JAMES D. HARRIS, PRINCIPAL ENGINEER,
AND JAMES S. STEVENSON, CANAL COMMISSIONER

BY HUBERTIS M. CUMMINGS

THE career of James Dunlop Harris in connection with the building of the Canals of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania was not initiated with peculiarly brilliant auspices.

It was by Act of February 25, 1826, that the program for effectuation of the State's proposed system of Internal Improvements was officially endorsed. Seven weeks later, on April 6, a letter from Joseph McIlvaine, Secretary to the new Board of Canal Commissioners, went forward from Philadelphia, requesting that Mr. Harris "proceed forthwith to Pittsburgh, and take the place of assistant to Nathan S. Roberts."¹ For his service under that distinguished engineer, who himself had come into the employment of Pennsylvania after a career upon the Erie Canal in New York, he was to have three dollars a day and necessary expenses.²

Three to four months later, the young surveyor from Bellefonte had run his levels between Pine Creek and the City of Pittsburgh, in conformity to the Board's instructions to his superior, and "continued them over Grant's Hill to Suke's Run for the purposes of ascertaining the propriety of terminating the canal at the Monongahela in that direction."³ This feat, reported on November 30⁴ by himself, was clarified by another report of the same date by Nathan S. Roberts. That second engineer recommended a route by the course which his assistant had located: for, "very expensive" and "longer" than other routes as it would be, it "would do less damage to individuals"⁵ as it passed "around the southern suburbs."⁶

¹ Joseph McIlvaine to J. D. H., April 6, 1826; Harris Papers, Penna. Public Records Office.
² Ibid.
⁴ Commrs.' Report, December 11, 1826, p. 95.
⁵ Ibid.
⁶ Ibid.
where little business was done. Then came the winter of 1826-1827, and the Legislature became wary of the cost of engineering.

Indeed, by Act of April 16, 1827, it declared that "from and after the term of time for which an engineer may have heretofore been employed, the salary of such engineers shall not exceed two thousand dollars" and "no allowance shall in any case be made for personal or other expenses." Messrs. William Strickland, David B. Douglass, James Geddes, and Nathan S. Roberts, who had all been employed at salaries of $3000 and expenses, and whose terms would expire in June, declined re-appointment under the circumstances now posed for them; and the State of Pennsylvania lost by their withdrawal three Erie-Canal-trained experts and the knowing recent agent overseas for the Philadelphia Improvement Society.

In this exigency a modest letter, written from "Springdale on the Canal Line" on May 11, acknowledged a favor of the 4th instant from the Board. James Dunlop Harris was "sensible of my want of experience in the business of making canals." He accepted "The appointment with diffidence." Beyond that he promised: "I shall shew my gratitude to the Board by taking every opportunity to make myself acquainted with the business, and fulfilling their wishes in every particular as far as in my power."

About his commencement of duties on the Pennsylvania Canal hung, in brief, a certain amateurishness. Like others of his colleagues he was entering a field of activity for which there had been virtually no training in their several previous environments. A canal was still more an idea than a material object. Harris would have to learn with the times and the occasion. But the man lacked neither initiative nor industry, and he had a just enough conception of his own worth.

In March, 1828, he could report progress on the part of the Western Division, the Allegheny Line from the mouth of the Kiskiminetas to the Monongahela, which was under his charge. All the locks except the outlet lock in Allegheny Town and those
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in Pittsburgh were nearly completed. All the aqueducts, except those at the mouth of the Kiskiminetas and across the Allegheny at Pittsburgh, were “in such a state of forwardness” that they could be completed in two months after the first of April. Work on the bridges, waste weirs, safety gates, and lock houses could be finished at the same time as these. The Tunnel (that is, the Grant’s Hill Tunnel) and Lock contracts in Pittsburgh were progressing with spirit. The Allegheny Aqueduct, now that expensive preparations for delivering stone had been made, was being pushed with vigor. Quite obviously the Principal Engineer, who was so successfully expediting construction of all these, was pleased with himself.

In his letter on the 20th of the month he spoke for himself. “The wages,” he wrote, “which have been allowed me by the Board heretofore I have considered equal to my merits; but, believing, as I do now, that I have acquired some knowledge and skill in the business and that the compensation should be in proportion to the responsibility and the experience, care, labor, and attention requisite, I would hope that the Board will see the propriety of raising my wages to $2000 pr. annum. I am willing to do as much as any other man in the same service.” The son of the late James Harris had been the recent assistant of the celebrated engineer who not only planned the Western Division but would gain laurels for building the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal in Maryland and the great aqueduct on the Erie Canal across the Genesee River at Rochester, New York. The younger Harris was a man who now believed in himself; he had increased in self-trust and, as an aide during the past year to Roberts, he knew he had increased in competence.

But the younger Harris lived in an age of politicians, and renown was not ahead. His labors on the Pennsylvania Canal were begun while Governor J. Andrew Shulze was in office, and while General Abner Lacock was Acting Canal Commissioner. Trends were, however, making themselves manifest in Pennsylvania. Jacksonian democracy was on the march; Anti-Masonry was brewing, although not yet ready for its one triumph in the Commonwealth; and in the early summer of 1829 James S. Stevenson succeeded the old-time
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Federalist Lacock on the Canal Board. With that official, displaced some six months before the Republican Governor George Wolf went into office, the fate of James D. Harris was and would be linked.

In his record Abner Lacock had enjoyed six years of service in the United States Senate, leaving office in 1819.

Stevenson had just returned to Pittsburgh from two terms in the House of Representatives at Washington. A friend of William Findlay, he and that ex-Governor of the Commonwealth had been the two outstanding figures at the Pittsburgh dinner rally of Jacksonians on the 4th of July, 1827. More than that, he had been host to a thousand guest-enthusiasts on the spacious green of his own estate on the bank of the Allegheny on that occasion. To his generous hospitality, when his turn to speak came, he had added a glowing toast to Pennsylvania: "Always on the side of liberty, and true to its firm defenders. Subtle devices cannot affect her principles. Traitorous conventions cannot corrupt her patriotism."

Out of Congressional office and back in Pennsylvania in 1829, Stevenson was chosen by his new colleagues on the Canal Commissioners' Board to be their President. The craving for further distinctions continued in him.

Unhappily, however, he chose to discredit the anti-Jacksonian General Lacock and that gentleman's friend, young Principal Engineer James D. Harris.

From the Canal Office in Pittsburgh, on December 9, 1829, he made report in considerable detail to the Board. His findings properly enough concerned themselves with problems of finance and narration of progress made or not made. But they enlarged on other points not apparently so frank or pleasant. "On the 14th of July," said Mr. Stevenson, "I received from my predecessor (Mr. Lacock) a note stating that the books, papers, accounts, &c. belonging to the division would be delivered at Spring Dale."

Earlier, on the 14th of June, he had "personally informed Mr. J. D. Harris that the Board had not continued him as an engineer." On the 17th of that month he directed "one of the principal assistants to receive from Mr. Harris, late engineer, such books, papers,
notes, instruments, &c.” as were in his possession. More than that, he dilated upon the sententiousness of that gentleman, who refused to consider oral notice of his dismissal as official, continued in his function until the 20th of June, accepted payment for services to that date, and even “preferred a claim for the continuance of his salary to a later period.” Worse than Harris’ truculence was the fact, as ex-Congressman Stevenson interpreted it, that the papers delivered to his messengers in July at Spring Dale, were unimportant ones. Neither cash books nor receipts were turned over to them. The “day book, journal, and two ledgers” which were delivered proved, when inspected, to show no entry later than September 18, 1828.

All, indeed, looked very damaging to both Lacock and Harris. Inconvenience was added to the labors of James S. Stevenson as he took up his Acting Commissionership on the Western Division. Allegedly he entertained considerable annoyance because the earlier Board had allowed Nathan S. Roberts to dictate the choice of the west side of the Allegheny for the Pennsylvania Canal, which necessitated an aqueduct across the river to Pittsburgh and was as foolish a measure as it would have been to take the Canal from below the mouth of Swatara Creek by aqueduct to the west shore of the Susquehanna and then bring that artificial waterway by another wooden aqueduct into Harrisburg on the east shore of that river. Moreover, Mr. Stevenson found much to dissatisfy him in the construction of the Allegheny Aqueduct according to the designs of Roberts. Regretfully he had had to guide on to its final completion on November 10, 1829, the structure on which James D. Harris and the contractors (who were Messrs. William LeBaron and Sylvanus Lathrop) had combined until that Principal Engineer’s dismissal in June. The “oblique arrangement” of its “piers on a foundation of gravel, and in a river having a fall of nearly three feet to a mile, sometimes rising twenty-five feet above low water mark, and often filled with driftwood and ice, is unaccountable on any supposition that the structure was meant to endure.” (The writer of the report of December 9, 1829, was
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not destined to know that the aqueduct and its piers, except for occasional repairs, would last as long as the Western Division was in use.)

Yet James D. Harris' future as a canal engineer was still in the making; and the case of James S. Stevenson against him was not so strong as it appears in one *ex parte* document. Less baleful light is cast upon his conduct by officially preserved papers in the Commonwealth's Land Office collection, by items in his personal collection as now owned by the State, and by Legislative action of March 18, 1830.

Principal Assistant to Harris on the Line from the Kiskiminetas to Pittsburgh in 1828 was his brother Andrew D. Harris. Of his two rodmen in that same season was one James S. Keen. A letter written at "½ past 8 Ocloc...k A.M." on June 5, 1829, by R. S. Keen, and posted hurriedly to be in the mail from Harrisburg for the west before 9, reached Harris at Armagh. It brought the news that the Canal Board had just adjourned: "yourself & Livermore have been superceded [sic.] by a Mr. Welsh [sic.] from the Union Canal, who is to have the charge from Johnston to Pittsb. Stevenson killed you, brought every think [sic.] up against you that he had ever heard seen or could imagine." In effect that communication forewarned Harris of the personal information of dismissal given to him on the 16th by Acting Commissioner Stevenson. On June 20 his brother Andrew showed him a letter from Stevenson which directed Andrew to take charge of the Ligonier Line and to proceed forthwith to make the monthly estimates there (a novel means of informing Harris that it was designed to supplant him with his own kinsman, but a means which his brother declined to embrace.)

In the son of James Harris of Bellefonte, the grandson of John Harris of Mifflintown, who deemed himself the loyal servant of Pennsylvania, his succession of experiences in June induced no tendency to knuckle under to a new official superior. James Dunlop
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Harris chose to carry on in his labors, to justify his diligence, and to submit his demands for remuneration.

On July 8, 1829, he addressed Acting Commissioner Stevenson formally, observing now that he was not ignorant of the fact that by a Resolution of the Canal Commissioners passed at their last meeting he had been removed from office, regretting that he had had no "official notice of my removal," deploRING the casual way in which he had been dismissed, and—as it were to teach his superiors better manners in the business—tendering "my resignation which I request you to lay before the Board." In the same letter he reminded the addressee that he claimed compensation up through July 4, as not having been properly dismissed and as having, for the good of the works, continued in his function until then. On September 18, from Bellefonte, he submitted a statement of his account for his services, with it reiterating the importance of his adhering to his function to the late date which he had adopted. That had been "for the purpose of causing an accurate estimate to be made to that time and putting the books and papers generally in a shape to be understood by my own and my assistants' successors," and for "giving any explanation which might be asked relative to the Line." Likewise he attached to the importance of his persistence in his tasks the fact that the monthly estimate to be paid on the Ligonier Line on July 1 was amounting to $80,000. His account for his services from June 21 to July 4, on the basis of a salary of $2000 per annum, he rendered as $76,71.6 And, in an N.B., he added: "My brother declined accepting the appointment tendered him by the Acting Commissioner for reasons contained in a letter to the Commissioner.—J. D. H." Yet, although he adhered to his convictions and insisted on his personal rights through the summer of 1829, Harris had no intention of giving up work as an engineer. On August 1, then, he wrote to Josiah White, of the Board of Managers of the Lehigh Navigation Company, and friend of his late father, James Harris. To the Quaker merchant, inventor, and promoter he gave an account of his life as an engineer from his first association "with
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another person [It was probably John Mitchell] in 1825 in the duty of exploring one of the proposed routes for the canal to connect the eastern and western waters,"\textsuperscript{58} to his late experiences on the Western Division. The work on the Ligonier Line to which he was appointed in June, 1828, he declared, was, when he left it on July 14, "in a beautiful state of forwardness. The Line, including four dams, 30 locks, and two considerable aqueducts were all so far advanced that, if drove on with spirit, they could all be completed this season and in the most substantial manner."\textsuperscript{59} But, while he toiled on that enterprise, although "unconscious of any misconduct" of my own or of having shown myself wanting either in capacity or integrity,"\textsuperscript{60} he had not been unaware of the hostility to him of a certain member of the Canal Board. Presently both he and Mr. Livermore had been removed from their principal engineerships. Messrs. Robinson and Welch had been appointed to succeed them. Would there be, Mr. Harris inquired, in the event of Mr. Welch's giving up his work on the Lehigh Canal to accept the new State appointment, an opportunity for himself to be employed by Josiah White's company? He could give as references: "General Lacock, Judge Scott, or any other of the late Board of Canal Commissioners, or Mr. J. Mitchell of the Present Board."\textsuperscript{41}

From the Acting Manager of the Lehigh Navigation Company reply came promptly and crisply. "Thy favor of the 1st inst is before me," wrote the good Friend: "It is a matter of great regret to the well wishers of the State that so many irregularities take place in doing public work. That they are proverbially more costly & less efficient than more private interested works there can be, I think, no doubt, not but that there is ample Talent in the service & and as much as in private service. Yet it has to move under the arbitrary direction of the all powerful 'political' feelings."\textsuperscript{42} But Mr. White, "our Canal being done,"\textsuperscript{43} had no position to offer Mr. Harris, even though "it would be a gratification to me to be of service to the son of my old friend."\textsuperscript{44}

The year 1829, in the course of which Sylvester Welch took
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charge of the Western Division of the Pennsylvania Canal and at the end of which Moncure Robinson submitted plans to the Board for the Allegheny Portage Railway, was not to be James D. Harris' year. But the engineer from Bellefonte was not the man to quit. Nor did any change of attitude come into him when James S. Stevenson's Report to the Board of December 9 became known at the Capital City.

On the 14th of that month Harris again addressed the Canal Commissioners. He had heard that a Committee report unfavorable to his application for compensation for his work in June and July had been made owing to Mr. Stevenson's assertion that he had not done the work for which he charged. He had learned that Mr. Stevenson had stated that he "had not handed over the Books belonging to the Engineer department, nor given any information on the subject." Accordingly he begged the favor of going before the Committee and having "an explanation with Mr. Stevenson in relation to that business." He thought it only fair that he have opportunity "to relieve my name from dishonorable imputation."

Five days later, on the 19th, he wrote a second time, now requesting privilege of interpreting to the Board what Stevenson was maintaining were errors in his estimates for costs on the Ligonier Line. The Board, however, remained obdurate. James D. Harris was invited neither to appear before them, nor before the Committee. On the 19th they rejected his petition for compensation, and ruled that he had been adequately informed of his dismissal when on July 20th Andrew D. Harris had shown him the letter "directing the said Andrew to take charge of the Ligonier Line and proceed forthwith to make the monthly estimates." Further than that they would only enter in the Board minutes the Committee's "remark that the testimony produced by Mr. Harris proves that the books and papers belonging to the Ligonier Line were either delivered to the Acting Commissioner or left in the Canal Office in Armagh in care of the draftsman Mr. Griffin."
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Their final nugatory action constituted considerable rebuff to Harris. But their refusal of the $76.71 which he argued he had properly earned did not so disappoint him that he overlooked the non-committal alternative which their last clause stated. Rather than that, their resolution gave him impulse for further procedure; and Harris made 1830 his year.

Indeed, he succeeded in having read before the House of Representatives on March 18, and having ordered to be placed in the Journal of that body, a memorial and accompanying documents to the Canal Board James S. Stevenson.

This memorial reviewed and recounted much. The broad purpose of James D. Harris in it was to have entered into the official records of the Legislature a statement which should offset the allegations made about him in Mr. Stevenson’s report of December 9, 1829, to the Canal Board. In his first paragraph he declared his opinion that it was “due to himself and to the memory of his grandfather and father, both of whom often sat in the legislative hall of this, his native state, as well as to his children” that “a plain unvarnished statement showing the injustice of the charges” against him stand in the Journal.

Then in the context he cleared himself one by one of Stevenson’s accusations. Without mentioning Andrew Harris by name he detailed his detractor’s mode of approach to his brother, and Andrew’s refusal to accept appointment and do estimates of costs on the Ligonier Line which should conventionally come from the man who had been directing the construction. More than that, he presented interpretation of Stevenson’s act on July 4 in completing payments on the Line, upon the basis of the estimates which James D. Harris himself had made, as demonstrating the due legality of his own conduct in staying with the work until the estimates could be rendered. If he had claimed remuneration after a time when he was informally given notice of his non-reappointment, it was because he had acted in an honest and, as he believed, official capacity.

For Mr. Stevenson’s charge of his non-delivery of the books
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and papers of the Ligonier Line, Mr. Harris was as ready. Supported by depositions and written statements from various of his late assistants and several notaries, which he appended, he showed "that after the 15th June, all the books and papers . . . were prepared under the direction of your memorialist for handing over to the new Acting Commissioner; that all . . . were so handed over and delivered; that your memorialist continued to be recognized and obeyed as Principal Engineer by his assistants" until the estimates were completed.

With similar exactitude he went into structural details and devices. Finally he did not omit providing evidence of the motives for his enemy's malice. In brief the cause was this: "in the fall of 1827, soon after your memorialist was entrusted with the construction of the work about Pittsburgh, he was requested by Mr. Stevenson to alter that part of the line passing his property, as located by N. S. Roberts, Esq., so as to give him several feet more ground, and throw the canal upon the ground of his neighbor on the opposite side of the street, [Stevenson] took umbrage at the refusal of your memorialist to make the alteration, and has appeared ever since to view him with a feeling of hostility."

Today we know as much as can be learned of the majority which ordered on March 18, 1830, that Harris' "Memorial" and its accompanying documents be placed upon the Journal of the House through a letter written by Henry Petriken on the day of action: there was no roll call; the writer heard but two dissenting voices; the explanations of J. D. H. gave general satisfaction; Stevenson, he believed, was in the House when the long address was read.

Its sponsor on the floor, Petriken, representative from Centre and Clearfield Counties in 1828-1830, had had the distinction of being the first white child born in the town which James Dunlop and his son-in-law James Harris had founded. He had grown up to be a printer, the editor of the Bellefonte Patriot, and the substitute completing Judge Thomas Burnside's unexpired term in the Pennsylvania Senate in 1826. He was to sit in that body as an elected incumbent from 1831 to 1835. In him, a man of his
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own age and a fellow townsman, was standing by James Dunlop Harris.

That other folk believed in the unseated Principal Engineer in 1830 is also suggested by the experience which attended James S. Stevenson nine months later than the March in which Harris commanded the respect of the Pennsylvania Assembly. On December 14, the Senate and the House met in convention to elect a United States Senator in the room of William Marks, whose term was nearing expiration. On the first vote Harmer Denny led as a nominee with 31 votes, James S. Stevenson following him in fourth place with 11. A second vote on the same morning showed a closely similar tally. In the third trial Denny lost one vote; Stevenson gained none. But in the afternoon Teller Henry Petriken could report a slight change in the fourth contest: Denny and Samuel McKean had exchanged first place in the count, although both were far from a majority; Stevenson had gained two votes. In the fifth trial Stevenson held his 13, while McKean and Denny tied for first place, still remote from an election. Sixth and seventh trials on the same December 14 gave Stevenson 14 votes, other nominees' positions remaining much as before. The convention had to adjourn without an election.

When the two Houses met again on the morrow Stevenson, with 22 votes, exchanged third place with William G. Hawkins who had previously held it. A second vote was called for; and, when Teller Petriken reported the results, Stevenson had taken two more votes from Hawkins, but was still trailing the highest two counts. A third vote on the second day of balloting added no more to his tally, but kept the two nominees leading him in their same relative strength and revealed the climbing up on the chart of William G. Hawkins.

Other ballottings were necessary. At the close of the last one on the 15th Henry Petriken had the chagrin of knowing Stevenson
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had climbed to second place with 31 votes; but McKean now led with 36, and Wilkins had come up to 21. At the first one on December 16, the friend of James D. Harris could take comfort at Stevenson's dropping back to fourth place with 20, while Wilkins gained one more. He could enjoy Harris' enemy's decline in the next count to 15, as Wilkins rose to 28. But he had to wait for two more counts, and an afternoon session, before the excitement came to an end. By that time Stevenson had risen to second place with 31 votes, but the dark horse William Wilkins had won the election with 72 votes.

Harris' vindication for his conduct in 1829 was not, however, fully to come by James S. Stevenson's failure to be seated in the United States Senate. Three weeks after that candidate's discomfiture General Abner Lacock in a letter to his Bellefonte friend indulged his political feelings freely: "In relation to the 'Hero' do you not think he had put more filth in the stable than he took out. You know the Jackson party in Penna, said they were cleansing the stable, when they threw you and me out, and put others in. If it be true in one case I think it is in the other, but we will let this pass. I think with you the people are pretty well tired with Jacksonism, but it is pretty certain they cannot continue his policy, or the reign of his dynasty without continuing him at the head of it, —for neither Calhoun or VanBuren, the two opponents, can successfully oppose Clay & it seems to be settled beyond all controversy that he is to be the opposing candidate. Between Jackson and Clay single-handed, the contest would be doubtful, and depend much upon N. York, the most unstable State in the union—Van Buren (J. S. Stevenson magnified) has lost much of his influence there."

This was, of course, a way of paying off the Acting Commissioner of the Canal Board. But a better means came three months later.

On April 6th Harris was appointed Principal Engineer "upon the upper part of the West Branch Division"; Commissioners James Clarke and John Mitchell had insisted, despite the dubious
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attitude of James S. Stevenson, on the restoration of the ousted
man to the service of the Commonwealth.

Upon his re-commitment to a professional share in the Public
Works he behaved with a characteristic candor. He came to Harris-
burg; took quarters at Wallace's Hotel; and, four days after his
appointment, addressed Mr. Stevenson from there.

He had understood "by Mr. Mitchell that he understood you
to express a willingness to meet me on such terms of friendship
as will at least enable us to transact with advantage such business
as will necessarily occur from the relation in which we stand
toward each other in the discharge of our duty to the State." If
the recipient of his letter consented, he would be glad to meet him
"on those terms or even more friendly" ones, and would call upon
him at his lodgings "tomorrow morning."

From Willson's Hotel, on the same day, the enemy replied as
tersely. "The proposition you make is in entire unison with my
feelings. I shall be at my lodgings from half after eight until half
after nine tomorrow morning. Your call shall be met in a spirit of
amity to the full extent that you have proposed."

Happily James D. Harris could write of the subsequent interview
afterwards to General Lacock: "In pursuing this course I con-
ceived that I did nothing derogatory to the respect due to myself
as the first advances were made by him unequivocally; and, as he
was my superior in office, it appeared to be my duty to call upon
him. We met each other with as little embarrassment as could have
been expected. Indeed it would astonish a person who would read
the correspondence which passed between us about the time of the
Election for U. S. Senator that we should meet in any other way
than by an exchange of blows, much less by a cordial exchange of
civilities. He expressed himself to another member of the board
delighted with the interview."
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