railroad papers</td>
<td>Dec.19, '48</td>
<td>30-2</td>
<td>S.Misc.Doc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King report on Panama</td>
<td>Jan.16, '49</td>
<td>30-2</td>
<td>H.rp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston resolutions on</td>
<td></td>
<td>31-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>road to Pacific</td>
<td></td>
<td>31-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate Journal</td>
<td></td>
<td>31-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House Journal</td>
<td></td>
<td>31-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report of Secretary of</td>
<td>Dec.'49</td>
<td>31-1</td>
<td>H.Ex.Doc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War Crawford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report of Secretary of</td>
<td>Dec.'49</td>
<td>31-1</td>
<td>S.Ex.Doc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War Crawford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Ord.</td>
<td>Congress Document</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 14, '50</td>
<td>31-1</td>
<td>S.Ex.Doc.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 21, '50</td>
<td>31-1</td>
<td>H.Ex.Doc.</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 21, '50</td>
<td>31-1</td>
<td>H.Ex.Doc.</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep. 12, '50</td>
<td>31-1</td>
<td>S.Ex.Doc.</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 6, '50</td>
<td>31-1</td>
<td>S.Ex.Doc.</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 1, '50</td>
<td>31-1</td>
<td>H.rp.</td>
<td>439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 3, '50</td>
<td>31-1</td>
<td>S.Misc.Doc.</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 24, '49</td>
<td>31-1</td>
<td>S.Misc.Doc.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 21, '50</td>
<td>31-1</td>
<td>S.Misc.Doc.</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar. 22, '50</td>
<td>31-1</td>
<td>S.Misc.Doc.</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr. 4, '50</td>
<td>31-1</td>
<td>S.Misc.Doc.</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 16, '50</td>
<td>31-1</td>
<td>H.Misc.Doc.</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 15, '50</td>
<td>31-1</td>
<td>S.Misc.Doc.</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar. 13, '50</td>
<td>31-1</td>
<td>H.rp.</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep. 12, '50</td>
<td>31-1</td>
<td>S.rp.</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 15, '51</td>
<td>31-2</td>
<td>S.Rp.</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 30, '50</td>
<td>31-2</td>
<td>S.Misc.Doc.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Ptd.</td>
<td>Congress</td>
<td>Document</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidell report on route from Great Bend on Red River to Mississippi in Louisiana</td>
<td>Feb. 28, '51</td>
<td>31-2</td>
<td>S. ExpDoc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate Journal</td>
<td></td>
<td>32-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House Journal</td>
<td></td>
<td>32-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stansbury report</td>
<td></td>
<td>32-1</td>
<td>S. Ex. Doc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation of Secretary of War for surveys</td>
<td>Jul. 7, '52</td>
<td>32-1</td>
<td>H. Ex. Doc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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