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To the Executive Committee Pacific Railroad Convention:

Gentlemen: Appointed by you, October 11, 1859, to bear to Washington and present the memorial of your Convention to the President, heads of Department and Congress; to act as the representative of the Convention in Washington, and to bring all possible legitimate influence to bear to secure favorable Congressional action on a Pacific Railroad Bill, I have the honor to present the following report of my proceedings, trusting it may meet your approval:

It will be remembered that in their consideration of the subject, the Convention concurred in adopting three resolutions which seemed to embody all the general principles necessary for a plan to carry out the work, to wit:

That the General Government should guarantee, under such restrictions and safeguards as might be necessary to prevent fraud, five per centum per annum upon the actual cost of the road to the parties constructing the same.

That Government should grant the right of way for the road across the Territories, and the party or company undertaking its construction should be left at liberty to select such route as they might deem for their interests.

That the State of California would undertake the construction of that part of the road within her limits.

The Convention also expressed a preference for what is known as the Central route, and recommended in their memorial some further details of minor importance.

Keeping in view these general principles, I proceeded to frame a bill in accordance therewith, a copy of which accompanies this report. A copy of the same was forwarded to California, and was indorsed and approved by the Convention at its second session in Sacramento.

On my passage to the East, being accompanied by Mr. Burch, our newly elected Congressman; also, General Lane, Senator from Oregon, I lost no time in endeavoring to impress upon these gentlemen the views of the Convention. Mr. Burch became thoroughly conversant with the action of the Convention, with whom the various provisions of the bill were carefully discussed. He manifested a regard and solicitude for our proceedings and future interests, which were fully evinced by his subsequent action in Washington. He agreed to
adopt our bill, present it to Congress and work for it, as the bill of the Convention emanating from and expressing the wishes and views of the people of California upon the subject. The bill was also presented to General Lane, who approved of it. Upon my arrival in New York I had the bill printed, also an explanatory circular (copies of which accompany, marked B and C), which were forwarded to California to Messrs. Gwin and Scott, and to the principal newspapers and prominent individuals particularly interested in the subject in our State and various other States.

Interviews were also had with various influential men in New York city and Boston on the subject.

December 3d I visited Washington, communicated with Messrs. Gwin, Scott and Burch on the subject, and endeavored to prevail on Mr. Gwin to substitute our bill for his, and present it to the Senate as the bill of the Convention. He examined the bill section by section, and although he considered some of its provisions objectionable, yet on the whole he approved of it; said that the ideas it contained were very similar to his own, and, if it could be passed as proposed, regarded it in some respects preferable to his own, but he had that morning introduced his own bill in the Senate. He stated that his own was the bill before the Senate at the last session; that it had been thoroughly discussed by that body; that it had been acted upon by the Committee, and embodied the amendments of various Senators; that the Senate was perfectly familiar with its provisions; and so much work had been done upon it, he thought it would be easier to pass it than the bill of the Convention, which was new, and would render prolonged discussion unavoidable. He expressed himself decidedly for it if it found favor and could be more easily passed than his own. His bill having been introduced and placed on the calendar as before stated, he suggested that Mr. Haun should introduce our bill also, and place it on the calendar, and that when the subject should come up he would work for the one which appeared to find most favor.

December 6th, Messrs. Gwin, Burch and Scott accompanied me to the President; with whom an interview was had. The nature of my business was explained, and agreeably to my instructions I presented the memorial and proceedings of the Convention to the President. He received them graciously, and expressed himself generally in favor of a Pacific Railroad.

Finding that the House would probably be occupied some time in the election of Speaker, and that no business could be transacted before that body, in the meantime I decided to make a tour through the West, and endeavor to awaken as much interest as possible in our efforts. Before the organization of Congress I accordingly visited New York, Albany, Syracuse, Buffalo, Cleveland, Columbus, Chicago and Cincinnati, being absent about one month, and arrived in Washington again January 14, 1860. Since which time I have been constantly engaged in endeavoring to further the passage of a Pacific Railroad Bill.
On consultation with Mr. Burch, at the suggestion of other members, it was decided to make some alterations in the bill, which was accordingly done. The bill was again printed, and also a circular explaining its features. I sent a copy of this bill and circular (marked D and E) to each member of Congress, and also to prominent newspapers and individuals throughout the country.

The Speaker of the House being chosen, the first business affecting our interests was the formation of Committees. I exerted myself with other friends to procure, among others, the appointment of Mr. Burch upon the Special Committee on Pacific Railroad. It soon became apparent that there was a great pressure on the Speaker for these positions. Parliamentary usage generally conceding the Chairmanship of a Special Committee to the member who first moves the Committee, or offers a bill and proposes its reference to a Committee to be appointed by the Speaker. Several attempts were made by members to this end, but the House seeming determined to act cautiously in the matter, these attempts were defeated by the bills being referred to Standing Committees, as the record of proceedings of February 15th and 16th will show. Mr. Scott introduced the Wigfall Pacific Railroad Bill, and moved its reference to a Select Committee, but it was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. Mr. Farnsworth, Mr. Fenton and Mr. Curtis severally made similar ineffectual attempts.

February 16th, Mr. Burch introduced our bill and memorial and asked its reference to a Select Committee. Objection being made, he asked for the ayes and noes, on which the motion was lost. The matter was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, by which a point was gained, that Committee being friendly to our bill. Mr. Craig, of Missouri, on the Committee, agreed to procure its reference to himself, and to report it favorably. Finally, on the 5th of March, Mr. Sherman moved a, Select Committee of fifteen, and that all the bills and memorials on the subject be referred to it, stating at the time that he did not desire the Chairmanship. The motion was carried.

I immediately saw the Speaker and explained to him the action of our Convention, our position and views. He assured me California and Oregon should be represented on the Committee, but could not say which of the delegates would be appointed, as the wishes of the Chairman was entitled to consideration, and would be consulted in the matter.

On the 14th March, the Speaker announced the following as the Committee, viz: Messrs. Farnsworth, Illinois; Phelps, Missouri; H. W. Davis, Maryland; Scott, California; Rice, Massachusetts; Fenton, New York; William Smith, Virginia; Taylor, Louisiana; Kellogg, Michigan; Blair, Pennsylvania; Aldrich, Minnesota; Hamilton, Texas; French, Maine; Stout, Oregon. Mr. Hindman, of Arkansas, was subsequently added to the Committee, increasing the number to sixteen.
The first meeting of the Committee was on March 15, 1860. A full copy of the proceedings of the Committee (marked "F") accompanying.

Mr. Scott having been appointed on the Committee, my future business operations with the Select Committee were of course through him. I cheerfully bear witness to his uniform interest and zeal on the subject, and can testify to his earnest endeavors to further our views and promote a general good feeling and harmony of action on the question of the Pacific Railroad.

Mr. Scott regarded the action of the Convention with respect and consideration, and was willing to work for any measure or bill which would give us a road. He immediately put me in communication with the members of the Committee, took me to see the Chairman, Mr. Curtis (with whom we had a long and satisfactory interview), and furnished me with the earliest information of the meetings of the Committee and its action. He also availed himself of every opportunity to introduce me to members friendly to the passage of the Pacific Railroad Bill.

My first business being to place the action and bill of the Convention before the Committee, and to procure its adoption, I sent each of them a copy of our proceedings and bill, and visited most of them personally, so that they might become thoroughly conversant with our action in California. I then prepared a letter (copy accompanying marked "G"), urging on the Committee their adoption of our views, which letter was presented by Mr. Scott, read in Committee and placed on file.

There being at this time many propositions and bills for a Pacific Railroad, emanating from different quarters—there being no less than four from the Pacific coast—and it being desirable that there should be some sort of unanimity of action, particularly from the Pacific coast, a meeting of the delegation (to which I was invited) was had, including Messrs. Latham, Gwin, Scott, Lane, Stout and Stevens, at which it was decided to drop all plans and bills until the Special Committee had matured a bill—to take that bill, no matter in what shape, work for and endeavor to pass it. It was believed at this time that the Select Committee would make an early report.

The indications being that the Committee would report a bill for one route; and afraid that if they attempted to locate that route it would result in serious trouble and perhaps defeat the bill, I endeavored, during the progress of Committee sessions, to prevail upon them, after locating termini, to leave the location of the route open, and it was pretty much decided to do so. But, inasmuch as it gave an opportunity for the Albuquerque or thirty-fifth parallel route to compete, the friends of both the Southern and Central route via Salt Lake united against it. This route was ably advocated by Hon. Mr. Phelps, of Missouri. The bill, as decided upon by Committee, fixed its western terminus on the navigable waters of the Sacramento river, or Bay of San Francisco, and did not contemplate its extension to the city of
San Francisco. This gave to the Central route an apparent advantage of 150 to 200 miles in length, as its length would be calculated only to Red Bluffs or vicinity. Mr. Phelps deemed this unfair, and argued that inasmuch as the corporators or trustees had been named generally from States known to be favorable to the Central or Salt Lake route; that inasmuch as the eastern termini had been decided upon to be two points severally on the western borders of Iowa and Missouri, the lines from which, uniting in two hundred miles, and thence proceeding by a main trunk westward, and as this was almost equivalent to fixing it upon the Central route, he insisted that the words "or city of San Francisco" be inserted, so as to establish something like an equality at the western end. He stated that he was willing that the friends of the Central route should name the corporators and fix the eastern termini, and he would be perfectly satisfied to take his chances, even against all these advantages, of showing his to be the nearest, best and cheapest route to the city of San Francisco, and finally succeeded in having San Francisco inserted by a vote of six to four. This controversy exciting some partisan feeling as to routes, at a subsequent meeting a motion to insert the words "via Salt Lake or vicinity" was, after much discussion, adopted by a vote of eight to six. Mr. Phelps then moved to further amend by adding the words "or to the mouth of the Columbia river." Mr. Stout moved to amend the amendment by inserting "to Vancouver in Washington Territory, or to Portland, Oregon." Mr. Stout's amendment to the amendment was adopted by a vote of ten to two.

The question then recurring upon Mr. Phelps' proposition, it was lost by a vote of five to nine.

I regarded this action as unfortunate, as it gave the bill a sectional aspect; it displeased the extreme North and evoked the opposition of the friends of both the thirty-fifth and thirty-second parallel. On consultation with Mr. Curtis, he became satisfied that the interests of the Central route were sufficiently protected by the eastern termini and corporators, and did not feel disposed to press the matter.

In order to obviate this difficulty—and Mr. Gwin stating that he could pass the Curtis bill in the Senate, if restored as it originally stood, leaving the route open—a new bill (copy of which accompanying is marked "G") was framed, substantially the same with that of Mr. Curtis, but leaving the route open and reducing the amount of Government aid to $50,000,000. Dr. Gwin agreed to procure its introduction in the Senate, to endeavor to call it up immediately and pass it, giving it preference over all other bills in the Senate, his own included.

Hon. Mr. Kennedy, of Maryland, took charge of and introduced it, and it was the general opinion that it would pass the Senate in that shape.

Mr. Curtis, after examining the bill, told me it would be quite satisfactory to him if the Senate would pass it in that shape.
Unfortunately for us, an opportunity to call up the subject in the Senate had not occurred when I left Washington. The cessation of business during the Charleston Convention, the debate upon the slavery question, and other matters of little moment to us, left no time for the consideration of the Pacific Railroad Bill, although it was the first bill introduced in Congress this session, and stands No. 1 on the calendar.

The House Committee having finished their labors, the Chairman was authorized to present the bill and report, but meantime Mr. Curtis had become convinced that it was best to strike out the words “Salt Lake,” and by mistake, in printing the bill and report, the printer left out these words, and it was generally supposed that this was the intention of the Committee; but at a final meeting of the Committee, the morning of its consideration by the House, Mr. French, of Maine, called attention to it, and denounced it as a mutilation, declaring his intention to oppose the bill and everything connected with it unless it was restored. The mistake of the printer having placed Mr. Curtis in an embarrassing position, there being no time for discussion again, the words were restored by a vote of seven to six.

I saw Mr. French an hour afterward in the House. Had a long conversation with him on the subject, and he told me that now as it was restored he really cared very little about it; he opposed it simply because it did not truly represent the action of the Committee; it was incorrect, and no one had a right to present the bill except as it left the Committee; not if every member had informally acquiesced; it should be done officially. These were the motives which induced his course in this regard.

Accompanying (marked “E”) will be found a record of the debates in the House on this subject.

Considerable difficulty was experienced in procuring an opportunity to report to the House, as some of the members carried their opposition so far as to seek occasion to interpose objections, declaring publicly their intention to resist not only its passage, but to prevent its consideration by all means within their power.

Under the rules of the House a single objection carries a bill, resolution or report over to the following day, when another objection may be made, and so on from day to day, thereby preventing its consideration. This may occur on any day but Monday, which is called suspension day, when (a member objecting) a suspension of the rules may be called for, which, if sustained by a two-thirds vote, allows a consideration of the subject.

After the Committee had matured their bill, Mr. Curtis made several ineffectual attempts to report, but the intervening Conventions and vigilance of those opposed prevented until Monday, May 13th, when under a suspension of the rules he obtained leave to report, and the bill was made a special order for Thursday, May 24th, at which time it came up for consideration, and was discussed. Friday being private
bill day, it was postponed until Monday and made the special order for Monday and Tuesday, 28th and 29th, and Mr. Curtis gave notice that he would call the previous question on Tuesday afternoon at four p.m.

It might not be inappropriate to present here a history of the debate, showing the progress made in settling upon details; but as the debates speak for themselves, are published and matters of record, I refer to the accompanying record of the proceedings of the House for the 24th, 28th and 29th of May, when it will be seen that the bill was recommitted, with a view of reconciling in Committee the differences which were embarrassing and delaying it in the House.

Those members who were unable to obtain a vote sustaining their amendments to the bill, knowing that a recommittal opened it again to amendment in the Committee, made a vigorous effort to prevent the previous question being called at the time fixed upon by the Chairman and tacitly agreed to by the House. As usual in such cases these members were disposed to magnify the difficulties and dangers surrounding its passage.

Many opposed to the passage of the bill encouraged lengthy discussion on its details, and themselves consumed a large share of the valuable time allotted to its consideration, with apparently no further object than to consume time—so that, on the arrival of the hour for the previous question, the bill would be found but imperfectly considered. As a natural consequence, when the time arrived, Mr. Curtis' call was met with the objection that by far the largest portion of the bill had not been discussed—that it might be faulty, and ought not to be so hastily pressed to a vote. Mr. Curtis then endeavored ineffectually to have the time for consideration extended. An attack was then made upon some of its provisions by H. Winter Davis, a member of the Committee, and Mr. Millson, of Virginia—raising grave doubts in the minds of many members as to an important section—and a motion to recommit was made. This was opposed by Mr. Curtis and several of the friends of the bill, and Mr. Sherman warned the friends of the bill that, if they allowed it to be recommitted, the pressure of important business would prevent its being again reported, and would carry it over to the next session. The hour having arrived for final determination of this great question, which had agitated the public mind so many years, involving the appropriation of so large an amount of money, with all its various and important results and responsibilities staring them in the face, the objections urged by Messrs. Davis and Millson had peculiar force and weight in the minds of many members really friendly to the bill, and it was evident that a strong feeling had been aroused favorable to its recommittal, which being pressed, Mr. Curtis endeavored to procure the motion accompanied with instructions and leave to report on a specified day. In the general excitement and confusion this was misunderstood by many friends of the bill as a yielding of consent on the part of the Chairman to its recommittal. They therefore voted aye, and it was recommitted by a vote of 101 to 87.
Those opposed to the bill manifested great satisfaction at their success, considering it as defeated for the session. Its friends, although some discouraged, were not disheartened, and determined to have it before the House again.

I saw Mr. Curtis immediately after the disposal of the bill, and he decided to call the Committee together again the following day. Mr. Burch saw Mr. Davis, who stated that he was not an opponent of the Pacific Railroad, but would sit down with Mr. Curtis and try to harmonize their views. Mr. Burch and myself had an interview with Mr. Curtis that evening, and he expressed a willingness to meet the gentleman whose views differed on the provisions of the bill and to so reconcile the objections so as to be able to present the bill again, when it would be likely to pass without further delay. We also saw other gentlemen who had proposed amendments, and who agreed to help to get it before the House again.

At the following meeting of the Committee, an amendment offered by Mr. Fenton, obviating the objection of Mr. Davis, was adopted, and the opposition of the friends of a Southern route was reconciled by the insertion of a Southern route, which rendered the bill generally acceptable.

A motion to report the bill again with these amendments was, at a subsequent meeting, carried, and the passage of the bill was universally conceded, in case it could be again gotten before the House.

The House having dispatched most of its important business, and the desire for the passage of the bill being very general, the Committee were again given leave to report.

A record of the proceedings of Congress will show that when it came up, the Chairman asked that it be postponed until the third Tuesday in December next.

Among the views which influenced Mr. Curtis to take this course will probably be found the fact that the postponement of the bill to a fixed time in the next session, makes it a special order for that time, and it comes before the House in the same position in which it stood at the close of this session; so that the work done upon it in Committee is all saved; it will not have to go into Committee again; and I am sustained by the views of many intelligent gentlemen of experience in the opinion that, with proper exertion, there is little doubt of the passage of the bill at the short session.

Mr. Curtis approved of so arranging the details of the bill that instead of stopping at the eastern boundary of California, the road should run to the navigable waters of the Sacramento river, or the city of San Francisco, and provided that Government aid should be extended to that portion of the road within the limits of the State. That this was a judicious and wise provision is apparent when we consider that in order to construct the road within the time contemplated in the bill, it is absolutely necessary that its western terminus should be located on navigable waters, as the supplies of iron and material must be carried out from each end. The work of construction must be
prosecuted *pari passu* from either termini, or the work performed in
the interior cannot otherwise receive its iron and material.

The amount of aid decided upon by Mr. Curtis for that portion of
the road within the limits of the State was $12,000 per mile east-
wardly to the base of the Sierra Nevada Mountains, and $24,000 per
mile from the base of the mountains eastwardly, with an addition of
$3,000 per mile for each degree of longitude, until the 109th degree
was reached. I endeavored to prevail upon Mr. Curtis to increase this
to $18,000 per mile, in view of the increased cost of roads in Califor-
nia, but could not induce him to alter it until the day it was last con-
sidered in the House, when he agreed to do so, and stated that an
amendment to that effect might be offered in the House and he would
accept it. The feature of the bill provides assistance for our local
roads running in that direction, which assistance may possibly never
be obtained in any other manner.

The bill is a very fair one. It contemplates a liberal donation or
loan of United States bonds; it provides for the construction of two
roads, and gives us a local road in California, which must be imme-
diately constructed, extending from the southern line of the State
through our fertile valleys, possibly to the headwaters of the Sacra-
mento river.

It will be observed that the amount of land donated to the road is
small, the reason for which is found in the fact that the Republican
party have adopted the policy indicated in the Homestead Bill, and
are generally opposed to the granting of lands in large bodies to any
company for any purpose whatever. The amount of land originally
intended to be taken was greater; but upon consultation with them
it was found that a liberal donation of lands would constitute a serious
impediment to the passage of the bill. They were willing, however,
that in lieu thereof an increased amount of Government Bonds should
be given, and aid of this kind was considered more desirable than a
larger donation of lands. The bill was therefore framed to accord with
their views in this respect, taking only a quantity of land sufficient for
the uses of the company.

Conceiving that it lay within the sphere of my legitimate duties, and
having spent my time during most of three previous sessions of Con-
gress in endeavoring to procure the passage of a bill making grants of
land to the State of California to aid in the construction of railroads
therein, I prepared early in the session a bill making a grant of lands
to the State of California for this purpose, but not without misgivings
on the subject in view of the declared policy of the Republican party
at this session, in opposition to making grants of land to any but ac-
tual settlers; but on conversation with many members of that party, I
found them well disposed—that a favorable feeling towards California
existed among them, and that many members would vote for such a
bill for California, who would, perhaps, vote differently on a similar
bill for another State, upon the grounds that, although in opposition to
their policy, it would be unjust to refuse to California the same aid for
her internal improvements which had been freely granted to so many Southern and Western States. Thus encouraged, and looking for assistance to the votes of those States which had been similarly benefited, a bill (marked "I" accompanying) was prepared, introduced and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

The bill, as originally framed, contemplated a road from the northern to the southern boundary of the State, with two branches, leading easterly to the eastern boundary, and a branch leading westerly to San Francisco, and asking ten sections of land per mile. The bill was referred in Committee to Hon. Mr. Barrett, of Missouri, who agreed to take charge of and report it favorably. Owing to delays in procuring information from the Land Department, and other causes, the bill made no progress in Committee. Mr. Barrett's time was also taken up in attending to his contested election case as to leave very little time to attend to other matters. The bill was therefore transferred to the charge of Hon. John G. Davis, of Indiana, who was friendly to and proposed to report it favorably. At Mr. Davis' request, I computed the quantity of lands and number of miles of road, which, when footed up, appeared so large that it was thought best to reduce both the length and number of sections per mile. Accordingly a new bill was drawn up for a substitute, contemplating a system of valley roads extending from the head of Tulare Valley on the south, to Shasta on the north, to San Francisco and Benicia or Vallejo on the west, and to the eastern boundary of the State on the east. The quantity of land was also reduced to seven sections, or 4,480 acres per mile, or about 3,500,000 acres in all; and it was further provided that where, by reason of the occurrence of Spanish or Mexican grants, or mineral lands, or lands condemned by the United States Surveyor as worthless, the full amount contemplated by the bill could not be had within certain limits, the balance of the quota might be selected from any of the Government lands (not mineral lands) within the limits of the State, such selection to be made by agent or agents to be appointed by the Governor, and selections to be approved by the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. Davis had also charge of similar bills for the Territories of Kansas and Nebraska, which were first acted upon by the Committee, reported to the House, put on their passage and lost.

Mr. Davis, feeling somewhat chagrined at the fate of the bills, requested to be relieved of the charge of ours, which was again transferred to the charge of Hon. Eli Thayer, of Massachusetts, Chairman of the Committee on Public Lands, who expressed himself in favor of the bill and manifested an interest in our movements. The business had so accumulated on the hands of the Committee that it was sometime before our bill came before them for action. They finally took it up, passed it in Committee unanimously and authorized the Chairman to report it favorably to the House. We urged on Mr. Thayer the necessity of making an early report to the House, to which he assented, but said that it was the intention of the Committee to ask of the House
one or two days to be set apart for the consideration of business of that Committee, when all their business would be disposed of.

The Charleston Convention intervening, no business was transacted for ten days, and Mr. Thayer being a delegate to the Chicago Convention, nothing was done with it until his return, except to prepare a copy of the bill which was introduced in the Senate by Mr. Latham and referred to the Committee on Public Lands. General Lane, on that Committee, consented to look after it there.

On Mr. Thayer’s return, the public business of importance had so accumulated in the House that he was unable to procure a time to be set for the consideration of the business of his Committee, and it was doubtful even if it would be called before the close of the session.

There is a generally favorable feeling towards this bill in the House, and could it have been gotten up it would undoubtedly have passed.

Mr. Burch has exerted himself with commendable zeal, and did everything in his power to induce it to be reported to the House.

In case this bill passes, I would state that the lines of railroad, as called for in the bill, are laid down on a map I prepared for the Committee on Public Lands, who required the indorsement or approval of the delegation, who gave such approval. The map, therefore, becomes valuable as indicating the position of the lines to which the aid granted in the bill was contemplated to be given. This map will be preserved for future reference.

I have also devoted a portion of my time and attention to the bill providing for a survey of the eastern boundary of California, which, having passed and received the approval of the President, leaves nothing more to be said about it. A copy of that bill is appended, also a copy of my communication to the delegation with regard to the difficulties and cost of making such survey.

I have also collected some reliable information with regard to the operating of locomotive engines on heavy grades, which becomes highly important in view of solving the question of crossing the Sierra Nevada mountains, as it establishes the fact that grades of as high as three hundred and fifty feet per mile can be overcome and operated with perfect safety.

I think it just and proper to state that, through the kindness and personal exertion of Hon. J. C. Burch, a room was provided in the Capitol (the old Vice President’s room), easy of access, upon the same floor with the hall of the House and Senate, which was appropriately furnished and given me for my uses and purposes. This was considered a general headquarters for the Pacific Railroad. I procured all the maps, reports, surveys, and papers of every kind, to be found on the subject, and, it being so convenient to the Halls, many of the Senators and members were accustomed to drop in almost daily. You may be assured that no opportunity was lost to further our views and impress on them the importance in which the subject is held in California.
I conceive the occasion a proper one to express my obligations to our Congressional delegation for the uniform kindness they have extended to me and the interest they have manifested throughout. Also to Lieutenant Abbott, of the Engineer Corps, U. S. A., in charge of Pacific Railroad surveys, for his kindness in furnishing me with copies of the maps, profiles, etc., in his charge. Also to Messrs. Curtis, Phelps, Stevens, Stout, Otero, French, Logan, Elihu B. Washburne, Thayer, Lice and Grow, members of the House.

It gives me pleasure to be able to present the accompanying testimonial, signed by the entire delegation from California, also by Messrs. Lane, Curtis, Phelps and E. B. Washburne, approving my course in Washington.

I would also state that, although the expenses of my mission, apart from my time, have cost me over $2,500, the only bills I have to present are:

For printing bill and circular in New York...........$20
For printing bill and circular in Washington....... 20

Total.................................................$40

Accompanying this report will be found the following papers, copies of which are at the service of the Executive Committee:
A—Debate in House on Pacific Railroad Bill; B—Bill printed in New York;
C—Printed Circular accompanying; D—Bill printed in Washington;
E—Circular accompanying; F—Full Official Report of Proceedings of Pacific Railroad Committee at each meeting (valuable);
G—Communication of T. D. Judah to Pacific Railroad Committee;
H—Letter of Approval of Delegation; I—Circular of Railroad Convention held at Louisville March 21, 1860; J—Memorial of Edward Larned to Congress, on Pacific Railroad; K—Letter of H. D. Whitcomb, Chief Engineer Virginia Central Railroad; L—Letter of Thomas Dodarnead, Superintendent Virginia Central Railroad; M—Letter of M. W. Baldwin & Co., locomotive builders, Philadelphia; N—Pamphlet by Charles Ellett, Esq.; O—Three Speeches of Hon. Wm. M. Gwin on Pacific Railroad; P—Original Bill of Hon. Mr. Curtis; Q—Bill of Select Committee; R—Bill introduced by Hon. Mr. Kennedy, United States Senate; S—Bill of Convention, introduced by Hon. Messrs. Haun and Burch; T—Report of Select Committee; U—Bill introduced by Hon. Messrs. Wigfall and Scott; V—Argument and Bill of F. W. Lander, Esq.; W—Bill introduced by Hon. Mr. Stout; X—Bill introduced by Hon. Mr. Boteler; Y—Communication to delegation respecting Survey of Eastern Boundary; Z—Copy of Map furnished Committee on Public Lands.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

Very respectfully,

THEODORE D. JUDAH.