

EASILY FOUND.

RECORD OF JAMES A. GARFIELD.

CREDIT MOBILIER

was the corporation that built the Union Pacific Railroad. Oakes Ames handled its stock, and bribed members of Congress to pass the bill by giving them stock. The whole of the facts came out in the Forty-second Congress, before the Poland Republican Congressional Investigating Committee. They are as follows:

Oakes Ames swore that in January, 1868, he got for Garfield ten shares of the Credit Mobilier stock; Ames paid for the stock; Garfield did not pay him any money; Ames sold the bonds for \$776, and received a cash dividend on the stock of \$600, leaving due to Garfield \$329, after paying for the stock, which amount he swore he paid him in cash, and he submitted the account as follows:

GARFIELD IN ACCOUNT WITH OAKES AMES.

The following memorandum referred to by witness as a statement of his account with Mr. Garfield was placed in evidence:

J. A. G.		Dr.
1868. To 10 shares stock Credit Mobilier,		
A.....	\$1,000 00	
Interest.....	47 00	
June 19, To Cash.....	329 00	
	\$1,376 00	
		Cr.
1868. By dividend bonds Union Pacific Railroad A.		
\$1,000 at 80 per cent. less 3 per cent.....	\$776 00	
June 17. By dividend collected for you.....	600 00	
	\$1,376 00	

OAKES AMES' "LITTLE BOOK"

showed the following entries of Senators and members of Congress, and the amounts received by them:

H. L. Dawes.....	\$ 600	Bingham.....	\$1,200
Schofield.....	600	Allison.....	600
Patterson.....	1,800	Kelley.....	329
Painter.....	1,800	Wilson.....	329
Wilson.....	1,200	Garfield.....	329
Colfax.....	1,200		

Ames swears that after the matter became public, Garfield wanted to treat it as a loan, and says:

I stated to him that he had never asked me to lend him any money; that I never knew he wanted to borrow any. I did not know he was short. I made a statement to him showing the transaction and what there was due on it; that deducting the bond dividend and the cash dividend, there was \$329 due him, for which I had given him a check; that he had never asked me to lend him any money, and I never loaned him any.

I told him he knew very well that that was a dividend. I made out a statement and showed it to him at the time. In one conversation he admitted it, and said, as near as I can remember, that there was \$2,400 due him in stock and bonds. He made a little memorandum of \$1,000 and \$1,400, and, as I recollect, said there was \$1,000 of Union Pacific Railroad stock, \$1,000 of Credit Mobilier stock, and \$400 of stock or bonds, I do not recollect what. My impression is that he wanted to say as little about it as he could, and to get off as easily as he could. That was about the conversation I had with him—about the long and short of it.

Q. Have you the memorandum Mr. Garfield made? A. I have the figures that he made.

Paper shown to the Committee containing figures as follows:

\$1,000
\$1,400
\$2,400

Q. You say this figures were made by Mr. Garfield? A. Yes, sir.

Q. What do these sums represent? How did he put them down? A. \$1,000 Union Pacific Railroad stock, \$1,000 Credit Mobilier stock, and \$400 which he could not remember whether it was to be in cash or stocks or bonds.

Garfield swore before the Committee that he simply borrowed \$300 from Ames, and afterward repaid him the money.

The Committee did not believe him, and did believe Oakes Ames; and its report to the Forty-second Congress contains the following:

"The facts in regard to Mr. Garfield, as found by the Committee, are identical with the case of Mr. Kelley to the point of the reception of the check of \$329. He agreed with Mr. Ames to take ten shares of Credit Mobilier stock, but did not pay for the same. Mr. Ames received the 80 per cent. dividend bonds and sold them for 97 per cent., and also received the 60 per cent. cash dividend, which, together, paid the price of the stock and interest and left a balance of \$329. This sum was paid over to Mr. Garfield by a check on the Sergeant-at-Arms, and Mr. Garfield then understood this sum was the balance of dividends after paying for the stock. Mr. Ames received all the subsequent dividends; and the Committee do not find that, since the payment of the \$329, there has been any communication between Mr. Ames and Mr. Garfield on the subject until the investigation began."

He voted for the railroad charter, received the proceeds of the stock, tried to treat the transaction as a loan, swore that he received no dividend, and his judges, the Committee, disbelieved him.

(New York Times, February 19th, 1873.)

Messrs. Kelley and Garfield present a most distressing figure. Their participation in the Credit Mobilier affair is complicated by the most unfortunate contradictions of testimony.

(New York Tribune, February 19th, 1873.)

James A. Garfield, of Ohio, had ten shares; never paid a dollar; received \$329, which, after the investigation began, he was anxious to have considered as a loan from Mr. Oakes Ames to himself.

Well, the wickedness of all of it is that these men betrayed the trust of the people, deceived their constituents, and, by evasions and falsehoods, confessed the transactions to be disgraceful.

DE GOLYER.

De Golyer & Company were parties who had a patent pavement which they wanted the Board of Public Works of Washington and Congress to buy and lay down. Sheppard was then in control of city affairs, and Garfield was the Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations in the House of Representatives. In order to obtain the contract they had to pass through both these bodies. The subject was investigated before a Committee of Congress, and it fully appeared, by the testimony of Garfield and others, that the agent of De Golyer & Co. paid Garfield a fee of \$5000 for his agency in procuring the contract for them; that he never filed with the Board of Public Works or elsewhere a brief or opinion on the subject of the patent pavement, but that he did speak to Gov. Sheppard once on the subject. The contract was given to De Golyer & Company. It cost the Government about \$1,200,000. The profits to the contractors were about \$400,000. It could not have gotten through the Committee on Appropriations without the influence of the Chairman. Garfield was the man to reach. His influence was secured by the \$5000 fee, for which he gave no opinion, except to speak to Sheppard. The pavement was a cheat and a swindle.

The question came up in court in Chicago as Chittenden, the man who secured Garfield through Parsons, brought suit against De Golyer and McClelland for this service after they had secured their money on the paving contracts. His claim was that he had secured Garfield, not as a lawyer, but on the distinct ground that he was Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. The plea of the defendants was that this was a claim for lobby services that the court could not recognize, because to do so would be against public policy, and their counsel quoted the opinion of Justice Swayne in a much weaker case than this of Garfield. The plea was sustained by Judge Farwell, of the Circuit Court of the United States in Chicago, and the case there ended with the defeat of the plaintiff.

The evidence was overwhelming, not only that the pavement was worthless and over-charged, but that the contract had been obtained through the influence of J. A. Garfield, member of Congress, and Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, through which committee the bill for that and all other District expenses would have to pass, and Richard C. Parsons, Garfield's friend and United States Marshal for the District. The pernicious effects of these official influences were so apparent, and presented a case so analogous to that of *Trist vs. Child*, passed on by Justice Swayne in the United States Supreme Court, that Judge Farwell took the identical ground, and even employed the same language which had been so happily suggested by Judge Swayne:

"The agreement with General Garfield, a member of Congress, to pay him \$5000 as a contingent fee for procuring a contract which was itself made to depend upon a future appropriation by Congress—which appropriation could only come from a committee of which he was chairman—was a sale of official influence which no veil can cover, as against the plainest principles of public policy."

The report of the committee and the testimony annexed are conclusive proofs of the facts here stated.

HIS OPPOSITION TO FOREIGNERS.

On the 8th of March, 1867, at the first session of the Fortieth Congress, Mr. Fernando Wood asked unanimous consent to offer the following resolution:

Resolved, That this House extends its sympathy to the people of Ireland in their pending struggle for constitutional liberty. If the despotic governments of Europe shall be allowed to establish monarchical institutions in America, so should the United States foster and promote the extension of republican institutions in Europe.

Mr. Broomall (Rep.) objected. The motion was then to suspend the rules to enable the resolution to pass. The question was taken, and there were 104 yeas and 14 nays. Thirteen of those who voted nay were Republicans, and James A. Garfield was one. Perhaps this affords a reason why Irishmen should rally to the support of Garfield.

In the Congressional Globe, April 17, 1871, First Session, part 2, page 735, will be found the following:

Mr. Kinsella. I move a suspension of the rules and the adoption of the following resolution, which I send to the desk:

Whereas, The prolonged incarceration in the prisons of the Dominion of Canada of persons accused of violating the neutrality laws is a source of irritation to a large number of American citizens; therefore,

Resolved, That the President of the United States is respectfully requested to have the case of such persons presented before such Joint High Commission, to the end that their release may be effected.

James A. Garfield objected, and voted against the passage of the strictly just resolution, showing thereby his hatred not alone of the unfortunate Fenian prisoners referred to in the resolution, who were then confined in Canadian dungeons for more than five years, but of the whole Celtic race.

VOTES TO TAX TEA, COFFEE, SALT, AND PRINTING PAPER.

As early as February 12, 1872, Mr. Mercur, of Pennsylvania, moved a resolution directing the Committee of Ways and Means to report a bill repealing the import duties on tea and coffee. The motion was agreed to without debate, for it was made under a suspension of the rules. Mr. Garfield is recorded in the negative. [Globe, part 2, Second Session Forty-second Congress, page 974.]

On the following Monday, February 19, Mr. Mercur made another motion of like import by moving to discharge the Committee of the Whole from the further consideration of a bill to repeal existing duties on tea and coffee. This was adopted also under a suspension of the rules. Mr. Garfield is again recorded against it. [Ibid. page 1118.]

On the same day a resolution was offered directing the Ways

and Means Committee, whenever it shall report a bill touching any import duties, to place salt and coal upon the free list. Mr. Garfield seems to have dodged this vote, for just before the vote was taken he is recorded on a civil rights bill, and just after it on the tea and coffee bill. [Ibid.]

The following is from the Congressional Record of April 6, '80: Mr. Townshend, of Illinois. I move to suspend the rules so that the Committee on Ways and Means be discharged from the further consideration of House bill No. 5265, and that the same be now passed: The bill was read as follows:

"That sections 2503, 2504, and 2505 of Title 33 of the Revised Statutes of the United States be revised and amended so that the duty on salt, printing type, printing paper, and the chemicals and materials used in the manufacture of printing paper, be repealed, and that said articles be placed on the free list."

Mr. Townshend, of Illinois. I call for the yeas and nays on agreeing to the motion to suspend the rules.

The yeas and nays were ordered. The question was taken, and there were—yeas 112, nays 80, not voting 100. So (two-thirds not voting in favor thereof) the motion to suspend the rules was not agreed to.

Mr. Garfield voted against the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to relieve printing paper, and type, and salt from tax.

SALARY GRAB.

He voted for the salary grab and took the money.

RAILROAD SUBSIDIES.

He voted to grant millions of acres of public lands to R. R. corporations, and against securing the rights of actual settlers on the same. May, 1870.

SWINDLES OF THE NEGRO.

He voted against instructing to investigate and try those concerned in the defalcations of the Freedman's Bureau.

CHINESE IMMIGRATION.

He voted against the bill to restrict it.

DENOUNCED BY HIS REPUBLICAN CONSTITUENTS.

September 7, 1876, Republicans of his Congressional District adopted the following:

Resolved, That we further arraign and denounce him for his corrupt connection with the Credit Mobilier, for his false denials thereof before his constituents, for his perjured denial thereof before a committee of his peers in Congress, for fraud upon his constituents in circulating among them a pamphlet purporting to set forth the finding of said committee and the evidence against him, when in fact material portions thereof were omitted and garbled.

Resolved, That we further arraign and charge him with corrupt bribery in selling his official influence as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations for \$5,000 to the DeGolyer pavement ring to aid them in securing a contract from the Board of Public Works of the District of Columbia; selling his influence to aid said ring in imposing upon the people of said District a pavement which is almost worthless at a price three times its cost, as sworn to by one of the contractors; selling his influence to aid said ring in procuring a contract, to procure which it corruptly paid \$97,000 "for influence;" selling his influence in a matter that involved no question of law, upon the shallow pretext that he was acting as a lawyer; selling his influence in a manner so palpable and clear as to be so found and declared by an impartial and competent court upon an issue solemnly tried.

In their address Sept. 10, 1876, they say:

The Republican party has done much to purify itself within itself. Its Whiskey Ring Revenue officers are convicted and imprisoned, Belknap is deposed and impeached and only escaped conviction by a technicality. Its Salary Stealing, Credit Mobilier, Pavement Jobbing Congressmen are mostly retired. James A. Garfield remains. Richard C. Parsons, his compeer as a great patent pavement lawyer, nominated without opposition in a district Republican last year by 6,500 majority, was buried at the polls by Henry B. Payne, a Democrat, by 2,500 majority. The office-holders nominated him, but the brave, honest people rebuked him.

James A. Garfield fell from 10,935 majority in 1872 to 2,526 majority in 1874. "Oh, what a fall there was, my countrymen." Rebuked, shorn of character for truth and integrity, all that is noble in manhood, almost defeated, he stands a sad and blackened monument of avarice and greed.

OFFICIAL RECORD

OF CHESTER A. ARTHUR.

Republican Candidate for Vice-President. He was Collector of Customs for the port of New York.

He was removed by President Hayes in 1879, and the following reasons for the removal were given by the President and Secretary of the Treasury to the United States Senate, in official letters.

Upon the strength of these charges of corruption and dishonesty in his administration of the office, the Senate assented to his removal.

"With a deep sense of my obligations under the Constitution, I regard it as my plain duty to suspend you, in order that the office may be honestly administered."—R. B. Hayes to Collector Arthur, January 31, 1879.

"You have made the Custom House a centre of partisan political management."—R. B. Hayes to Collector Arthur, Jan. 31, 1879.

"Gross abuses of administration have continued and increased during your incumbency."—John Sherman to Collector Arthur, January 31, 1879.

"Persons have been regularly paid by you who have rendered little or no service; the expenses of your office have increased while the receipts have diminished. Bribes, or gratuities in the shape of bribes, have been received by your subordinates in several branches of the Custom House, and you have in no case supported the effort to correct these abuses."—John Sherman to Collector Arthur.