Facts Revealed in the Treasury Department.

MANIPULATION OF FIGURES, ALTERATIONS, CHANGES AND DISCREPANCIES IN THE OFFICIAL FINANCE REPORTS.

MILLIONS INVOLVED AND UNACCOUNTED FOR.

SPEECH

OF

HON. HENRY G. DAVIS

OF WEST VIRGINIA.

IN THE SENATE, NOVEMBER 16, 1877.

ACCOUNTS OF THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT.

Mr. Davis, of West Virginia. If there be no further morning business, I ask that the resolution submitted by me on the 18th ultimo be now taken up.

The Vice-President. The resolution called up by the Senator from West Virginia will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Whereas there appear to be material differences, alterations and discrepancies in the official finance report of the Treasury Department as to the annual expenditures, receipts of the Government and the public debt, and particularly in the reports of 1869 to 1872 inclusive, which differences, discrepancies, changes and alterations involve many millions of dollars, and no explanation appears in said reports for the same: Therefore,

Be it resolved. That a committee of five be appointed to investigate the finance reports, books and accounts of the Treasury Department, particularly with reference to differences, discrepancies and alterations in amounts and figures that have been made in them, especially in the annual statements of the expenditures of the Government, revenue collected and the public debt, contained in said reports; and if any such differences, discrepancies and alterations be found to exist, to report the same, and the extent and nature thereof, the years wherein they occur, by what authority made, if any, the reasons that induced them, and to report generally such other and further information earing upon the subject as to them may seem best; and that said committee have power to send for persons and papers, to take testimony, to employ stenographers, and such clerical assistance as they may deem necessary, and leave to sit during the session of the Senate; and that the expenses attending this investigation shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the committee.

Mr. President, to do this subject justice and point out all | the changes and alterations in the finance reports, it would require perhaps several hours; but inasmuch as the subject has been discussed heretofore in the Senate by several Senators, including myself, I will be brief, probably not occupying the attention of the Senate more than

forty or fifty minutes.

It is not my purpose to make an extended argument, but to submit figures and facts drawn from the official finance reports. All the figures and facts stated or used by me are taken from the annual official statements to Congress made by the Secretary of the Treasury. And I am ready and willing to make good every figure used. If any Senator can throw light upon or correct what I am about to state, let him stop me and do so.

From the great abundance of instances showing differences, changes, and altera-

tions in the official finance reports, I cite the following, relating to the

PUBLIC DEBT.

The annual statement of the public debt from 1835 to 1871, as appears in the finance reports for 1869 and previous reports, and 1871 and subsequent reports, shows the difference in each year and the total difference between the two reports, (see pages 12 and 368, finance report for 1871, and page 317, fluance report for 1869:)

YEAR.	Reports of 1869 and previous years.	Reports of 1871 and subsequent years.	report of	Decrease.
1835 1836 1837 1838 1339 1840 1841 1841 1842 1843 1844 1845 1846 1846 1847 1848 1849 1850 1851 1850 1851 1855 1856 1856 1857 1858 1859 1869 1870 1861	291,089 23 55 1,878,223 55 1,878,223 55 1,878,223 55 1,878,223 55 1,125,077 63 6,737,398 00 15,028,486 37 27,203,450 69 24,748,188 23 17,093,794 80 16,750,925 33 8,956,623 88 48,526,379 37 62,560,395 26 65,131,692 13 67,340,628 78 47,242,206 65 39,963,731 65 39,963,731 65 39,963,731 65 39,963,731 65 39,963,731 65 39,963,731 65 39,963,731 65 39,963,731 65 39,963,731 65 21,471,471,471,471,471,471,471,471,471,47	336 967 88 3 398,124 07 10,434,221 14 3,573,348 82 5,250,875 54 13,594,480 73 20,601,226 28 32,742,922 00 23,461,652 56 15,925,303 01 15,556,202 97 38,826,534 77 47,044,862 23 63,961,858 634 582,773 55 68,301,796 62 66,199,341 71 59,803,117 77 42,242,222 42 35,586,956 56 31,972,537 99 28,699,831 85 44,911,881 03 28,698,837 87 28,698,873 72 28,698,873 72 28,698,673 78 28,773 78,783 78 28,783 78	\$ 45,868 78 1,429,900 52 5,576,560 68 125,797 91 6,857,082 73 5,572,739 91 5,539,471 31 5,744,400 76 1,067,649 58 1,008,628 26 1,103 37 72,584 80 9,965,940 21 20,978,957 26 75,093,881 68 99,449,733 36 94,313,828 07 \$332,843,228 59 85,076,553 88	8,410,393 71 1,286,535 73 1,168,491 79 1,200,723 39 130,088 61 1,481,517 14 1,642,835 02 775,464 82 775,751 08 4,999,983 63 4,999,983 63 4,382,774 49 360,555 05 267,861 45 286,954 96
Total increase		\$241,110,014 11	\$247,766,674 71	PER CHARLES AVAILABLE

And the increased figures appear in all finance reports since 1871. In other words, the changes and alterations made in the finance report for 1871 as to the public debt for the years from 1835 to 1870 inclusive increase it in the aggregate during the period \$247,766,674 71.

Since the formation of the Government the Register of the Treasury, the official book-keeper of the Treasury Department, has made as required by law an annual statement of the public debt. Up to 1870 his reports substantially agree; but in 1871 this officer makes his usual statement of what the public debt was during each year from the beginning of the Government, and we find, without explanation, that com-

mencing with the year 1835 it entirely differs from the report he made in 1869 from all former reports and increases the public debt in the aggregate the enormous sum above stated; and it can be established by positive proof that the Register did not re-state his accounts from the data in his office, the only proper source, but, without any reference to them whatever, made the public debt statement referred to, under directions from the Secretary of the Treasury and according to a statement furnished, which changed former public debt statements as far back as 1835 in the manner and to the extent above stated.

Again, by comparing the public debt statements found in the report for 1870 (page 276) and 1871 (pages 368, 369), we find large differences commencing with the year 1862. And although these changes extend as far back as 1835, yet the greatest increase, indeed almost all of it, was from 1862 to 1870, as the following table will

show:

YEAR.	Report for 1870, page 276.	Report for 1871, pp. 368, 369.
1862 1863 1864 1864 1866 1866 1867 1868	2,636,320,964,67 2,489,002,480,58	1,119,772,138 63 1,815,784,370 57 2,680,647,869 74 2,773,236,173 69 2,678,126,103 87 2,611,687,851 19 2,588,452,213 94
(Potal	\$19,023,595,208 63	\$19,272,555,561 57
Difference, or increase		\$ 248,960,352 94

Now, it is a matter of importance to know, and it should be fully explained, why it was that the Secretary of the Treasury in 1870-771 directed a new and different statement of the public debt from statements regularly made in former years, and particularly why or how in 1871 he could go back a period of ten years or more and change the public debt for a given year, largely increasing it, after it had been officially stated, reported, and stood on the books at a fixed and certain amount, as the following table will show he did in a number of years:

YEAR.	Public debt, stated in report for 1870 (page 276.)	Public debt, stated in report for 1871 (pages 368 and 369.)
1862	\$ 514,211,371 92 1,098,793,181 37 1,740,690,489 49 2,489,002,480 54 2,386,358,599 74	\$ 524,176,412 13 1,119,772,138 63 1,815,784,370 57 2,588,452,213 94 2,480,672,427 8J
Total	\$8,220,056,322 96	\$8,528,857,563 08 8,220,056,322 96
Showing an aggregate increase in these years of		\$299,801,340 02

It will be borne in mind that in the year 1862 and each of the years up to 1870 the public debt was reported and stood on the books of the Treasury Department just as stated by the Register in the finance report for 1870; yet in 1871 the Secretary changes these amounts by increasing them largely in each year.

these amounts by increasing them largely in each year.

Again the statements made by the Secretary of the Treasury in the annual finance reports and in the monthly debt statements, as also those made by the Register of the Treasury, for a given year, often differ materially from each other. For instance, take the year 1869:

\$ 100 miles and the second	2,656,603,955 73
Finance report for 1869, page 29	2,645,170,294 16
Monthly debt statement, July 1, 1809	2,588,452,213 94
Finance report, 1870 (June 30, 1869), page 25	2,489,002,480 58
Finance report 1870 (by the Register), page 276	

From this comparison it is impossible for any one to know what the public debt was for 1869; and yet there is no explanation for this difference, although it varies from eleven to one hundred and sixty millions of dollars.

Again the Register, at page 317, finance report for 1869, states the public debt for that year to be	\$2,489,002,480 58 2,480,672,427 81
The difference between these sums ought to show the decrease of the public debt for 1870, which is. But the monthly debt statements for the year 1870, state the decrease of the public for that year was.	\$8,330,052 77 102,643,880 84
Making a difference between the finance reports and monthly statements of	\$94,313,828 07
Now, up to 1869, the Pacific railroad debt was carried as part of the public debt, but in 1870 it was taken from the public debt and stated as the debt of the Pacific railroad, amounting at that time, which was only an apparent and not real reduction, to	\$58,638,320 00 8,330,052 77
It would appear that the public debt for 1870 was increased	\$50,608,267 28
And not decreased, as set forth in the monthly debt statements	\$102,643,880,84

The public debt for a given year is susceptible of being accurately determined and stated; and when once determined and stated to be a certain sum, it should remain for all time, not subject to change by succeeding officers of the Treasury.

In connection with these differences, changes, and discrepancies, I wish to state a remarkable fact, that the finance reports, in their annual statements of the public debt, expenditures, and revenue, all substantially agree, from the beginning of the Government up to and including the year 1869, and from 1872 until the present year. In the finance report for 1870 the new table of the Secretary first appears, in which these and other great changes were made. Now take the

LOANS AND TREASURY NOTES.

Under this head I call the attention of the Senate to the great difference in the finance reports as to what they were for the year 1863. They are stated differently in four annual reports, as follows:

In the report of 1863	PTER 400 005 1	
In the report of 1876.	717, 284, 707	11

These reports differ for the same year from twenty to more than ninety millions of dollars; and who can tell which is correct?

EXPENDITURES.

The various finance reports differ widely as to the annual expenditures of the Government, as the following table will show:

Years.	Total annual exper	Total annual expenditures as stated in financial report for— 869 and previous 1870 and subsergences (pp. 320, quent reports, 271, 275.) Increase in report of 1870 over 1869.		
Tours.	reports (pp. 320.			Decrease in report of 1870 over 1869.
1860-61 1861-62 1862-63 1863-64	570,841,700 25 895,796,630,65	\$ 85,387,363 08 565,667,358 08 899,815,911 25 1,295,541,114 86	\$ 50 00 4,019,280 60	\$ 5,174,342 17
1864-65	1,897,674,224 09 1,141,072,666 09	1,906,433,331 37 1,139,344,081 95	8,759,107 28	2,603,541 14 1,728,584 14
Total Difference or in- crease	\$5,888,917,190 16	\$5,892,189,160 59	\$12,778,437 88 3,271,970 43	\$9,506,467 45

And, what is remarkable, the reports for 1870 and subsequent reports increase the expenditures over the report for 1869 and former reports from three to four millions of dollars.

The finance report for 1871 in its statements of the annual expenditures materially increases them as stated in the report of 1869 and previous reports, as the following table will show:

Increase in Expenditures in Report of 1871 as Compared with Report of 1869.

Year.	Military Serv-	Pensions.	Indians.	Naval estab- lishment.	Total.
1860	\$2,000,000 00		\$ 104,546 10		
1862 1863	4,015,810 99	\$ 5,840 73	2.075.706 35	\$ 50,130 04	
1864 1865 1866		7,056,010 86 197 53	92,395 81 48,664 76	49,657 95	
Total	\$6,015,810 99	\$7,061,949 12	\$2,412,991 19	\$99,787 99	
Increase: Military service Pensions Indians Naval establishme					\$6,015,810 99 7,061,949 13 2,412,991 19 99,787 99
Total	:nu				\$15,590,529 2

Again, the Pension Bureau on the 25th day of July, 1876, furnished an official statement from its books that from 1860 to 1870, inclusive, there were paid for Army and Navy pensions \$129,391,228 38, while the Secretary of the Treasury in the finance report for 1870 states the pension expenditures for the same period at \$142,540,493 44, which is an increase of \$13,149,265 06, as the following table will show:

Statement showing the total amount paid in each fiscal year for Army and Navy pensions, as per finance report for 1870 and letter of the Commissioner of Pensions of July 25, 1876.

Years.	From Secreta- ry's table, finance report of 1870, page 30.	Commissioner	Increase.	Decrease.
1860	\$1,100,802 32 1,034,599 73 852,170 47 1,078,513 36 4,985,473 90 16,347,621 34 15,605,549 88 20,936,551 71 23,782,386 78 28,476,621 78 28,340,202 17	\$1,154,321 73 1,089,218 75 800,819 94 1,044,364 47 4,521,622 18 8,542,885 27 13,250,980 17 18,681,711 79 24,079,403 18 28,445,089 09 27,780,811 81	\$51,350 53 34,148 89 463,851 72 7,804,736 07 2,354,569 71 2,254,839 92 31,532 69 559,390 36	\$58,519 41 54,619 02 297,016 49
Total	\$142,540,493 44	\$129,391,228 38	• \$13.554,419 89	\$405,154 83

Secretary's table, finance report for 1875	\$142,510,493 44	\$13.554.419 89
Increase Letter of Commissioner of Pensions, July 25, 1876 Decrease		
	\$13,149,265 06	\$13,149,265 06

Many more instances might be cited, but these are deemed sufficient to show that the finance reports do not agree as to the expenditures or debt of the Government for the same year.

REVENUE COLLECTED.

Nor do the reports agree as to what amount of revenue has been collected for various years; and what is most remarkable in this case, instead of the changes I cite in the reports increasing the revenue as they do the public debt and expenditures, they decrease it, as the following table shows:

Year. State	s' total reve-	States' total revenue collected.	Decrease in report of 1871.
		3/3//3	AL Y
1854	1,867,450 66 27,947,142 19 5,340,025 82 5,069,662 84 5,401,804 58 7,066,889 65 7,669,766 75 11,803,404 58 11,773,955 64 19,379,652 52 15,939,945 93 10,884,173 11	\$31,865,561 16 27,853 853 84 33,851,242 89 25,032,193 59 55,338,168 52 56,992,479 21 47,649,388 88 61,500,102 81 81,758,557 30 889,373,652 51 1,805,933,250 82 1,270,712,078 82	\$1,889 50 63,288 35 1,458,782 93 37,499 25 63,636 66 14,410 44 20,377 87 303,501 77 15,408 34 6,000 01 6,695 11 172,094 29

There are other changes and many large differences between the Secretary's, Treasurer's and Register's reports relating to currency, bond, loan and interest accounts which I have not referred to, leaving them to the committee, if appointed. In view of the facts I have stated and figures cited, all drawn from the official

finance reports, showing differences, changes and alterations involving hundreds of millions of dollars, and this without explanation, I will not permit myself to doubt that the Senate will readily agree to have the whole matter thoroughly investigated and understood; and in my opinion this can be best done by a special committee em-

powered as provided in the resolution now before the Senate.

To my mind it is a matter of great moment, demanding serious consideration, and concerns not one political party more than another, but the whole country, because the official reports of the financial operations of the Government ought to correctly show what they are and have been; ought to be certain and positive, and when once made should not be subject to change or alteration, and if any person or persons, officer or officers, have from good or bad motives, or from any consideration, assumed the power to make changes and alterations in the finance reports, as has certainly been done and without authority, it belongs to and is the duty of Congress to know the reasons.

Why, Mr. President, you or the Secretary of State would have the same right to change a law on the statute book as the Secretary of the Treasury has to change and

alter the finance reports after they have once been made to Congress.

In presenting this resolution, as with the one at the last Congress, it is not my intention to reflect upon any party or upon the past or present officials of the Treasury Department, but my greatest desire is now, as it was then, that all of the facts in connection with these changes and differences might be made to fully appear. Now that the country is comparatively free from political excitement, it seems an opportune time to investigate this whole subject, elicit all the truth, and let in all the light possible.

It may be claimed that the Finance committee of the Senate at the last session of Congress investigated and reported upon this subject. I admit the question was referred to that committee for report, and a report was made, but it is a well known fact that, as was predicted when the resolution was referred, it did not have the time

to make a proper investigation.

The committee as such made no investigation or examination whatever of the books, accounts, or records of the Treasury Department. Neither did they individually, except the chairman (and he only once or twice), or as a committee ever visit the

Treasury Department on the subject.

The matter was referred to the chairman of the Finance Committee, now the Secretary of the Treasury, and the distinguished Senator from New York (Mr. Kernan), both of whom have stated in the Senate that they made no personal examination and could not make any for want of time. The resolution was referred by them to the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Treasury officials made an ex parte statement or defense by way of explanation of some of the changes and alterations pointed out by myself, which statement was embodied in the report of the committee, and this was the extent of the investigation.

The report is important, however, in this: it makes certain admissions upon this subject, some of which I cite as a further reason why this resolution should pass

On page 9 of the report, the committee, after speaking of the examination of the public debt from the year 1836, quoting from the finance report of 1871, say:

A part of the differences has arisen from a want of knowledge and care on the part of subordinate clerks in staring loan accounts, but much the larger proportion has occurred from want of a unity, system, and proper method in the accounts as heretofore kept in the department.

The committee also incorporated in their report a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, in which, after speaking of the discrepancies that exist in the finance report, he says :

They arose from a system of book-keeping which was defective and which has been of late years greatly improved.

On page 13 of the report the Secretary, in this same letter, says:

Some of the discrepancies referred to have actually existed for many years, in fact commencing with some of the accounts of the first loans issued by the Government, and were first shown in the reports of the years 1870 and 1871, for the reason that during that period an examination into the subject was begun, and changes were then made in the published statements as the result of graph overprincipal. such examination.

Further on, under the head of public debt, he says:

In 1871 this account was restated from 1836 from the receipts and expenditures.

And he also says:

When this examination was completed the Register was directed to state his accounts accordingly.

On page 16 of the report, Secretary Bristow, in this same letter, says:

The year 1869 was the first of Secretary Boutwell's administration, who remodeled the debt statement.

Here we have several admissions, both from Secretary Bristow and the Finance Committee, that alterations and changes were made, and that the public debt statement was "remodeled." Now, the business of the special committee, if appointed, will

be to ascertain why they were made and to what extent.

In my investigations I have been confined to the reports as made to Congress. I have not had the opportunity of looking into the books of the Treasury Department or getting aid from the officials, and I submit, from the examination I have been able to make, if so many discrepancies and alterations appear, what may we not expect from a committee with full authority to examine the reports before they are made to Congress, as also the books and accounts of the Department?

The facts and figures which I have given, all taken from the official reports, clearly

First. That differences, changes and alterations, involving millions of dollars, have been made in the annual finance reports after being officially made to Congress.

Second. That ex-Secretary Bristow and the Finance Committee admit that they were made between the years 1869 and 1871, without explanation and without authority, and the reasons for making them ought to be known.

Third. That the annual finance reports to Congress substantially agree, up to and including the year 1869 and from 1871 to the present, as to the public debt, expendi-

tures and receipts of the Government, but between these years differ widely.

Fourth. That in 1870 the Register of the Treasury was directed to restate the public debt and expenditures from the year 1835 to 1870 according to a statement sent him

from the Secretary's office, and not according to the data or books in his office.

Fifth. That, between the years 1869 and 1871, the Secretary's new tables stating and "remodeling" the public debt and expenditures of the Government first appear in the finance reports, which makes these changes and alterations and increase the public debt and expenditure more than a hundred million dollars.

Mr. Thurman. Mr. President, this subject is not new to me; and although my recollection of the details of it is not so good as it once was, it is sufficiently vivid to compel me to dissent from some of the remarks made by the Senator from Vermont.

This subject came before the Senate by a resolution offered by the Senator from West Vivinia two or three areas and the senator from the s

West Virginia two or three sessions ago for a special committee to investigate certain alleged discrepancies in the books of the Treasury Department and in the reports made to Congress; and that Senator, in support of his resolution, made a speech that quite startled the Senate, I am sure, for I do not think anybody had imagined before that such discrepancies existed.

I supposed that the resolution would pass, but it did not pass. On the contrary,

instead of raising a special committee, of which of course the mover of the resolution, the Senator from West Virginia, would have been a member, if not the chairman, his resolution was amended so as to make it the duty of the Committee on Finance to

make the investigation.

My Bayard. Now, this is no small matter. It is not the sum of a few dollars more or less that would simply betray trifling inaccuracy; but it amounts to a mighty sum, a sum that not simply affects the convenience of a people, but is grave enough to affect the morals of a people. As I understand it, here the aggregate of these discrepancies amounts to \$241,000,000. Such charges as these taken from the face of these documents "cannot be whistled down the wind." They must be met and explained. It is our duty to our people to meet and explain them; it is our duty to the officials under whom these accounts have been prepared, and under whose authority they have been published, that they should be explained. If the Secretary of the Treasury had been my most confidential friend, I think I should have been foremost in insisting upon the fact that a committee armed with proper powers and supplied with proper instruments of examination should be charged at once with the examination of these accounts.

Other wa have several admissions both from Secretary Briston and the Photosic Committee, that alterations and charges were made, and that the public door grainmone was "remedeled." And, the business of the electric committee, stroppolities, with a constant why they or made and to what extent. In any department one I have been confined so the reports as made to Compress. I have not had the experiments of locking into the books of the Tressure Museringant. A That or Secretary Briston and the Florence Countities admit that The second subsection of the very second sec Date as the year the property of the property chair each discrepancies existed.

I supered that the regulation would pass, but it did not pass. To the contrary.