

# Internal Improvements without a Policy

(1789-1861)

By VICTOR L. ALBJERG

Few domestic issues attracted greater attention during the early period of American history than did the question of internal improvements. Judged by the space devoted to it in the *Annals of Congress*, the *Debates in Congress* and the *Congressional Globe*, it was of paramount interest. Evaluated according to the amount appropriated, it occupied a position of much less significance. The first session of the seventieth congress appropriated almost twice as much for the improvement of a single harbor as did all of the congresses prior to the Civil War for all purposes of internal improvement.<sup>1</sup> During the period from 1789 to 1861, although the amount of debate in Congress on appropriations for lighthouses and fortifications was almost of no consequence, more money was actually appropriated for each of these than was granted for internal improvements.<sup>2</sup> The policy of internal improvements was, therefore, more important for what it might have become than for what it was. It was finally adopted as a system, but not until after it was no longer keenly needed. After the Civil War there was no real opposition to the federal government's aid in the construction of roads and harbors, but by that time there were other agencies which were in a position to furnish transportation facilities.

Congress displayed a lack of policy toward internal improvement from the very beginning of its consideration of that subject. In the Constitutional Convention, Benjamin Franklin proposed that Congress should have the power to construct canals so that the old provinces could keep in touch with the western settlements. This motion was rejected by a

---

<sup>1</sup> The amount appropriated for internal improvements in the period from 1789 to 1861, including the 2, 3, and 5% funds to the states was \$30,881,056.14. Compiled from the *United States Statutes at Large*; "Statement of Appropriations and Expenditures for Public Buildings, Rivers and Harbors, Forts, Arsenal, Armories and other Public Works from March 4, 1789 to June 30, 1882," in 47 Cong., 1 Sess., *Sen. Ex. Doc.*, 196; "Letter of the Secretary of the Treasury Communicating information called for by the Resolution of the Senate December 2, 1878 as to the amount expended for Public Works in the States and Territories," in 48 Cong., 1 Sess., *Sen. Ex. Doc.*, 12. The amount of money appropriated by the general government for light houses in the period from 1789 to 1861 is \$31,762,988.91. See *ibid.* The amount appropriated for fortifications in the same period is \$47,768,905.55. See *ibid.* The first session of the seventieth congress appropriated \$55,886,310 for the improvement of New York Harbor. *Statutes of the United State of America passed at the First Session of the Seventieth Congress, 1927-1928*, p. 359.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

vote of three to eight; the framers of the Constitution feared that Congress would become too powerful if it were allowed to exercise such a function. The intention of the Constitutional Convention was, therefore, to deny Congress the right over internal improvements. Yet, Congress eventually brushed aside all constitutional restraint and exercised the very powers which the framers had intended to deny.

It was generally conceded when internal improvement legislation was approached that Congress had the power to construct roads and canals and improve harbors within the territories where there was no state sovereignty, but that it had no similar rights within the states. Under this interpretation of the Constitution the first appropriations for internal improvements were made within the territories, when three sections of land were granted to Ebenezer Zane for the cutting of a trace from what is now Wheeling, West Virginia, to Limestone, Kentucky,<sup>4</sup> and when the sum of \$6,000 was appropriated in 1802 for the construction of roads in the Northwest Territory.<sup>5</sup> Likewise, the first federal appropriation for the improvement of a river was made within the territories. On February 15, 1819, Congress appropriated \$6,500 for the "Survey of the Tributaries of the Mississippi".<sup>6</sup> But the policy of confining appropriations to the territories was abandoned almost as soon as it was put into operation, for in 1806 Congress extended the operation of its power to the states but only after it had secured permission from the state through which the improvement was to be made.<sup>7</sup> State sovereignty was not to be violated.

The War of 1812, through an undeniable necessity, had accustomed the people to a greater reliance upon the federal government, and they had come to look upon it as the proper instrumentality by which their welfare should be promoted. Consequently in 1826, Congress harmonized its own convictions with the popular desires when it appropriated federal money for the improvement of the Savannah River.<sup>8</sup> This was the first appropriation within a state without previously

---

<sup>3</sup> *Journal of the Federal Convention*, kept by James Madison, edited by E. H. Scott (Chicago, 1893), p. 725.

<sup>4</sup> *Laws of the United States of America* (Philadelphia, 1796), III, p. 291-293.

<sup>5</sup> *Statutes at Large*, II, p. 180.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* III, p. 480.

<sup>7</sup> The federal government petitioned Maryland, Virginia and Pennsylvania for permission to construct the Cumberland Road through their limits.

<sup>8</sup> *Statutes at Large*, IV, p. 170.

obtaining the state's permission to make such improvement, since appropriations to a state reduced the lustre of its sovereignty. Appropriations for improvements within the states followed, and of the amount appropriated for roads before 1861 seventy-two per cent of it was applied to internal improvements within the states as distinct from the territories,<sup>9</sup> while a still larger per cent of the money set aside for harbors was also used for state improvement. In the period from 1789 to 1861 more than \$2,400,000 was appropriated for canal construction by the federal government. Of this sum only \$25,000 was applied in the territories, and this was for the Carondelet Canal in Louisiana.<sup>10</sup> Approximately four million acres of land were granted to the states for the construction of canals, yet only a few were given to the territories for the same purpose.<sup>11</sup> Necessity and practicality superseded theories of government, and again a former policy was repudiated.

No one displayed greater vacillation on the internal improvement policy than did the Presidents. Jefferson, that apostle of state rights, permitted the inauguration of the greatest internal improvement project of this whole period, the Cumberland Road, yet in his last days he fulminated against internal improvements by the federal government.<sup>12</sup> Madison co-author of state rights and satellite of the sage of Monticello, without questioning the power, recommended in 1811 that Congress aid New York in the construction of a canal to connect Lake Erie with the Hudson River.<sup>13</sup> Yet, in his Bonus Bill veto, he reversed his early position on internal improvements and emphatically declared that Congress neither had the power to appropriate for, nor to construct works of internal improvement.<sup>14</sup> Such a pronouncement was enough to paralyze further internal improvement efforts at least as long as Madison remained in office.

Monroe's policy was equally confused and contradictory.

<sup>9</sup> Appropriation for roads within the territories \$3,181,517.88  
 Appropriation for roads within the states \$6,417,253.07  
 Compiled from the *Statutes at Large*, "Statement of Appropriations and Expenditures for Public Buildings, Rivers, Harbors, Armories, Arsenals and Other Public Works from March 4, 1789 to June 30, 1812," in *Sen. Ex. Doc.* 196, 47 Cong., 1 Sess.

<sup>10</sup> *Statutes at Large*, II, 517; IV, 124, 139, 162, 169, 253, 293, 350, 560, 427, 716; VI, 936; X, 60, 247.

<sup>11</sup> *Statement showing Land Grants made by Congress to aid in Construction of Railroads, Canals, and Internal Improvements together with data relating thereto*, Compiled by the General Land Office, (Washington 1888).

<sup>12</sup> *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson*, edited by Paul Leicester Ford (12 Vols., New York, 1905), XII, 58, 350, 426, 418, 430.

<sup>13</sup> *Messages and Papers of the Presidents*, edited by James D. Richardson, I, p. 497.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 585.

Before he met his first Congress he had assured Madison that their views upon improvements coincided. He was determined, he said, to continue the policy of his predecessor,<sup>15</sup> and he informed Congress of his purpose. It was not until 1822 that the national legislature seriously challenged his policy by passing of the Tolls Bill. In the veto of that measure, Monroe denied that Congress had the power to construct works of internal improvement, but admitted that it had unlimited power of appropriation for any purpose whatsoever.<sup>16</sup> This was a departure from the views of Madison and a wedge that was to widen the breach still further. In his seventh annual message to Congress, Monroe repudiated his own policy still further by admitting that Congress might construct works of internal improvement provided that these were "national not state, general not local". Such a definition permitted an elastic interpretation soothing to executive logic and conscience. The result of this message was the passage of the Survey Bill in 1824 which created a board whose duties it should be to determine projects which complied with the President's criterion. This body interpreted liberally the term, "national". Consequently, larger and more frequent appropriations for internal improvements followed. Monroe, furthermore, signed a bill which granted to Ohio for the construction of a road the alternate sections of land for five miles on both sides of the route.<sup>17</sup> This is the first instance of land being granted for internal improvements. It was under Monroe's administration that the federal government for the first time purchased stock in canal companies.<sup>18</sup> Therefore, all of the methods employed by the federal government for the aiding and encouraging of internal improvements before 1861 had been put into practice before Monroe left office. All that remained to be done was merely to increase appropriations and to enlarge stock subscriptions and land grants, which was done by 1829. Webster, indeed, declared that Monroe's policy "took for granted the complete power of internal improvements as far as any of its advocates had ever contended for",<sup>19</sup> while

---

<sup>15</sup> James Monroe to James Madison, November 24, 1817, in *Writings of James Monroe*, edited by Stanislaus Murry Hamilton (7 vols., New York 1898 to 1908), VI, p. 8.

<sup>16</sup> *Messages and Papers of the Presidents*, II, p. 43.

<sup>17</sup> This road ran from the lower rapids of the Miami to the western boundary of the Connecticut Reserve. The track contained 80,778,54 acres. *Statutes at Large*, IV, p. 124.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>19</sup> *Webster-Hayne Debate*, edited by Lindsay Swift (Boston, 1898), p. 157.

Clay considered his own policy realized.<sup>20</sup> Senator Macon of North Carolina regarded the system of internal improvement as one of the most dangerous that had been established in the United States".<sup>21</sup> This had been achieved under a president who, upon entering office, had denied to Congress the power of making internal improvements.

Never did a cause secure more enthusiastic support than that given to internal improvements by John Quincy Adams. In his inaugural address he was convinced that because of internal improvements the "unborn millions of our posterity who are in the future ages to people this continent, will derive their most fervent gratitude to the founders of the Union; that in which the beneficent action of its government will be most deeply felt and acknowledged".<sup>22</sup> While the earlier presidents had held the use of powers not specifically granted to be unconstitutional, Adams declared that the exercise of powers "is a duty as sacred and indispensable as the usurpation of powers not granted is criminal and odious".<sup>23</sup> With that conception of the Constitution added to his native ardor for roads and canals he did not lessen the gratitude of the "unborn millions" by appointing Henry Clay—that enthusiastic spokesman of the American System—Secretary of State. On July 4, 1828, Adams broke the ground for the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal. In his zeal for the enterprise he sank the spade so deeply into the earth that it struck a root. Thereupon the dignified New England Puritan President removed his coat, grasped the spade more firmly, turned it successfully and expressed the hope that his action would symbolize the determination of the corporation to bring the construction of the canal to a successful completion. Members of Congress with few exceptions were willing to accept Adams' leadership. Madison, writing to Van Buren in 1826, declared, "it seems, indeed, to be understood that the policy of internal improvements has taken such an extensive and permanent hold upon the public will that the constructive policy of Congress to make them will not be relinquished".<sup>24</sup> Macon, the venerable senator from North Carolina, was one of the few who was still loyal to his

---

<sup>20</sup> *Annals of Congress*, 18 Cong., 1 Sess., p. 1028.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, 18 Cong., 2 Sess., p. 281.

<sup>22</sup> *Messages and Papers of the Presidents*, II, p. 298-299.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>24</sup> Madison to Van Buren, September 20, 1826, in the *Writings of James Madison*, IX, p. 255.

earlier convictions. He, "rose with a full heart to say good-bye to an old friend whom he had always loved and admired, the Constitution of the United States".<sup>25</sup> Thus for the short period of Adams' administration there was a policy of internal improvements. During this interval, Congress and the President co-operated harmoniously on a constructive plan. At no other time did this occur. The Board of Engineers created in 1824 surveyed cities for improvement and furnished Congress with information which it used as a basis for legislation. During Adams' administration more money was appropriated for internal improvements than had been granted during all of the previous administrations.<sup>26</sup>

The wide-open policy of Adams with regard to internal improvements was in theory closed by Jackson when he became president. He furnished no leadership, had no clear-cut policy and denied to Congress the exercise of the power which would have compensated for his vacillation. While Jackson had been a member of the Senate he had voted for six internal improvement bills, three of which were opposed by nearly all of the strict constructionists. While he was president he vetoed an equal number of bills which embodied the identical principles of those which he had supported while in the upper chamber. By the veto of the Maysville Road Bill, he reverted to Monroe's interpretation of the Constitution with regard to internal improvements and specified that in order to qualify for federal aid, projects must be "national not state, general not local". Old adherents of state rights were overjoyed. At a dinner given in honor of John Randolph, the guests toasted, "The rejection of the Maysville Road Bill; it falls upon the ears like the music of other days".<sup>27</sup> Col. Robert Y. Hayne of South Carolina spoke of it as the "most auspicious event which had taken place in the history of the country for years past".<sup>28</sup> John Quincy Adams closeted himself with his diary.

<sup>25</sup> *Annals of Congress*, 20 Cong., 1 Sess., p. 634.

<sup>26</sup> Appropriations for roads before Adams' presidency .....	\$1,935,625.00
Appropriations for roads during Adams' presidency .....	923,465.26
Appropriations for canals before Adams' presidency .....	825,000.00
Appropriations for canals during Adams' presidency .....	1,503,500.00
Amount of land granted for canals before Adams' presidency .....	22,800.00
Amount of land granted for canals during Adams' presidency .....	1,750,437.79
Appropriations for river and harbor improvement before Adams' presidency .....	231,572.16
Appropriations for river and harbor improvement during Adams' presidency .....	1,340,049.68

<sup>27</sup> John Spencer Bassett, *The Life of Andrew Jackson* (2 vols., New York, 1905), I, p. 490.

<sup>28</sup> Martin Van Buren, *Autobiography*, American Historical Association Report, 1918, II, p. 326.

To it he confided that Jackson, "to promote his candidacy and obtain western support had truckled to it (internal improvement policy) for a while and had now taken a decided stand against it",<sup>29</sup> while Calhoun had "turned his back upon it", and "Webster had silently given it up".

The bolts of Jackson's thunder against internal improvements were, however, much less destructive than their detonations indicated. The joy of the strict constructionists must have vanished before their chief left office, for while he had been most emphatic in his denunciations of internal improvements he had also been most liberal in extending federal aid. Practically one third of all the federal money spent for internal improvements from 1789 to 1861 was raised during the eight years of Jackson's administrations. Yet, by his Maysville veto, he had stemmed the tide of federal appropriations for roads and canals, rivers and harbors. In 1831 the House committee on internal improvements reported bills which called for \$104,243,740.71.<sup>31</sup> Had Henry Clay been President, the fondest hopes of the enthusiasts for internal improvements might well have been realized.

It was during the presidencies of Adams and Jackson that Indiana profited most from federal assistance which was limited to the gift of five per cent of the land sales in the state, and aid in the construction of four major projects. Receipts under the five per cent sales began pouring into the treasury of the state in 1820 and continued until 1856 when the total amount from this source reached \$620,352.92.<sup>32</sup> Three-fifths of this sum was spent for roads and canals within the state and two-fifths for roads leading to it.<sup>33</sup>

In 1827 Congress granted a right of way for a wagon road across Indiana from Michigan City to Madison *via* South Bend, Logansport, Indianapolis and Greensburg. This cession also included a section of contiguous land for every mile of the road, which when surveyed gave the state 221,013.35 acres.<sup>34</sup> This land was to be sold at not less than \$1.25 an acre and the

<sup>29</sup> *Memoirs of John Quincy Adams*, edited by Charles Francis Adams, (12 vols., Philadelphia, 1874-1877), VIII, p. 233.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 172.

<sup>31</sup> *Reports of United States Engineers*, 21 Cong., 2 Sess. *House Ex. Doc.*, 30, pt. I, p. 11.

<sup>32</sup> "Statement of Expenditures and Appropriations for Public Buildings, Rivers and Harbors, Forts, Arsenals and Armories and Other Public Works", *Sen. Ex. Doc.*, 196, 47 Cong., 1 Sess., p. 296.

<sup>33</sup> *United States Statutes at Large*, III, p. 290.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, IV, p. 234.

proceeds were to be applied to the construction of the road.

More important than any other internal improvement project within the Hoosier state was the Cumberland Road. The eastern terminus of the road was Cumberland, Maryland, where construction began during Jefferson's second administration. Slowly it made its way westward and eventually reached St. Louis. The appropriations ceased while the highway was in process of construction in Indiana, and none of it was ever macadamized beyond the western boundary of the state. It was the main artery of transport and communication between the East and the West. The total cost of its construction was \$6,832,945.05.<sup>35</sup> Of this sum \$1,135,000 was applied within Indiana.<sup>36</sup>

Due to the congestion of shipping in New Orleans, commodities from the Wabash region were frequently delayed in reaching their eastern destination. Consequently a persistent agitation was carried on by Indiana's representatives in Congress with a view to the cutting of a canal that would unite the Wabash River with Lake Erie. A beginning was made in 1824 when Congress granted a strip of land 320 feet wide through the public domain for the construction of the proposed canal. This offer was, however, rejected by Indiana and new efforts were made to secure federal assistance which resulted in the act of March 2, 1827, which donated a canal route and the alternate sections to a depth of five miles on each side of the canal. Four subsequent grants of land were made which brought the total land donation for this enterprise to 1,695,376.74 acres.<sup>37</sup> Upon more extensive surveys it was discovered that a part of the canal would extend into Ohio. Congress accordingly authorized Indiana to convey to its sister state the lands within Ohio to be used by it for the construc-

<sup>35</sup> *Sen. Ex. Doc.*, 196, 47 Cong., 1 Sess., p. 320.

<sup>36</sup> "Letter from the Secretary of the Treasury", *Sen. Ex. Doc.*, 12, 43 Cong., 1 Sess., p. 54.

<sup>37</sup> Dates and amounts of the land grants made to Indiana for the Wabash and Erie Canal:

March 2, 1827 .....	527,271.24 acres
May, 9, 1830 .....	29,552.50 acres
February 27, 1841 .....	259,368.48 acres
August 29, 1842 .....	766,680.19 acres
May 9, 1848 .....	113,348.33 acres
	1,695,367.74 acres

*Statement Showing Land Grants Made by Congress in Aid of Construction of Railroads, Wagon Roads, Canals and Internal Improvements, 1888.* The estimated cost of the construction of the Canal was \$991,000. See Logan Esarey, *Internal Improvements in Indiana* (Indianapolis, 1912), p. 358. The estimated value of the land that Indiana received was \$1,250,000. See Margaret Duden, "Internal Improvements in Indiana, 1818 to 1846," in *Indiana Magazine of History*, V, p. 161.



tion of its share of the canal. In 1834 Congress also voted \$28,337.55 additional to aid in the construction of the canal.

Indiana received federal assistance for the improvement of one harbor only. Six appropriations for the harbor at Michigan City, amounting to a total of \$156,204.92, were made from 1836 to 1855.<sup>38</sup>

Following the period of Jackson, the usual inconsistencies were pursued during the succeeding administrations. Van Buren professed to have accepted the policies of Jackson. Nevertheless he approved internal improvement bills of purely local concern.<sup>39</sup> He placed his signature to river and harbor bills making larger appropriations than any that had been passed before his administration.<sup>40</sup> Tyler did nothing to clarify or formulate a policy, but Polk when he entered the White House pursued a course strikingly in contrast with that of John Quincy Adams. While the latter had invited and encouraged such legislation, Polk with one exception, and that was a military road bill for the army during the Mexican War, vetoed every internal improvement bill which was submitted for his consideration.<sup>41</sup> He interpreted the Constitution more strictly on this subject than any of his predecessors had done or any of his successors were to do. On the last night of his term he went to his office armed with a veto for any internal improvement bill which Congress might pass. During his administration the internal improvement enthusiasts lost more ground than they had gained in almost half a century of agitation.

But the vacillation continued. On August 30, 1852, Fillmore placed his signature to a river and harbor bill which provided for the expenditure of a larger sum than did any other measure passed before the Civil War.<sup>42</sup> He granted what Polk had been unwilling to allow. Pierce attempted to reverse this policy by vetoing five river and harbor bills on the ground of unconstitutionality. After almost sixty years of continuous agitation Congress found itself for the first time sufficiently united on this question to pass all of them over the executive veto. Not only had the Presidents failed in executive leadership, but they had been contradictory in their interpretation

---

<sup>38</sup> *United States Statutes at Large*, IV, p. 716.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, V, p. 260.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, IX, p. 151.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, X, p. 56.

of the Constitution as to the powers possessed by Congress over internal improvements, while the national legislature did little to compensate for executive deficiency. There was always a strong opposition which supported the Presidents in denying to Congress the power to execute a system of internal improvements. Even the staunchest state rights men were willing to compromise their convictions for appropriations within their own states. Senator Branch of North Carolina, emphatically denied the right to Congress to make internal improvements, but when an appropriation for improvements within his own state was included in the river and harbor bill for 1825, he confessed that he would not let a morbid sensibility prevent his accepting the boon.<sup>43</sup> Whereupon Senator John Chandler of Maine cried: "Help, Lord—the Mighty Man Faileth; this was the first bone held to the gentleman and he bit".<sup>44</sup> There were others less frank but equally susceptible. The Democratic Convention of 1835 included a resolution in its platform denying to Congress the right to effect internal improvements yet each year saw the national legislature violate the party pledge. Presidential candidates were either evasive or irresponsible. In 1848 the Democratic Convention declared "that the Constitution does not confer upon Congress the power to commence and carry on a general system of internal improvement". In accepting the platform of 1848, Cass declared he adhered to it as firmly as he approved it cordially. Yet, when he had been in the senate he had voted for every internal improvement bill that had come up.<sup>45</sup> It is not so surprising that some of the abler men of the day were out of sympathy with such lack of consistency and absence of policy. When the constitutional objection was brought against a bill for internal improvements in 1852, Clay in his last speech on this subject asked how long it would be "before the people would rise up en masse and trample down your little hair-splitting distinctions about what is national and state and demand what is fair and just." Seven years later Stephen A. Douglas in exasperation declared that "this whole system has proved a failure".<sup>46</sup>

---

<sup>43</sup> *Congressional Debates*, 19 Cong., 1 Sess., p. 714.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>45</sup> *Congressional Globe*, 30 Cong., 1 Sess., p. 709.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*, 34 Cong., 1 Sess., p. 1551.

*Distribution of Appropriations for  
Rivers and Harbors, Roads and Canals*

	<i>Canals</i>	<i>Rivers and Harbors</i>	<i>Roads</i>	<i>Total</i>
1802		30,000.00	6,000.00	36,000.00
1805		5,888.79		5,888.79
1906		448.71	18,400.00	18,848.71
1809	25,000.00		12,200.48	37,200.48
1811			6,000.00	6,000.00
1812			800.00	800.00
1816			18,000.00	18,000.00
1817			4,000.00	4,000.00
1818			10,000.00	10,000.00
1819		6,500.00		6,500.00
1820			3,300.00	3,300.00
1821		2,650.00	1,000.00	3,650.00
1822		34,200.00		34,200.00
1823		6,000.00	11,420.00	17,420.00
1824		115,000.00	58,000.00	173,000.00
1825	300,000.00	65,084.56	63,000.00	428,084.56
1826	270,000.00	146,404.90	21,000.00	437,404.90
1827		184,471.44	79,035.18	263,506.62
1828	1,000,000.00	660,295.29	26,760.95	1,687,056.24
1929	333,500.00	348,878.00	42,000.00	724,378.00
1830	10,000.00	188,942.77	128,144.29	327,487.06
1831		631,551.84	46,014.75	677,566.59
1832	3,000.00	712,198.11	113,000.00	828,198.11
1833	170,000.00	679,073.68	191,113.30	1,040,186.98
1834	35,210.82	780,288.63	118,500.00	933,999.45
1835		505,057.03	218,000.00	723,057.03
1836		1,171,669.36	100,000.00	1,271,669.36
1837	150,000.00	1,881,722.00	20,313.00	1,552,035.00
1838	100,000.00	1,556,438.53	83,879.53	1,740,318.06
1839	50,000.00	46,110.00	102,125.67	198,235.67
1840		1,225.68	6,000.00	7,225.68
1841		101,869.00	5,000.00	106,869.00
1842		110,000.00		110,000.00
1843		149,471.57		149,471.57
1844		639,919.75	15,000.00	708,919.75
1845	5,000.00	23,373.04	41,000.00	69,373.04
1846				
1847		14,876.47	100,000.00	114,876.47
1848		40,000.00		40,000.00
1849		6,500.00		6,500.00
1850		100,000.00	30,800.00	130,800.00
1851				
1852		2,212,790.00		2,232,790.00
1853		50,877.42	92,122.05	142,999.47
1854		190,000.00	122,000.00	212,000.00

*Albjerg: Internal Improvements*

179

1855	172,236.61	369,372.92	541,613.53
1856	785,000.00	50,000.00	835,000.00
1857	6,919.38	662,495.01	669,414.39
1858	2,502.11	180,000.00	182,502.11
1859	672.75	100,000.00	100,672.75
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	2,472,110.82	13,972,457.42	3,386,301.13
			19,830,869.37

[Compiled from the *United States Statutes at Large*: "Letter of the Secretary of the Treasury Communicating Information Called for by Resolutions of the Senate of December 2, 1873, as to the Amount Expended in Aid of the Construction of Public Works in the States and Territories," *Sen. Ex. Doc. No. 12*, 43 Cong. 1 Sess.; "Statement of Appropriations for Public Buildings, Rivers and Harbors, Forts and Arsenals, Armories and Other Public Works from March 4, 1789 to June 30, 1882," *Sen. Ex. Doc. No. 196*, 47 Cong. 1 Sess.]