of the people to demand its removal to the central part of the country.

In support of these claims, the following facts are offered as testimony:

When the first Congress, sitting at New-York in 1790, selected the present site for the National Government, the United States, exclusive of the North-Western Territory, embraced a narrow strip of the Atlantic slope consisting of an area of 341,756 square miles, and had 3,929,827 inhabitants—scarcely more than the present population of the State of New-York. Not a foot of land did our Government own beyond the Mississippi, nor did she prize her possessions beyond the Apalachian mountains of much value, for the Indian, the buffalo, the deer and panther, ruled supreme.

In selecting a permanent seat of government, the Congress of 1790 legislated in the special interest of the 13 original States—legislated exclusively for themselves. This was their wisdom; appropriate and just to themselves and their times, but to us an error. They were a small band of people; we are a continental people. Our national legislation must conform to our wants and our times, and cannot be gauged by the narrow limits of the old Government of 1790.

From an area of 610,512 square miles, including the North-Western Territory, the national domain has grown to an area of 2,950,264 square miles, exclusive of Alaska—more than three times as large as the old Government, and embracing within its control the shores of two oceans, the greatest gulf, the mightiest lakes and rivers in the world.

Of the vast domain which now composes our territorial extent, 860,000 square miles lie east of the Mississippi, and 2,070,000 west of it, exclusive of Alaska, which has 577,390 square miles. Thus it will be seen that by the Louisiana purchase in 1800 we acquired more than double the territorial area, and the full control of the great rivers and the inexhaustible mineral wealth of the mountains; and these acquisitions have been made since the location of the Capital at Washington.

POPULATION.

This is the most interesting and valuable part of the whole argument. As I have already stated, the entire population of our country in 1790, when Washington was made the seat of Government, was 3,929,827. In the space of 80 years, we have grown to nearly 40,000,000, as our present census will show. Of these less than 19,000,000 belong to the Atlantic slope, 19,000,000 to the Mississippi Valley, and at least 2,000,000 to the Pacific slope. This will give to the West a preponderance of population.

Of this entire population there will not be an average of 14 to the square mile of our past domain, exclusive of Alaska. But, from the rapid increase of our people, may we not look for all these numbers to be swelled far beyond our ordinary conception in the brief space of a lifetime? The increase of population in the North-West during the decade between 1850 and 1860 was 67.9 per cent, while the ratio of increase in the whole country was 35.52. The popular vote of 1852 shows the North-West to have cast 29.46 per cent of the entire vote. But, aside from any local causes that may have existed to produce a more rapid increase of population in one locality than another, there is an exact law of human development, which, when properly applied, solves this problem of population with exact mathematical accuracy. Malthus laid down the law that, be this: That the productive power of healthy, well-fed, well-fed, and well-lodged people, was so great that fully two children would be born for every person who died within a given time. Therefore he fixed 25 years as the time necessary for any people to double their number. George Combe, commenting upon the doctrine of Malthus, wrote that in the new States of North America the population doubled every 25 years, independent of immigration.

Dr. Elder, a prominent writer on Political Economy in our own land, writes that our population doubles every 23½ years; and the recent calculations of our Government are based upon 23 years as the time necessary for doubling. With these facts before us, what may we not expect to be our increase before the century closes? Taking the calculation of Dr. Elder as being correct, may we not assume that before the century expires more than 100,000,000 people will occupy the present area of our country? And with the increased facilities for immigration and the rapid development of our resources, the child is now born that will see more than 300,000,000 people residing upon our present domain.

Of these, not more than 70,000,000 will inhabit the Atlantic slope, while more than 230,000,000 will inhabit the interior plain and the region beyond it.

COMMERCE.

But, Mr. President, let us pass from the subject of population to a consideration of the commerce of the country. And here I must express my regret that I cannot present to you an analysis of the facts which our new census will reveal; yet I am happy to say that I can make my argument strong without them. The Atlantic seaboard of the United States extends about 3,500 miles, and the Mississippi and its tributaries afford an inland navigation of 30,000 miles, upon the bosom of which now floats an amount of commerce three times as great in value as the whole foreign commerce of the country.

In former times, our trade with foreign parts was looked upon as our most important interest. It is now dwarfed in comparison by the transportation and handling of domestic produce for domestic markets.

In 1867, the entire products of the United States were $1,900,000,000. Its exports were less than one-fifth of this amount, leaving four-fifths to be exchanged between the States. It is said that at the present time not more than one-fifteenth of the business of New-York City is based upon foreign commerce.

The Mississippi drains 2,445,000 square miles, which is more than half the number of square miles in the United States. The surface contains 768,000,000 acres of the finest land in the world. It has space for 150 States the size of Massachusetts, and, were its population in the same proportion, it would contain more than five times the present population of the whole United States. At this time, not more than one acre in five is under cultivation, and the vast resources of coal and minerals have hardly begun to be fairly developed. The value of the commerce of the Mississippi is estimated at $2,000,000,000; and the Agricultural Bureau, basing its calculations upon past results, estimate that the cereal products of the North-West will, in 1900, amount to 3,121,970,000 bushels. In addition to these vast statements of wealth, we are enabled to bring in as reënforcements, the productions and commerce of the Pacific slope, which in itself has the strength and value of an empire, and far transcends the commerce of the old Government of 1790; and in whatsoever manner we examine the commerce of our country, whether interiorly upon the lakes, adjoining the Gulf, or upon the Pacific slope, we find the assurance that in either case a few more years will show an equal, if not greater, commerce than the Atlantic slope can afford.

There are now in the United States more than 50,000 miles of railway, three-fifths of which lie west of the Apalachian Mountains, in the Valley States and Pacific slope. They have been constructed at a cost of about $2,000,000,000; and yet not half of our vast country is supplied with roads. Another 25 years will almost double the number of miles already built. In addition to the wonderful system of railways, who can conceive of the mightiness of our future shipping upon the ocean and inland waters, all of which will contribute to swell our national greatness at home and our fame abroad?

POLITICAL.

There are also political reasons, Mr. President, why the Capital should be removed to the West. The balance of power in the National Legislature has already passed west of the Apalachian Mountains, and belongs to the States and Territories lying beyond. And when we consider how great the disproportion will be in the National Legislature when the "New West" is carved into States, we cannot fail to see the justness of the demand for a more central location of the National Capital.

Look at the facts for one moment. The Atlantic slope has an area of 423,197 square miles, which is divided into 17 States. Under the Constitution, they are allowed 34 Senators and 120 Representatives in the National Legislature. The Mississippi Valley has an area of 2,445,000 square miles, with less than one-third of its territory made into States. It now has 18 States, which, under the Federal Constitution, are allowed 36 Senators and 115 Representatives in the National Legislature. The Pacific slope has an area of 627,256 square miles, part of which is made into three States, which are entitled to six Senators and five Representatives in the National Legislature. Alaska has an area of 577,390 square miles, and is large enough to make more than 14 States as large as Ohio. Another view shows 860,000 square miles east of the Mississippi River, which is already divided into 27 States, including Louisiana and West Virginia. These send 54 Senators and 205 Representatives to the National Legislature. West of the Mississippi River we have 2,070,000 square miles, exclusive of Alaska, which, at the least calculation, ought to be made into 56 new States, each one of them being larger than Ohio, and containing 40,000 square miles.

Again, the States of the Atlantic slope have 34 Senators and 120 Representatives in the National Legislature. The Mississippi Valley together with the Pacific slope, has 42 Senators and 120 Representatives; this places the balance of power in the Senate west of the Alleghanies, and makes an equal representation in the House of Representatives. But how long, Mr. President, will this remain the order of political representation in the National Legislature? Not only will the West gain by the apportionment under the new census, but also will new States succeed each other in coming into the Union, as we go forward in our national growth and progress.

But you say, Mr. President, that you are not willing to submit this question to a majority of the Representatives of the people. Ah, Mr. President, that was a fatal expression for you to make; the great people all over the country heard you speak the word. Are you to sit in the chair of Washington and dictate terms to the people, which he dared not do, and to object to the people's Representatives doing that which is their plain and lawful duty? Do you claim the right to exercise such unlawful authority? If you do, let me advise you to reverse your decision, for no power on earth can enforce it. It will prove to be a more heathen declaration than that of Xerxes writing to Mount Athos, and ordering it to get out of the way of his march, or his vain attempt to chain the Hellespont and stay its ebbing waves; or than that of Mohammed, asking the mountain to come to him; the sequel showed that Mohammed had to go to the mountain, and with equal propriety it may be said, that the National Capital will and must gravitate to the great center of population.

But, Mr. President, aside from the question of numerical and political power which belongs to the West, and its claims as the center of our territory, there is a paramount necessity for locating the seat of the Government of the nation in the midst of its material power. The life of a nation is made doubly secure when united with the strongest and greatest commercial and material interests of her people; for, thus united, they compliment each other, and the security and perpetuity of the one becomes the security for the perpetuity of the other. Nothing can be more absurd than to imagine that the life and perpetuity of this Republic is as secure for the future with the seat of Government at Washington—a distant place on the outskirts of the country, with no material power or prestige—as it would be in a central position in the Mississippi Valley, where the great vitalizing heart of the Republic is destined to beat in harmony with its onward progress and greatness.

IV. CONGRESS DISCUSSION OF THE SUBJECT.

Mr. President: Having presented an incontestible array of arguments, facts and figures, to prove an entirely different state of things in the political, commercial, and material character of our country than that which existed at the time of the location of the present Capital, thus proving beyond question the necessity of a change of location, I will now present, as subordinate to the argument, a synopsis of discussions made in Congress, at different times in our country's history, upon the subject of Capital removal. To save unnecessary labor in this matter, I here quote from a paper prepared from the debates by Mr. George Alfred Townsend, as follows:

"The main argument of the tradesmen and property holders of the village of Washington, for the retention of the Capital among them is that this spot was 'consecrated by the preference of all the patriots.' It is so common for statements of this kind to be made without authority and circulated through ignorance, that I recently took opportunity to overhaul the venerable 'Debates and Proceedings in the Congress of the United States,' published by Gales & Seaton, as well as the debates of later Congresses, published by John C. Rives, to see upon what foundation stood the warrior's pride. And, as I anticipated, the forefathers approached this subject with the same practical sagacity which we are called upon to assume in reconsidering it. They looked for no omens or sacred birds to fix their choice. They took Washington City as a compromise against the wish of a majority of them, and particularly against the wish of the Eastern State and Middle State people and statesmen. They spoke of the importance of getting as far westward as possible as far back as 1789, and they did go as far West as practicable, considering the narrow strand of population and the condition of American highways at that time. From the moment Washington was fixed upon, the common sense of the East revolted, and a smothered dislike of the site was manifested till 1816, when by three several votes it was resolved to go to a city farther north, and this resolution obtained the vote of the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Langdon Cheeves of South Carolina, and the removal was only prevented by the extraordinary efforts of the people of Washington village, who built at their own expense, a new edifice for Congress—since called the Old Capitol Prison. After this the discontent continued, till, in 1846, Alexandria, with more pride than Washington, demanded to be retroceded to Virginia, so that she could have a self-existent anatomy, and then the call for a movement into the Valley of the Mississippi became distinct and decided. That there may be no mistake in this matter, I append all the material points of the debates extant, of the three periods referred to. There is not the remotest indication anywhere that Washington City would have had a ghost of a chance for being the Capital site ten years after its foundation. Virginia, alone, kept the seat of Government on the Potomac."

WASHINGTON SELECTED IN DEFERENCE TO THE WEST.

On the 27th of August, 1789, Congress sitting in New-York City, Mr. Scott of Pennsylvania introduced the resolution in Congress which provided for a permanent Capital, in these words:

Resolved, That a permanent residence ought to be fixed for the General Government of the United States at some convenient place, as near the center of wealth, population, and extent of territory as may be consistent with convenience to the navigation of the Atlantic Ocean, and having due regard to the particular situation of the Western country.

The terms of this resolution are almost exactly applicable to the present movement for readjusting "the center of wealth, population, and territory."

Among the few debaters recorded on this proposition were Scott, Jackson of Georgia, Goodhue of Massachusetts, Lee of Virginia, and the illustrious James Madison. Goodhue "favored the Susquehanna, either at Harrisburg or opposite Havre de Grace."

Jackson said that "upon this subject depended the existence of the Union. The place of the seat of Government was important in every point of view. It might be compared to the heart of the human body; it was a center from which the principles of life were carried to the extremities, and from these might return again with precision."

In 1869 Jackson would have found this heart in the extremities, like the bulb in a thermometer.

Scott thought "the principles of the Union were the principles of equal justice and reciprocity. He conceived the question now before the House as grand a link as any in the Federal chain. The future tranquility of the United States depended as much on this as on any other question that ever had or could come before Congress. It was a justice due to the extremities of the continent to adopt such a measure."

Had Scott so spoken in these days he would have been accused in the garbage prints of Washington of "speculating in St. Louis corner lots!"

Mr. Lee of Virginia (Light Horse Harry) said: "A place as nearly central as a convenient communication with the Atlantic ocean and an easy access to the Western territory will permit, ought to be selected and established as the permanent seat of the Government of the United States. Will gentlemen say that the center of Government should not be the center of the Union? Will they say our Western brethren are to be disregarded? These are momentous considerations, which should lead the House to a conclusion. If they are disregarded it will be an alarming circumstance to the people of the Southern States, who have felt their alarms already."

This was the same man who delivered over Washington the funeral eulogy of "First in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen." He was Washington's neighbor, and his argument is directly in the line of the Mississippi Valley.

The entire argument of those urging the Potomac for the site of the Capital was that it was the highway to the West, and that the West should be consulted, while the Northern men pressed the Susquehanna as being the true route westward.

MADISON ON A NEW CAPITAL SITE.

Perhaps the greatest authority, however, was the illustrious James Madison, who spoke as follows on September 3, 1789: "An equal attention to the rights of the community is the basis of republics. If we consider, Sir, the effects of legislative power on the aggregate community, we must feel equal inducements to look for the center in order to find the present seat of Government. Those who are most adjacent to the seat of legislation will always possess advantages over others. An earlier knowledge of the laws, a greater influence in enacting them, and a thousand other circumstances, will give a superiority to those who are thus situated. If we consider the influence of the Government in its Executive Department, there is no less reason to conclude that it ought to be placed in the center of the Union. It ought to be in a situation to command information from every part of the Union; to watch every conjecture; to seize every circumstance that can be improved. The Executive eye ought to be placed where it can best see the dangers which threaten; and the Executive arm whence it may be extended most effectually to the protection of every part. In the Judiciary Department, if it is not equally necessary, it is highly important that the Government should be equally accessible to all. With respect to the Western territory, we are not now to expect it, for it would be an affront to the understanding of our fellow-citizens of the Western waters, that they will be united with their Atlantic brethren on any principle than that of equality and justice. We had every inducement, both of interest and prudence, to fix on the Potomac as most satisfactory to our Western brethren. He defied any gentleman to cast his eye, in the most cursory manner, over a map and say that the Potomac is not much nearer this center than any part of the Susquehanna. He granted that the present center of population is nearer the Susquehanna than the Potomac. But are we choosing a seat of Government for the present moment only? He presumed not!"

This speech was quoted in 1846 in favor of the removal of the Capital to the Ohio, by Mr. Pennybacker, in Congress. There is not a word in it which does not justify and encourage the present movement for a new Capital city in the great Western Valley. A Committee of seven were appointed to select a central site, by a vote of only 72 to 71; and at the head of this Committee was Mr. Fisk of New-York.

THE REMOVAL AGITATION IN 1814.

On the 26th of December, 1814, Mr. Fisk of New-York rose in the House and introduced the following resolution.

"*Resolved*, That a Committee be appointed to inquire into the expediency of removing the seat of Government during the present session of Congress, to a place of greater security and less inconvenience than the City of Washington, with leave to report by bill or otherwise."

By a vote of 79 to 37 the resolution was taken into immediate consideration, and debated till October 15. At this time the Capitol wings were in ashes, and Congress met in the unfinished Patent Office. I append the material extracts from the debates.

Mr. Fisk of New-York—"Where shall Congress sit with safety and convenience? Some designate one place, some another; but few imagine that the councils of the nation will continue here. The confidence and the credit of the nation is identified with the security of the public councils and the safety of the public records."

Mr. Lewis of Virginia—"A temporary removal only is contemplated; but once started, the Capital will never return. For the last ten or twelve years similar attempts have been made."

Mr. Fisk of New-York—"On a removal to any other place, the inconveniences of this would appear by contrast so strongly that the Government could never be induced to return."

Mr. Grosvenor of New-York—"The gentleman from South Carolina conceives that a removal will be striking our colors. 'Wait,' says that gentleman, 'till the enemy comes and chases you off.' That is the very dishonor I dread from remaining—the very disgrace I wish to avoid. The gentleman from Tennessee says if his house was burned he would not move off his farm. But suppose a neighbor would politely offer him a clean bed and excellent food and accommodations, would he refuse the use of them and rather sleep in his barn? Let gentlemen ask themselves fairly, Were they willing to appropriate the money of the people of the United States to build a Capitol where it might be destroyed in 20 days? Let them remove to a place of safety, where it would not be necessary to expend $10,000,000 or $15,000,000, or any other sum, for the simple defense of Congress."

Mr. Oakley of New-York—"It was owing to the forebearance of the British that Congress had now a single roof to cover their heads. They had been told that this place was defensible up to the moment when the enemy arrived. Immediately afterward, another city on the Atlantic coast had been attacked. Whatever respect he might feel for the inhabitants of this District, their interests could not for a moment enter into competition with the interests of the nation.

Mr. Hanson of Maryland "entertained very great contempt for the people of Washington."

The Speaker, Langdon Cheves, S. C., said: "This District cannot be defended, except at immense expense—an expense, perhaps, half that required to carry on the War.

Richard Stockton of New-Jersey made his maiden speech in favor of removal, Oct. 5, 1814. He said: "Gentlemen had only to look around to survey the District to judge correctly. A permanent seat of government is not required by the Constitution. A power to fix the seat of government for centuries—forever—who can believe that the people of the United States would have invested such a power in the Congress of 1789. A power to fix a permanent seat of government, without regard to the alterations, improvements, resolutions, and changes which would naturally be produced by a good government, an increasing population, and the settlement of the vast regions of the western country. No, Sir. The great Washington landlord was not to be compensated, because he converted barren land into city lots, and made a fortune out of his sales. Was he to be compensated because he was prevented from making more? The speculator, too, must abide by his loss. The Government minion was not to be paid for being torn from his hold! The people of this District were entitled to no more than the same kind of defense afforded to their fellow-citizens. The removal of the Capital ought to be decided on principles exclusively public. He had made up his mind, with reluctance, that a removal was essential to the honor and interest of the nation. The dispersion and capture of the members of Congress would gratify the pride and resentment of the English nation more than any other operations their army on the coast could perform. The Military Committee estimated that 20,000 men, costing $30,000 a day, could defend the Capital. The people of the country would not stand this one month, one week, or one day!"

OTHER VOICES OF 1814.

Mr. Pearson of North Carolina said at the same time: "From the first moment we met here we have found almost every member north of Maryland, and a few of the hardy sons of the West, apparently dissatisfied with their accommodations."

Mr. Grovesnor of New-York alluded to the disposition of the friends of the District to kill the bill by forcing a vote upon it in empty session, and said: "Until the pervade upon the ratio of increase for the last half-century, it will contain about eight-tenths of all the population and wealth of the nation. As the natural center of the population and wealth of the nation, it is the fit and necessary seat of the political center of the Government, where the people and the Government are necessarily brought in daily contact for the common benefit of both. The Creator has placed the heart in the center of our bodies for the perfection of the circulation of the blood, whose functions it is to vitalize and warm our systems; and so a political seat of a representative system like ours should be located at the heart of the country, where the ebb and flow of the tides and currents of political opinion will traverse the most direct route from the center to the extremities and back again. Such a central location of a political power of a representative Government will do much to preserve the nation against all forms of anarchy or despotism. The great political considerations point to the establishment of a central national capital as one of the necessary safeguards for the preservation of a representative form of government.

The present capital of the nation is more remote from the Pacific States and Territories than Constantinople is from Great Britain or St. Petersburg from Spain or Morocco.

VII. PROPHETIC TESTIMONY.

Mr. President: To aid the argument and to strengthen the whole facts which I have thus far presented for your consideration, I desire to call your attention to the prophetic testimony in support of the position of the friends of Capital removal on this question. This part of the subject should properly begin with Plato, and come down through the idealistic minds of intervening ages, but for brevity I will refer you to the Hon. Charles Sumner's Prophetic Voices about America, in *The Atlantic Monthly* of September, 1867, where you will find a vast array of prophetic testimony in favor of the future empire of the American continent. The testimony given in the last half century bears more directly upon the question under consideration, and therefore is in a great measure submitted as follows:

Looking beyond to the future growth of our Continental Government, Henry Clay said, in a speech made in the United States Senate, Jan., 1824, on the extension of the Cumberland road, and replying to the opposition of Eastern members to Western improvements, "Not today, nor to-morrow, but this Government is to last, I trust, forever; we may, at least, hope it will endure until the wave of population, cultivation, and intelligence shall have washed the Rocky Mountains and mingled with the Pacific. Yes, Sir; it is a subject of peculiar delight to me to look forward to the proud and happy period when circulation and association between the Atlantic and the Pacific and the Mexican Gulf shall be free and perfect as things are at this moment in England."

In a speech made by Thomas H. Benton, in the United States Senate, March 1, 1825, on the occupation of the Oregon River, he said: "Within a century from this day a population greater than that of the present United States will exist on the west side of the Rocky Mountains. I do not deal in paradoxes, but in propositions as easily demonstrated as the problems of Euclid."

Here, then, is the demonstration: Dividing one portion of this continent into five equal parts, and there will be found, in the Valley of the Mississippi, three parts; on the east side of the Alleghany Mountains, one part; on the west of the Rocky Mountains, one part. Population will distribute itself accordingly; three parts in the valley, and one part on each of the appurtenant slopes.

Within a century the population of the whole will be 160,000,000; of which 100,000,000 will drink the waters which flow into the Mississippi, and 60,000,000 will be found upon the lateral streams which flow east and west, toward the rising and the setting sun. The calculation is reducable to mathematical precision. We double our numbers once in 25 years, and must continue to do so until the action of the prolific principle in man shall be checked by the same cause which checks it in every race of animals—the stint of food. This cannot happen with us until every acre of our generous soil shall be put in requisition; until the product of more than 1,000,000,000 of acres shall be insufficient to fill the mouths which feed upon them. This will require more people than a century can produce, even at the rate of doubling once in 25 years; a rate which will give us 160,000,000 in the year 1920; that is to say, 20,000,000 more than the Roman Empire contained in the time of Augustus Cæsar. A century is but a point in the age of a nation. The life of an individual often spans it; and many are the children now born who will see the year 1920, and the accomplishment of the great events which their nurses believe to be impossible."

The great Webster said in a speech in the Senate on the compromise measures, Jan. 25, 1850: "Sir, nobody can look over the face of this country at the present moment, nobody can see where its population is the most dense and growing, without being made to admit, and compelled to admit, that ere long the strength of America will be in the Valley of the Mississippi."

Said the Hon. Horace Greeley in speaking of the West: "Let her not be despised! American Orientals may dream that wisdom has taken up her perpetual abode on the shores of the Atlantic, and that the genii of Art, of Science, of Literature, have planted their rosy grottoes on the sunny side of the Alleghanies; but a thousand fancies never made one fact. Like the swaddled Hercules, the West has already put out her infant arms and strangled two political dragons that were coiling about her cradle; and, as soon as she walks forth in the consciousness of matured strength, she will make a greater fluttering among the harpies that prey upon her interests than did the club of the hero among the Stymphalian vultures. Ill-founded contempt is a blow that always rebounds. The Assyrian contemned the Persians, while the Persians, like muskrats, were undermining the walls of Babylon. Haughty, learned, philosophic Greece, the conqueror of Xerxes, became a Turkish slave, and the fair daughters of Themistocles and Leonidas were bought and sold in the shambles of Smyrna. Rome despised the barbarians, and the barbarians conquered Rome. Cæsar overrun Gaul with victorious legions, and now Gaul holds a standing army in the city of the Cæsars. England would force America to drink Bohea, and America poured out for England a cup of gunpowder tea, the taste of which she has not yet got out of her mouth. Thus it is Arms and Arts, in their onward progress, have always pitched their tents near the setting sun, and the conquests of the one and the triumphs of the other have left their fruits to ripen and decay on the track. The very relics of the ancient empires are now to be dug out of the soil. Civilization, like the ostrich in its flight, throws sand upon everything behind her; and before many cycles shall have completed their rounds, sentimental pilgrims from the burning cities of the Pacific coast will be seen where Boston, Philadelphia, and New-York now stand, viewing in moonlight contemplation, with the melancholy owl, traces of the Athens, the Carthage, and the Babel of the Western Hemisphere."

At a later date, said the Hon. Charles Sumner: "The Mississippi Valley speaks for itself as no man can speak. Give us peace, and population will increase beyond all experience; resources of all kinds will multiply indefinitely; arts will embellish the land with immortal beauty; the name of Republic will be exalted until every neighbor, yielding to irresistible attraction, will seek a new life in becoming a part of the great whole, and the national example will be more puissant than army or navy for the conquest of the world."

Said John Bright, the Great English statesman, in speaking of the American Republic, its future greatness and grandeur: "I see one vast confederation, stretching from the frozen North in one unbroken line to the glowing South, and from the wild billows of the Atlantic, westward, to the calmer waters of the Pacific, and I see one people, and one law, and one language, and one faith, and over all that vast Continent the home of freedom and refuge for the oppressed of every race and every clime."

The great field of the West—"As the center of population and power is to be in the Mississippi Valley in the future, so must we look thither for the New Man who is to be the redeemer of our race and character. The Western man already shows larger, broader, and healthier development, spiritually speaking, than his brother in the East. He has never been cramped as yet by any of the restraining forms of social ecclesiasticism; his mind, like his eye, ranges over large extents, and is not content to sit down with itself after having acquired a little power over its fellows. As the Great West is bound to supply laws and men for the vast future of this continental country, so will it furnish the religion, whose all-embracing forms are to invite the entire people into the simple secrets of its worship."

The Men of the West—"One who has not visited the West knows but little or nothing of the spirit of the Western men. There is an all pervading zeal, energy, ambition, push-go-ahead, seen nowhere else. The blood of the Western man courses more rapidly in his veins than in the Eastern man or in the European; and he thinks, talks, and acts on a larger scale. The Western farmer wastes more in a year than the Eastern farmer saves. He may lack refinement, but he has a generous heart for his friends and a deal of pluck for his enemies. His religion is less sectarian, less bigoted, and more broad, catholic, and truly Christian.

Having submitted only a fragment of the strong but direct prophetic testimony in favor of the future empire of the great West, and the consequent demand for the Seat of Government, I now desire to call your attention to some testimony bearing immediately upon the question of removal.

Since the days of Jefferson, far-seeing men have from time to time declared that the Capital of the nation would some day be removed from the Potomac to the Mississippi. At a dinner given to Mr. Jefferson in Frederickstown, Md., in honor of the Louisiana purchase, a gentleman, whose name, I regret, is lost, while voluntarily defending Mr. Jefferson, against the silly slurs made about his purchase, said to the guests, as he unrolled the plat of a grant of land 25 miles square, including the site of Alton, Illinois: "You need not laugh at Mr. Jefferson, for some day," pointing at his map, "the Capital of the United States will be located upon this land." The laugh for the moment was turned upon the stranger, and the inquiry made, how could people ever get there?

The stranger answered, "I don't know, but I think they will go there by steam." This occurred about 1804, long before railroads were constructed, even in the very infancy of the Republic. All along the line of our historic march have men declared the coming transfer of power from the Atlantic seaboard to the States west of the Alleghanies. In our own time thousands of the wisest men have declared the removal of the Capital to be inevitable. Said the Hon. Wm. H. Seward, in a political speech at St. Paul in 1860, "The power of the Republic is being gathered in the Mississippi Valley, and with that power will come the Capital of the country."

Said the Hon. Charles Sumner: "I have no love for Washington, and the removal of the Capital is only a question of time."

Said Dr. Draper, in speaking of the Capital at Washington: "It has ceased to be the appropriate site for the metropolis of the continental Republic. Western influence predominating will draw the Capital into the Mississippi Valley, in absolute security from all foreign attack, and territorial control."

Said the Hon. Richard Yates: "Now, Sir, when I see this country, when I see its vastness and its almost illimitable extent; when I see the keen eye of capital and business fastened with steady interested gaze upon the trade of the West, and all our Eastern cities in hot rivalry are reaching out their iron arms to secure our trade; when I see the railroads that are centering here in St. Louis; when I see this city with 60,000 miles of railroad communication and 100,000 miles of telegraphic communication; when I see that she stands at the headwaters of navigation, extending to the north 3,000 miles and to the south 2,000 miles, and when I see that she stands in the center of the continent as it were; when I see the population moving to the West in vast numbers; when I see emigration rolling toward the Pacific, and all through these temperate climes I hear the tramp of the iron horse on his way to the Pacific Ocean; when I see towns and villages springing up in every direction; when I see States forming into existence, until the City of St. Louis becomes the center as it were of a hundred States, the center of the population and the commerce of this country—when I see all this Sir, I feel convinced that the seat of empire is to come this side of the Alleghanies, and why may not St. Louis be the future Capital of the United States."

Said the Hon. Horace Greeley—New-York, Oct. 20, 1870:

"DEAR SIR: I have your letter of the 15th, inviting me to attend the Capital Convention at Cincinnati on the 26th. It is not possible that I should leave our State again pending our approaching election. I can only find time to say that the subject of your deliberations is of the very greatest consequence to our country's future, and deserves prompt as well as earnest consideration. Washington seems to me an unfortunate location for our national metropolis, and sure to be rendered less acceptable by the march of events. Our capital should be a great city. I prefer our greatest, supporting a perfectly independent press, whereby all the acts and leanings of the Government would be criticised with absolute freedom from deflection in the hope of Federal patronage or the fear of its withdrawal. It should be surrounded by a dense, intelligent, spirited population, readily rallied in myriads to the defense of the national archives and treasures. It should be a focus of art, and literature, and refinement, thus inviting the presence and commanding the admiration of the choice spirits of the entire civilized world. I judge New-York to be preeminently that city. I am quite sure that Washington is not. Let the subject be thoughtfully and generally canvassed, and I feel confident that a change will be approved and demanded."

Under this head, Mr. President, I could quote to you the great majority of the ablest newspapers and public men of the country who are decided for the removal—men and newspapers that are not depending on a little Government patronage or Washington flattery for their bread and butter and social and political standing—but I think the testimony sufficient, and hold that if you have been observant at all upon the tendency of the people upon this question you must know what the final decision will be. I therefore pass on to consider the unfitness of Washington.

VIII. THE UNFITNESS OF WASHINGTON FOR THE CAPITAL OF THIS GREAT NATION.

It is assumed, Mr. President, by the friends of Capital removal, that the seat of Government at its present place is not adapted to the national life, nor to the wants of our continental people; that at every stage of the national growth Washington City is rendered less and less fit to be the Capital of this nation, and that, therefore, the Capital ought to be removed to some more central and convenient place in the wide domain of this continental commonwealth.

No reasonable person would think of confining the full-grown man to the cradle of his infancy, but would urge him forth to the chamber and drawing-room suited to his manhood. So, too, of this Republic. The Capital that was once central to the nation—central to the States of the Atlantic slope, and adapted to the wants of an infant people, has, in the multiplication of States to imperial Republic, left the Capital of its infancy on the Atlantic, like a barren rock upon a desert shore. The Republic has grown to the West in magnitude and mightiness, until it now embraces the shores of an ocean greater than that upon which it was born, and, in every conceivable view we can take of the subject, Washington appears unfit to remain the Capital of this great nation, and is only a sink-hole for demagogues, hirelings, dependents, politicians, and office-seekers. Horace Greeley once said to me that there was not a heathen city in the world as corrupt as Washington. In fact, Mr. President, all arguments turn upon the unfitness of Washington to be the Capital of the nation, and the fitness of some central place in the great Valley to be the future home of the Government.

Let us look for one moment at this. Ask the statesman for the philosophy of the integrity of Government. He will tell you that it must be representative in all its relations to civilization and the great wants of man. Ask the moral philosopher for the philosophy of the integrity of civilization. He will tell you it, too, must be representative in its relations to government and the great interests of man. Now, in the name of heaven, Mr. President, is Washington City in any conceivable way representative of any of the interests of this great nation and people? Not at all. It is the cradle, the home of the infant Republic, which was found in the bull-rushes, but now is deliverer and benefactor; Washington possesses no representative element either in character or locality. No commerce, no industry, no material power, no prestige, no nothing in common with the great representative, political, material, industrial, and progressive interests of this nation. Of the 50,000 miles of railroads in the country, stretching from one ocean to ocean, and from the Lakes to the Gulf, she has only one. Her commerce is not equal to that of the meanest port on the coast of Africa. There is not published in the city—in the capital of this great Republic—a newspaper entitled to any consideration. They are all craven, toadying, and distempered papers. Col. Forney endeavors to publish a Court Journal—*The Chronicle*—an organ for the purpose of narrating from day to day all the toady doings of the so-called fashionable suppers, and dinners, and kissing parties, &c., &c. When these things are so, Mr. President, is it not possible for you to rise to the dignity of your position—high up in the sphere of clear conception, and behold Washington as Jesus beheld Jerusalem, the city that killed the prophets and stoned them that were sent unto it. "Oh, venal city, if a purchaser could be found thou art gone." But, why are these things so? I answer, it is in the very nature of things, it is in the philosophy of the integrity of a representative government, that its Capital must, in order to subserve its highest purpose, be inseparably identified with the great representative interests of the nation, the symbol of whose power it is. Civilization and government must act in reciprocal relations. Washington has become totally unfit for the Capital of this vast Continental Republic, because it embodies no representative interests common to the people of this great nation. While the Capital is at its present place, the Government, as represented by the law-makers, the administers of the law, and the officiating officers, has none of the strength of the nation, none of its great vitalizing power and the public interests of the great people to lean upon, to draw vitality from. In the mighty growth of the Republic the nation is essentially left at Washington, like a lone child forsaken on a desert rock. It grows weak and forgets the great world around it; it yields to temptations and becomes demoralized.

I speak to you, Mr. President, "the words of truth and soberness," and I say that the Capital *must* be removed from Washington, as a necessity to the HIGHER LIFE of the Republic, and, if you don't rise to the grandeur of the occasion, you will be left to the folly of your decision. There is still another reason for removing it which no power in the world can ignore. I refer to a demand which the rising millions of this great valley will soon make for the Capital. A giant empire is now growing up here in the West, soon to be more powerful in peace than the mightiest nation known to history, and from it a voice will go forth of commanding power. It will speak in majorities, and its will must be obeyed. It will be as a great *giant* ruling a continent. Its veins will be coursed by blood from every land. Its arms of power will extend—one to the Atlantic, the other to the Pacific—giving parental protection to the children of the nation upon the shores of the Eastern and Western Oceans. Let me remind you, Mr. President, that those in power must prepare to hear the voice of this growing empire of the West, and to obey its will when it speaks in majorities.

IX. OBJECTIONS ANSWERED.

The President—Thus far in the discussion by the people at large, but two objections that have the least possible weight have been urged against removal.

1. The expense consequent on the change. This objection is trifling in the extreme, and certainly would not be urged by a sensible man, when familiar with the facts. The Government owns, in the District of Columbia, 578 acres, divided into lots, parks, &c. This land was valued in 1868 at $13,412,293 26. The improvements on the land, and including all the Government expenditures in the whole District for 80 years, amounted, June 30, 1868, to only $37,320,853 08. Now, Sir, the man's soul is small and sordid, indeed, who, in the face of these facts, will contend for one moment that the expense consequent upon the removal is an obstacle. I will venture that if the opportunity was afforded, that Missouri, and, I think, Iowa, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio or Kentucky, would incur a debt of $50,000,000, if necessary, to secure the Capital upon the respective soil of either; but the work is too great for this mighty nation to dicker about. It is beneath the dignity of the Republic to consider any proposition beyond the simple cession by a State of a new District, wherein to place the seat of government.

2. Another silly objection urged by some, is that the time has not come for the removal. The present Capital fails to subserve the present wants of the Government, and is destined to be "rendered less and less acceptable by the march of events," and its removal to some more central and appropriate place, cannot, in the least, adversely affect the general good of the country, and therefore, the time has come for the removal. I dismiss this objection as one of no weight whatever.

There still remains, Mr. President, to be considered in connection with the National Capital a conviction, with many, so absurd that it deserves only to be noticed that it may be rendered contemptible. I refer to the conviction that the presence of the Capital, at any place, tends to demoralize the people and exercise an injurious influence upon the public interests where it may be. I am aware, Mr. President, that you believe in this absurdity. I have been informed that you so expressed yourself to your friends in this city during your last visit, and said that if the Capital was moved here, you would sell your land and abandon the city as your future home. Now, Mr. President, you should not have made that remark, nor should you entertain such a view of the Capital of your country. You are the official head of the American nation, and it becomes you to bear aloft the American name and the American character. It is unpatriotic, unstatesmanlike, to entertain such a view of the Capital of your country. I am aware that Washington City has given a bad experience, but I have shown you why. I have shown you that it was not the distinctive presence of the Capital that has given the bad experience to Washington, but the unfortunate relation of the representative power of the nation with the non-representative interests and civilization of the people. The mechanic, the merchant, the banker, the landlord, the laborer, and all are dependent upon Government patronage for subsistence; and no dependent people can live above demoralization. They will as surely generate vice and inefficiency as stagnant water generates malarious scum. The people of Washington City are chained to dependency; and the nation suffers by resting its arms on weakness. In fact, Mr. President, Washington City is unjustly dealt with by the United States Government by the control exercised over the people of that city, under the policy of reconstruction; all have heard much about republican forms of government for the revolted States, and yet the District of Columbia, with a population greater than is contained by several of the States represented in Congress, has no political voice in the national councils. In this there is manifestly a wrong. The degradation of the people also carries with it the degradation of the national legislature. Congress is nothing but a national committee on streets and alleys for Washington City—an official capacity degrading to the official body it is. The removal of the Capital would benefit Washington and exalt the nation. It would place the people of the District of Columbia upon their own resources, and develop their smothered energies. It would give to the nation a new manifestation of life, consummate our national transition and herald the inauguration of the NEW REPUBLIC.

The new Capital must be adjacent to one of our great metropolitan cities, where