

House bill 8947, to extend the Free Delivery Service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of A. Levy & J. Zentner Co., of San Francisco, Cal., protesting against the passage of House bills 9266, 9530, and 9987, relating to cold storage; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petitions of Henry Cowell Lime & Cement Co., of San Francisco, Cal., relative to lime and the new tariff law, and Chamber of Commerce of Sacramento, Cal., protesting against certain provisions of the income-tax law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorials of Santa Clara (Cal.) Letter Carriers, Branch 193, National Association of Letter Carriers, of San Jose, Cal., and San Diego (Cal.) Letter Carriers, protesting against elimination of assistant postmasters from the classified service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the Western Forestry and Conservation Association, favoring greater appropriations for the Forestry Service; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce of Sacramento, Cal., protesting against the passage of the seamen's bill; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of Sacramento, Cal., favoring the passage of the Nelson-Madden consular bill; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce of Sacramento, Cal., protesting against the Kahn bill (H. R. 7595) providing for free importation of articles for foreign exhibits building at Panama Exposition; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce of Sacramento, Cal., relative to the completion of the park-way plan in Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, memorial of East Auburn Local Socialist Party, Local Tehama County Socialist Party, and Local Indian Falls Socialist Party, all in the State of California, favoring an investigation of the labor strike in the copper mines of Michigan; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. REILLY of Connecticut: Petition of sundry citizens of the State of Connecticut, favoring the two-battleship program; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petition of the Chicago Federation of Labor, of Chicago, Ill., favoring an investigation of the trouble in the copper regions of Michigan; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. J. M. C. SMITH: Petitions of E. Gilbert and 20 others of Pottsville, Mich., protesting against the passage of the Sabbath-observance bill (H. R. 9674); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of the Grand Rapids Association of Commerce, favoring city parks and beautifying the National Capitol; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, petition of Socialist Local of Albion, Mich., favoring Federal investigation of copper strike; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TUTTLE: Petitions of International Brotherhood of Stationary Firemen, of Newark, N. J., and Local No. 9, Polishers, Buffers, and Platers, of Elizabeth, N. J., favoring investigation of strike conditions in Michigan; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petitions of Daughters of Liberty of Morristown and Rahway, N. J., favoring immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Lodge No. 375, Independent Order Brith Abraham, of Morristown, N. J., protesting against immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of town of Morristown, N. J., favoring Senate bill 3063; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, petition of Plumbers' Local Union No. 245, of Elizabeth, N. J., favoring House bill 1873; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VARE: Petition of certain citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against House bill 9674; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WALTERS: Petition of Cyril L. Wolfhope, J. B. Salinger, R. C. Bruce, J. A. McHugh, John H. Moorey, and Robert R. Fritsch, of Pennsylvania, favoring the passage of resolution proposing prohibition amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of organizations and citizens of Pennsylvania, favoring the passage of House bill 6060, restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: Memorial of Day of Rest Conference of New York City, protesting against amendment to Post Office appropriation bill providing that compensatory time

for Sunday work shall be given; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the Abraham Lincoln Branch of the American Continental League, of Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against appropriation of money for celebration of "One hundred years of peace among English-speaking peoples"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WINGO: Memorial of Socialists of Bownville, favoring an investigation of the labor troubles in the copper regions of Michigan; to the Committee on Rules.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, January 21, 1914.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. OLIVER and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented memorials of Lincoln Branch, American Continental League, of Hubbard, Ohio; of General Daniel Morgan Branch, American Continental League, of Philadelphia, Pa.; of Valley Forge Branch, American Continental League, of Philadelphia, Pa.; and of Robert Morris Branch, American Continental League, of Philadelphia, Pa., remonstrating against any appropriation by Congress for the celebration of the so-called "One hundred years of peace among English-speaking peoples," which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. THOMAS presented memorials of sundry citizens of Lyons, Colo., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation compelling the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. OLIVER presented memorials of Yorktown Branch, American Continental League, of Philadelphia, Pa.; of Nathan Hale Branch, American Continental League, of Philadelphia, Pa.; of Andrew Jackson Branch, American Continental League, of Shenandoah, Pa.; of General Sullivan Branch, American Continental League, of Pittsburgh, Pa.; of Anthony Wayne Branch, American Continental League, of Philadelphia, Pa.; and of Molly Pitcher Branch, American Continental League, of Philadelphia, Pa., remonstrating against any appropriation by Congress for the celebration of the so-called "One hundred years of peace among English-speaking peoples," which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of Valley Hill Council, No. 59, Daughters of Liberty, of Parkesburg, Pa., and a memorial of Local Council No. 109, Daughters of Liberty, of Monaca, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. BRISTOW presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Hanover, Kans., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale, manufacture, and importation of distilled liquor containing alcohol except for certain specific purposes, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Morganville, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale, manufacture, and importation of distilled liquor containing alcohol except for certain specified purposes, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. ASHURST presented resolutions adopted by the Socialist Party of Yuma, Ariz., praying for the enactment of legislation authorizing Government ownership of all the mines of the United States and the Territories thereof, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I have a letter from Rev. George Brown Thomas, pastor of St. Paul's Methodist Episcopal Church, of Manchester, N. H., from which I desire to read a paragraph:

As pastor of the largest Methodist Church in the State I am writing to beg you, not only as an individual, but as representing practically a united body of citizens who are members of this church and parish, to support the immigration bill which will soon come before your body, introduced into the House by Mr. BURNETT and known as House bill 6060. Probably a separate bill will be introduced into the Senate, if it has not already been introduced, under a different name, but containing the same provisions, particularly the educational restriction.

After much study and observation and experience I am convinced that we face no other peril greater, if as great, than the tremendous influx of foreign peoples who are totally illiterate.

My correspondent goes on to discuss the matter somewhat further in detail, which I will not read. I move that the letter be referred to the Committee on Immigration.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. KENYON presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Humboldt County, Iowa, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation compelling the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of sundry clerks and letter carriers employed in the post office at Oskaloosa, Iowa, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the retirement of incapacitated civil-service employees, which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

Mr. WEEKS presented a memorial of Hebrew Progressive Lodge, No. 177, Independent Order B'rith Abraham, of Boston, Mass., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. BURLEIGH presented a petition of York Pomona Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Maine, praying for the passage of the so-called Lever agricultural extension bill, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. SIMMONS presented a petition of sundry citizens of Rocky Mount, N. C., praying for the construction of two new battleships, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Elm City, N. C., praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

SENATOR FROM ALABAMA.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I desire to make a privileged report. The Committee on Privileges and Elections, to which was referred the credentials of FRANK P. GLASS as a Senator from the State of Alabama, have considered the same, and I am directed by that committee to submit a report thereon. I ask that the report may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

[Senate Report No. 164, part 1, Sixty-third Congress, second session.]

CREDENTIALS OF FRANK P. GLASS AS SENATOR FROM ALABAMA.

Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Privileges and Elections, submitted the following report (to accompany S. Res. 249):

The Committee on Privileges and Elections, to whom was referred the credentials of FRANK P. GLASS as a Senator from the State of Alabama, have considered the same and submit the following report:

At the time the seventeenth amendment became valid as a part of the Constitution of the United States, on the 31st day of May, 1913, and thereafter until his death, on the 8th day of August, 1913, following, the State of Alabama was represented in the Senate in part by Hon. Joseph M. Johnston, holding by election by the legislature of that State for a full term, which would expire on the 4th of March, 1915. Later the governor of that State, the Hon. Emmet O'Neal, designated Hon. HENRY D. CLAYTON to fill the vacancy thus occasioned. His credentials were presented to the Senate and by it referred to its Committee on Privileges and Elections, but before any report was made by the committee they were withdrawn by request of the appointee, who declined the place. Subsequently, on the 7th day of November, 1913, the governor issued a certificate by which the Senate was advised that he had appointed Hon. FRANK P. GLASS as a Senator of the United States from the State of Alabama. His credentials having been presented to the Senate and by it referred to the appropriate committee, that committee now reports that in its opinion the governor of Alabama had no authority under the Constitution of the United States to make the appointment and that the said FRANK P. GLASS is not entitled to a seat in this honorable body.

The right claimed under the appointment depends upon the construction to be given to the seventeenth amendment, referred to, which reads as follows:

"The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof for six years; and each Senator shall have one vote. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for the electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.

"When vacancies happen in the representation of any State in the Senate the executive authority of such State shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies: *Provided*, That the legislature of any State may empower the executive thereof to make temporary appointments until the people fill the vacancy by election, as the legislature may direct.

"This amendment shall not be so construed as to affect the election or term of any Senator chosen before it becomes valid as a part of the Constitution."

It is contended on behalf of Mr. GLASS:

(1) That by reason of the last clause of the amendment it is inoperative with respect to any vacancy that may occur by the death, resignation, or expulsion of any Senator who had been elected prior to the 31st day of May, 1913, when the amendment became a part of the Constitution: that during the full period of six years for which any Senator had therefore been elected any vacancies occurring in the office to which he had been elected are to be filled pursuant to the provisions of the original Constitution.

(2) That the amendment is not self-executing and that until Congress or any particular State enacts legislation under which an election by the people for Senators can be held, Senators from such State must be chosen according to the provisions of the original Constitution and that Alabama had no such legislation.

(3) That assuming the amendment to be in force and operative in the State of Alabama, the laws of that State warrant the appointment under the second clause of the amendment, which empowers the legislatures of the States, respectively, to invest the governors thereof to make temporary appointments in the case of a vacancy in the representation of any State in the Senate.

The propositions above listed, numbered 1 and 3, were both advanced on behalf of Mr. CLAYTON—the view expressed in No. 2 was first presented in connection with the hearing on the case of Mr. GLASS. After the committee had heard arguments by eminent and able counsel, as well as a very valuable discussion by a member of this body, Hon. JON T. ROBINSON, junior Senator from Arkansas, on behalf of the first appointee of the governor of Alabama, a member of the committee, read to it a written opinion expressive of his views respecting the contention made leading to the conclusion that the governor was without authority to appoint. The committee refers to the opinion thus prepared, a copy of which is filed herewith, as conforming to its convictions concerning the merits of the question canvassed—adding simply a brief statement of the reasons which impel it to reject the additional contention now advanced.

The amendment plainly says that the Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof for six years. As to Senators elected after May 31, 1913, for the full term of six years—that is, all except those the choice of whom by some other method may be required by the provisions of the amendment—they must be chosen by the people. The mandate of the Constitution is perfectly plain.

It is argued that the amendment can not go into effect in any State until that State, in the absence of congressional legislation, shall have provided by appropriate enactment for the holding of an election for Senator, and that to avoid a hiatus the method prescribed by the original Constitution is to be followed until such legislative machinery is provided. The logic of this argument leads to the conclusion that if for any reason the measure now pending before the Senate making provision for the holding of senatorial elections in the several States or some other bill of like import, should fail to pass, any State in which the local sentiment is adverse to the election of Senator by popular vote, or any State wherein by notorious methods the popular will can not or does not find expression in legislative action, may go on indefinitely electing its Senators according to the method which it was believed had, after many years of struggle, been abolished. It would result that one system of electing Senators might be in vogue in some States and another in others, both sanctioned by the supreme law. The committee finds it impossible to believe that a construction which leads to such a condition can be correct.

If legislation is essential to permit the voters of a State to signify their choice of a candidate for Senator, the State must provide the law under which the election can be conducted, or it must suffer the consequences in the loss of its representation in the Senate. If this shall seem harsh, it is within the power of the State to avoid the consequence complained of by an observance of its duty to enact the requisite law that its people may select their representatives as prescribed by the Constitution. It is not believed that the comparatively trifling expense that would attend the convening of the legislature in extra session in a State whose laws are not sufficiently comprehensive in their terms to permit a senatorial election ought to be regarded as a consideration of sufficient weight to justify the belief that it was intended that the old system should continue in force conditionally or otherwise. The authorities to which our attention is invited do not require that we accept the view urged upon us. Blake v. Board of Commissioners (47 Pac. 754), an Idaho case, is relied upon as the most direct authority in support of the position taken in behalf of the appointee. The constitution of that State made it the duty of the legislature to provide for the election biennially of a "probate judge who is ex officio county superintendent of public instruction," which it did.

In 1896 an amendment was adopted which directed the legislature "to provide" by general and uniform laws for the election biennially "of the several county officers named therein, among others, of a county superintendent of public instruction." The court held that until the legislature enacted the new law, as it was commanded, the old law remained in force and the probate judges continued to be county superintendents. It is difficult to conceive how any other result could have been reached in that case. It is perfectly obvious that the amendment contemplated that the old system should continue until the new one had been provided for by appropriate legislation. The case affords very little basis for the contention that anyone may claim a seat in the Senate who is not, as provided for in the first clause of the amendment, "elected by the people," unless his case falls within the exceptions covered specifically by the second or third clause thereof. The amendment, considering the language of the first clause, may very properly be regarded as, in effect, saying that no one except his case falls within the provisions of the second or third clause shall be entitled to a seat in the Senate who shall not have been elected by the people of the State from which he comes.

It is quite evident that it was contemplated that legislation concerning the time, place, and manner of holding elections for Senators under the new plan would be enacted wherever existing statutes were inadequate or wanting in definiteness or directness. When the Constitution was originally adopted, it was likewise contemplated that the States would make appropriate provisions for conducting congressional elections. As national legislation could not be had until a Congress should be assembled, it was essential for the inauguration of the system that the machinery for the conduct of the election should be provided by the States, respectively. Most of them did make specific provisions through their legislatures, assembled in general or special sessions. The Representatives from other States in which recourse was had to existing election statutes were, however, admitted as well, though such laws could only by a very liberal construction be held applicable to the election of Representatives in Congress.

A question soon arose as to the authority to hold an election to fill a vacancy in the absence of specific legislation applicable to such a case. Pennsylvania had made provision for the holding of a general election for the choice of a Representative in Congress for the full term, but had no law directly applicable to the conduct of an election to fill a vacancy. One of the Representatives having resigned, the governor, pursuant to the mandate of the Constitution, issued his writ of election to fill the vacancy, commanding that the election be had on the day of the ensuing general election, which was to occur, and which did occur, two days later. It was argued before the House that in the absence of any State law the governor enjoyed the right as incidental to the authority vested in him by the Constitution to call the election, to prescribe the time, place, and manner of holding it, and that having specified that it should be held in conjunction with the election provided for by law and in the manner prescribed for such an election and at the places at which it was held, a valid election to fill the vacancy was had. The House seated the candidate thus chosen, and the case is generally referred to as authority for the proposition that the governor has the right to prescribe the time, place, and manner, in the absence of legislation on the subject, of holding an

election to fill a vacancy in the House of Representatives. (1 Hinds' Precedents, 640, Hoge's Case.)

It is here contended that, whether the case was correctly decided or not, the determination constituted a construction of the Constitution by the only tribunal entitled to pass upon the provisions involved, and that when the identical language is found employed in the seventeenth amendment it is to be given the significance thus attributed to it. The force of the Hoge case as a precedent is somewhat weakened, however, by the fact that it was urged by Mr. Clay in the debate that the Pennsylvania statute was broad enough in its terms to cover the case of elections to fill vacancies as well as the case of an expiring term. His views may have prevailed with some of those voting to seat the claimant.

In the view of the committee it is immaterial whether the case is accepted as authority or not. If it is rejected and the conclusion is reached that Alabama is not now equipped to hold an election, it will, in the opinion of the committee, be necessary that she assemble her legislature to make provision. Some of the States anticipating the eventual success of the amendment, long before Congress for consideration, enacted laws to meet the contingency of its adoption. Oklahoma made specific provisions in her constitution for the election of Senators by the people whenever that system should be legalized. In other States laws have been passed intended to make effective the Oregon system, under which the people have gone through every form necessary to elect their Senators. It is quite generally conceded that these laws, though enacted before the amendment was adopted, may be availed of. Still other States have election laws so general and comprehensive in their terms as to reach to the case of officers whose election by the people might in the future, speaking with reference to the time of the enactment of such statutes, be provided for by law. No reason is perceived why senatorial elections may not, with entire propriety and legality, be conducted under the sanction of such laws. It is the opinion of the committee that Alabama is thus provided, and that there exists no obstacle to the holding of an election for Senator in that State.

Article 19 of chapter 15 of the Code of Alabama, 1907, deals with the subject of "special elections." Section 439, with which the article is introduced, reads as follows:

"1. When a vacancy occurs in the office of senator or representative in the legislature, when the legislature will be in session prior to the next general election for that office.

"2. When a vacancy occurs in the office of Representative in the Congress of the United States, by which the State may be deprived of its full representation at any time Congress will be in session prior to the next general election for that office.

"3. Whenever any general or special election for members of the legislature or for Representatives in Congress is not held.

"4. When any vacancies occur in any State or county offices filled by the election of the people not otherwise provided for by the constitution or laws of this State.

"5. In such other cases as are or may be provided for by law."

Now, the seventeenth amendment certainly provides for the calling of a special election in the case of a vacancy in the Senate. Its language is quite equivalent to a direction to the executive to call a special election to fill a vacancy which may occur in the representation from any State. It is not only a law, but by the declaration of the Constitution is a part of the "supreme law of the land." The adoption of the amendment and the death of Senator Johnston gives rise to a case falling under the fifth subdivision of section 439.

The section quoted is followed by these:

"440. Day for holding special elections.—All special elections shall be held on such day as the governor may direct.

"441. Special elections ordered by governor.—All special elections provided for by this article are to be ordered by the governor, who must issue writs of election directed to the sheriffs of the counties in which such election is required to be held; and must specify therein the districts or counties in which, and the day on which such election is to be held; the cause and object of the same; the name of the person in whose office the vacancy has occurred; and in all cases in which a special election is directed in a district composed of more than one county, such election must be directed to be held on the same day in each county.

"445. How conducted and certificates given.—Special elections are to be held and conducted, the returns thereof made and certificates given, and, unless otherwise expressly provided, regulated in all respects by the provisions in relation to general elections."

It is difficult to understand why all the necessary machinery for the conduct of an election to fill a vacancy in the Senate is not provided by these sections of the Alabama statutes.

That State seems to have been one of those which anticipated the necessity of conducting an election by the people for United States Senator, for it provided in section 332 as follows:

"General elections, for whom held.—General elections throughout the State shall be held for governor, lieutenant governor, attorney general, State auditor, secretary of state, State treasurer, superintendent of education, commissioner of agriculture and industries, three railroad commissioners, no two of whom shall be elected from the same congressional district; State game and fish commissioner, chief justice and associate justices of the supreme court, supernumerary judge, and electors for President and Vice President of the United States, and such other officers as may be required by law to be elected by the voters of the entire State."

And by section 331:

"State and county officers who are elected by the people.—The following officers in this State shall be elected by the qualified electors thereof: Governor, lieutenant governor, attorney general, State auditor, secretary of state, and such other officers as may be required by law to be elected by the people."

Though the heading to the section, probably the work of the compiler rather than the legislature, designates the officers to which it relates as "State and county officers," the act itself speaks of all officers in the State who may be required by law to be elected by the people.

The statutes are so plain in terms, so comprehensive in their scope, that it is difficult to conceive how the view could be entertained. If it was, that Alabama is under the necessity of convening her legislature in extra session if the view that the amendment is presently operative as to her should obtain.

But were they much less so they might still be adequate for the purpose. The method prescribed by the amendment for the election of Senators is the same as that laid down in the original Constitution for the election of Representatives. Concerning the filling of vacancies the identical language used in the Constitution respecting Members of the House is employed in the amendment. The most liberal rule has been established by long practice in the House concerning that provision of the Constitution which directs that the legislatures

of the States shall prescribe the time, place, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives. A careful examination has failed to disclose that any special legislation had been enacted concerning elections of Representatives in either New Hampshire or Georgia prior to the first appearance in Congress of Members from those States, and yet they were admitted apparently without question.

The condition which prevailed in Pennsylvania and which gave rise to the Hoge case obtained in practically all the original States. An examination of the statutes under which their first Representatives were elected and which made provision for subsequent elections will reveal that few if any of them made provision for elections to fill vacancies. Apparently the doctrine of the Hoge case, either that the statutes covering the case of regular elections should be held applicable or that in the absence of legislation the governor could prescribe rules for the conduct of such elections, was generally accepted. Though the fourth section of the first article reposes in the legislatures of the States, respectively, the authority to prescribe the rules for the conduct of congressional elections, it is the settled practice after repeated contests to admit the first Representative sent by a State, though they are, as is usually the case, elected under laws enacted by Territorial, not State, legislatures. (See Hinds' Precedents, 644 and 648.)

The Fifty-sixth Congress admitted Robert W. Wilcox as a Delegate from Hawaii, though there was no law of the islands specifically reaching to the case of the election of such an official. The election was conducted, however, under the forms prescribed by the local law for the election of members of the legislature, and having been found to have been fairly conducted was approved.

Under similar conditions the present Delegate was seated, upon a contest, by the Fifty-ninth Congress. (1 Hinds' Precedents, 675.)

Had Alabama proceeded to elect a Senator to fill the unexpired portion of the term of the late Senator Johnston, it is surely not open to doubt that he would have been seated, as he ought to be seated. The appointee of the governor can not claim any right to membership in the Senate.

Therefore the committee respectfully recommend the adoption of the following resolution:

"Resolved, That FRANK P. GLASS is not entitled to a seat in the Senate of the United States as a Senator from the State of Alabama."

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF SENATOR THOMAS J. WALSH.

VIEWS EXPRESSED BY SENATOR THOMAS J. WALSH OF MONTANA, A MEMBER OF THE COMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS, RELATIVE TO THE VALIDITY OF THE CREDENTIALS OF HENRY D. CLAYTON AS A SENATOR FROM ALABAMA.

The committee has had under consideration the credentials of Hon. HENRY D. CLAYTON, appointed by the governor of Alabama to fill a vacancy in the representation from that State, in the Senate, occasioned by the death of Hon. Joseph M. Johnston. The very grave duty is imposed upon the committee of determining whether, under the Constitution of the United States, in view of the seventeenth amendment thereto, proclaimed as a part of it on the 31st day of May, 1913, the governor of Alabama has any power to fill by appointment the vacancy which thus arose. The amendment in question is as follows:

"The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof for six years; and each Senator shall have one vote. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for the electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.

"When vacancies happen in the representation of any State in the Senate the executive authority of such States shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies: *Provided*, That the legislature of any State may empower the executive thereof to make temporary appointments until the people fill the vacancy by election as the legislature may direct.

"This amendment shall not be so construed as to affect the election or term of any Senator chosen before it becomes valid as a part of the Constitution."

It is contended—

1. That by the third clause of the amendment a vacancy occurring by reason of the death, resignation, or expulsion of any member elected before it took effect must be filled in the manner prescribed by the original Constitution; that is, temporarily by appointment by the governor, and thereafter by selection by the legislature; and

2. That the governor has the power which he has attempted to exercise by virtue of a statute which authorizes and requires him to fill by appointment all vacancies which may occur in any State office when no other mode is prescribed by law.

1. It is asserted on the one hand that the plain meaning of the clause of the amendment referred to is that the right of no Member who had been regularly elected or appointed prior to the time the amendment became valid as a part of the Constitution should be open to question, nor should the term for which he was elected be either extended or abbreviated in consequence of it; that the election or appointment of a Senator, valid when it occurred, should remain valid, and that he should be entitled to sit for the entire term for which he was elected or appointed, any provision of the amendment to the contrary notwithstanding; and that all vacancies occurring after the amendment became valid as a part of the Constitution—that is to say, after it was ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States—must be filled in the manner prescribed by it; that is, by election by the people, the governor having power to appoint until an election may be held only if the legislature of his State shall choose to clothe him with such authority.

Against this view it is urged on behalf of the appointee of the governor that the word "term" as used in the concluding clause of the amendment has an entirely impersonal significance, that it refers to the period of time, and the whole period of time, for which any Senator was elected, and that such term is not cut short even by the death of the Member. In this view it is proper to speak of the term of Senator Johnston as still subsisting. A great wealth of authority is adduced to give sanction to the idea that it was in such sense that this important word was used. The basic idea upon which the contention thus made rests is set forth with unusual clearness and force by the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin in the opinion in the case of State ex rel. Bashford v. Trear (138 Wis., 536), from which the following quotation is made:

"The office, the term, and the incident—a specific salary—may exist for any period of time without the office being filled or without there being any method provided for filling it.

"Upon such method being provided and the office being filled, the incumbent takes it with its fixed term and incident. If he goes out during such term and another steps in, the latter does not take a new

term, but takes a part of the same term prior thereto enjoyed by his predecessor. The term continues during the fixed period with its incidents for such period regardless of how many incumbents there may be, each succeeding the other. Where another incumbent goes in at the commencement of the full term prescribed by law, such full term becomes his term within the meaning of language in the fundamental law prohibiting any change in an officer's salary during his term of office, and in case of his going out during such term and being succeeded by another, such other succeeds to the same term as that held by his predecessor, so that during his incumbency the full term, so far as not yet run, becomes his term in the constitutional sense.

Having established that the word "term" is to be construed as signifying the entire period of six years for which Senator Johnston was elected, it is urged that the amendment does not become operative during that period because of the clause referred to, that "this amendment shall not be so construed as to affect the term of any Senator chosen before it becomes valid as a part of the Constitution."

But if the first step in the argument be accepted as sound, the conclusion to which the student is asked to pass is by no means his destination. Let it be agreed that the word "term" refers to the entire period of six years for which the late Senator Johnston was elected. The question still remains as to how the unexpired portion of that term, that period of six years, is to be filled. Keeping in mind the definition assigned to the word "term," giving it a purely impersonal significance as a period of time merely, what does the amendment say? That it shall not "affect" that term, that period. The only way in which anything can affect a period of time under any definition of the word "affect" is either to lengthen or to shorten it. The full meaning of the language of the amendment, then, is that it shall not be construed to render void or questionable the election of any Senator valid at the time it was adopted, nor to lengthen or shorten his term by whomsoever that term may be filled. It means that the successor of Senator Johnston, however he may be selected, will hold only for the unexpired portion of the term of the deceased Senator. It does not appear, accordingly, that any advance toward a solution of the problem is made, though the significance assigned to it be given to the word "term" as it is used in the amendment.

The plain and obvious purpose of the third clause of the amendment was to preserve from question the seats of Members lawfully elected prior to the time the amendment should become a part of the Constitution and to confirm them in their right thereto for the full period for which they were, respectively, chosen. It is said, however, that under ordinary rules of construction such would be the operation of the amendment if the third clause were not a part of it at all, and perhaps that is true. But such language as that under consideration never does serve to give to a constitution or statute a significance different from what it otherwise would rightfully bear. The language of an act to the effect that nothing in it shall be construed in a certain way operates only to make more clear what has gone before, to foreclose any assertion that a meaning is to be attributed to it contrary to the recital of the proviso.

Without the clause in question it might, for instance, be argued that Senator elect BROUSSARD, of the State of Louisiana, chosen in 1912 by the legislature of that State for the term beginning March 4, 1915, could claim nothing under his election, since he had not become a Senator in fact when the amendment became operative. The clause under consideration prevents, and was intended to prevent, the advancement of such a contention. So it might not be without the bounds of reason to advance that upon the adoption of the amendment the seats of all Senators would be vacant, since none were elected by direct vote, as required by the Constitution. Again, it might be contended that, though the election of sitting Senators would not be invalidated, it was implied that at the first opportunity, say at the next general election, the people should have the right to elect; that is to say, that the terms of Senators elected before the amendment took effect would be cut short and that none should be entitled to hold longer than until their successors should be elected. The purpose of the clause was to put past doubt the meaning of what had gone before. It was not contemplated that the meaning otherwise attributable to the amendment was to be in any respect changed.

Yet it would change the effect of the preceding language if given the significance which we are asked to assign to it. The second clause provides that—

"When vacancies happen in the representation of any State in the Senate, the executive authority of such States shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies."

That clause is to be made to read:

"When vacancies happen in the representation from any State in the Senate after the expiration of the term of any Senator chosen before this amendment becomes valid as a part of the Constitution, the executive authority of such State shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies."

In an effort to arrive at the true meaning of a statute or constitution when the language gives rise to doubt, the result to which any particular construction leads or may lead may be regarded. The necessary result of the contention being considered, made on behalf of Mr. CLAYTON, is that any vacancy occurring during the term of any Senator heretofore elected, save in the case of the senior Senator from Georgia, who holds by virtue of the direct vote of the people of his State under the amendment, must be filled by election by the legislature of the State in which the vacancy occurs, or temporarily by appointment by the governor, and that the Senate must refuse to seat a claimant who comes under a commission reciting his election by a direct vote of the people taken at a special election held pursuant to the mandate of the amendment itself to the effect that—

"When vacancies happen in the representation of any State in the Senate, the executive authority of such States shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies."

The term of the present junior Senator from Louisiana expires March 4, 1919. His successor will be elected by direct vote of the people of that State, presumably in 1918. The term of Senator elect BROUSSARD will not expire until March 4, 1921. Should he resign in 1919, the governor, under the contention made, would be entitled to fill the vacancy by temporary appointment, though the legislature expressly refused to confer upon him such power, as it might under the amendment, and when the legislature again convened it would be entitled to fill the vacancy. An interpretation which gives rise to such a possibility is not to be indulged unless the language employed plainly commands it. There appears to be no reason why the time when the amendment should go into operation should thus be postponed. Vacancies occurring after a time beyond the period for which Senators were elected prior to the adoption of the amendment are indisputably to be filled by election by the people, the executive of any State in the rep-

resentation from which a vacancy occurs being required to issue writs of election to fill the same as in the case of a vacancy in the delegation in the House of Representatives, though the governor may be empowered to make a temporary appointment pending an election. What reason can be assigned as to why vacancies now occurring should not be filled in the same manner?

These considerations but enforce the conclusion that the third clause means, and means only, what it plainly says, that the amendment shall neither lengthen nor shorten the term of any Member, whether the word "term" is used in a personal or an impersonal sense, and does not mean what it does not say, that this amendment shall be inoperative during the term for which any Senator is chosen.

It was argued that the word "chosen" in the clause in question, not being applicable to the case of a Senator holding by appointment, leads to the conviction that the word "term" was used in the impersonal sense. Even if that should be admitted, the conclusion urged, as shown, would not follow. But, though unusual, the word is not at all inapt to express the idea of a selection by the governor. He is required to choose, in order to make an appointment, quite as much as is the legislature, or as are the people in electing. No such nicety is exhibited in the use of terms in the Constitution. By it each State is authorized to "appoint," in such manner as the legislature may direct, a number of electors of President and Vice President equal to the whole number of Representatives to which the State is entitled in Congress. Though it is authorized to "appoint," each and every State now elects, and it has been judicially held that such procedure meets the constitutional requirement.

That provision of the Constitution found in Article V of the Constitution dealing with amendments, which provides that no State shall, without its consent, be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate, is conceived by some to be of consequence in arriving at a correct conclusion concerning the true significance to be attributed to the last clause of the amendment. It is to be gathered that the claim is made that unless the significance claimed for it, as above set forth, is attached to the amendment, Alabama is, for a time, without its full quota in the Senate. This argument would lead to the conclusion that unless the governor has the power to appoint, agreeably to the contention that the amendment is not presently operative as to vacancies occurring during the term of any Senator elected before its ratification, the amendment itself is void, or, at least, is in effect only in those States by which it was ratified.

The amendment did not introduce any inequality in the representation of the States in the Senate. There is nothing in Article V which forbids an amendment by which each State shall become entitled to three Senators or to one only. It was simply to insure uniformity that the restriction was placed on the power of amendment. So long as all the States stand on the same footing in respect to the number of Senators to which they are entitled, none has any cause of complaint. It can not be said that Alabama is "deprived" of her equal suffrage in the Senate when she enjoys exactly the same rights under the Constitution as every other State. Some time must necessarily intervene in order to permit an election to fill a vacancy. Some, in practice at least, must ensue, even though the governor appoints. Alabama may reduce but she can not obliterate the hiatus that must follow the death of any of her Members, by authorizing her governor to fill temporarily a vacancy thus occasioned.

II. Admitting, then, that the seventeenth amendment is now in general operation not only in respect to the selection of Senators who are to enter upon new terms but Senators who are chosen to fill vacancies, it is asserted that Mr. CLAYTON is rightfully appointed by the governor in view of the statutes of the State of Alabama and the provisions of the second clause of the amendment.

An act approved August 25, 1909, is as follows:

"[No. 65—H. 55.]

"An act to provide for the filling of any vacant office of the State or any county or any municipality when there is no provision of law for filling such vacancy.

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of Alabama:

"1. That when any office of the State, of any county or municipality thereof, is vacant from death, resignation, removal from the municipality, county, or State, or because the former incumbent absconds, or because an incumbent has been removed for ineligibility, or when the office is vacant from any other cause, and there is no way provided by law for the filling of such vacant office, the governor is hereby empowered and required to appoint a qualified person to fill the unexpired term of such office."

It is argued that United States Senators are not officers of the United States, neither is the office any such holds an "office under the United States," but an "office of the State" within the meaning of this statute, which, with much force and convincing logic, is said to contemplate not only offices then existing but those which might thereafter be created by law; not only those concerning which there was at the time of the enactment of the statute no express method provided for filling vacancies, but as well to those which, by any event, should be found vacant, and in relation to which there existed no express provision of the law for filling the vacancy.

If it should be admitted that a United States Senator is an "officer of the State," the question would still remain as to whether the second clause of the amendment does not contemplate and require future affirmative action on the part of the legislature before the governor becomes vested with the authority to appoint. That question will be canvassed later.

Various provisions of the Federal Constitution are referred to in this connection clearly establishing that as the phrase is used in them Senators and Representatives are not to be regarded as "officers of the United States." Thus in section 1 of Article II it is provided that—

"No Senator or Representative or person holding an office of trust or profit under the United States shall be appointed an elector."

And in section 6 of Article I is the following:

"And no Senator or Representative shall, during the time for which he was elected, be assigned to any civil office under the authority of the United States which shall have been created or the emoluments whereof shall have been increased during such time; and no person holding any office under the United States shall be a Member of either House during his continuance in office."

So it was held in *Burton v. United States* (— U. S., —) that the judgment therein which, pursuant to a statute, disqualified the defendant "to hold office under the United States" did not operate to vacate his seat in the United States Senate, the necessary conclusion being that in the view of the Supreme Court, a United States Senator did not hold an "office under the United States."

But it does not by any means follow that because Senators and Representatives are not within the purview of particular provisions of the Constitution or of particular Federal statutes referring to officers of the United States they are necessarily officers of the States, respectively, from which they come.

It has been expressly held in Kentucky that Members of the House of Representatives are not "State officers" as that expression is used in the constitution of that State. A provision thereof required that certain vacancies should be filled by election "at the next succeeding annual election at which either city, town, county, district, or State officers are to be elected." It was held that the office could not be filled at a November election at which only Members of the House of Representatives were elected. (*Neely v. McCollum*, 53 S. W. 37; *Eversole v. Brown*, 53 S. W. 527; *Donelan v. Bird*, 118 S. W. 178.)

Language found in the opinion of Mr. Justice Miller in *Ex parte Yarborough* (110 U. S., 657) clearly implies that in the opinion of that tribunal Members of Congress are not State officers. We read therein as follows:

"The day fixed for electing Members of Congress has been established by Congress without regard to the time set for election of State officers in each State."

Indeed, that court apparently found some difficulty in classifying the position, for it said in the case referred to that—
"the office [Members of Congress], if it be properly called an office, is created by the Constitution and by that alone."

"The Constitution not only creates the office of United States Senator, 'if it be properly called an office,' but it prescribes the duties thereof; it prescribes the qualifications and the disqualifications under which those chosen as such labor. A Senator participates in the work of the National Legislature of which he is an integral part and receives his compensation out of the National Treasury. The pending tariff bill contains a provision to the effect—

"That in computing net income under this section there shall be excluded * * * the compensation of all officers and employees of a State or any political subdivision thereof."

A similar provision was found in the income-tax feature of the act of 1894. In such exceptions is recognized the principle that the Federal Government can not tax the salaries of officers of the State governments. Yet it is the common understanding that the salaries of Members of Congress in both branches must be reported, and such seems to be the inevitable conclusion from the context. By statutory definition Senators and Representatives are not "State officers" in New York. (*People v. Nixon*, 158 N. Y., 221.)

The language of the Alabama statute is not apt to include United States Senators, and it is scarcely to be conceived that the filling of vacancies in the representation of the State in the Senate was contemplated by the legislature in passing the act in question. The concluding portion of the act reciting that the appointee is to serve for the unexpired portion of the term enforces this conclusion, for under the seventeenth amendment the governor's appointee does not, should the legislature see fit to invest him with the power to appoint, serve for the remainder of the unexpired term, but only until an election can be held as the legislature may direct.

The legislation referred to clearly does not embrace the case of a vacancy in the United States Senate. But if it did, the question would arise as to whether existing statutes of the various States enacted before the amendment was ratified, either general in their nature or specific in character, can be appealed to as a warrant for a temporary appointment by the governor. The great central idea of the amendment is the election of Senators by direct vote of the people. For reasons unnecessary to dwell upon here, the framers of the Constitution regarded it as unwise to repose that power in the people. However weighty this opinion may once have seemed, a well-nigh universal conviction had come to prevail that time had robbed it of its force, if it ever had any real value, and that intolerable abuses flowed almost inevitably from the delegation of power which had been made in reference to the selection of Senators. The people determined to and did reinvest themselves with the power they had surrendered to their representatives. The provisions of the Constitution respecting the manner of electing Members of the House of Representatives became a convenient guide in the framing of the amendment by which the change was to be effected. Clause 1 of section 2 of Article I of the Constitution provides:

"The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature."

The correlative clause of the amendment says:
"The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof for six years; and each Senator shall have one vote. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for the electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature."

The fourth clause of section 2 of Article I declares that—
"When vacancies happen in the representation from any State, the executive authority thereof shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies."

The new amendment, in its second clause, makes this provision:
"When vacancies happen in the representation of any State in the Senate, the executive authority of such States shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies."

The system of delegating the power to choose Senators had broken down. It was everywhere in disrepute and in deserved disrepute. The jealousy of the people was aroused. They recalled the power which they believed had been unwisely delegated and determined to make their own choice, by direct vote, for Senators, even in case of vacancies, leaving to each State, if it saw fit to do so, to invest the governor thereof with the power to fill a vacancy by making a temporary appointment which should be effective only until an election should be held, as the legislature might direct.

The power to elect is by the amendment restored to the people, but the people of each State may, if they care to do so, vest in the governor power to fill a vacancy by appointment until an election can be held.

This clearly contemplates a deliberate purpose on the part of the people of the State, having this provision of the Constitution as it now exists in mind, to clothe their governor with such power by appropriate legislative action. The provision in question quite manifestly contemplates future affirmative action on the part of the people of the State, speaking through their legislature.

It is not to be understood that the view is expressed that if a State legislature, in anticipation of the ratification of the amendment, had passed, in form, a statute, declaring that in case the amendment should become valid by ratification the governor should be empowered to

appoint, its effect to make timely provision would be abortive. Congressional legislation in which many of the framers of the Constitution participated affords a justification for such action by a State.

"When the amendment of the Constitution of the United States relative to the choice of President was pending, and also an election of President, Congress passed an act providing that whenever that amendment should be adopted the Secretary of State should give notice to the executive of every State, who should notify the electors of his State; and these electors were to vote in the mode thereby prescribed. But as this ratification might not be known in season to all the electors, it was also provided that in such cases the electors might vote in conformity to the original Constitution and also in conformity to the amendment; and when the votes were counted those certificates only should be opened which contained the votes given in conformity to the Constitution, as it was in force on the day fixed by law at the time of the meeting of the electors. (Act of Mar. 26, 1804.) (Pratt v. Allen, 13 Conn., 119-128.)"

That case considered a statute of the State of Connecticut which was passed in anticipation of the adoption of an amendment to the constitution of that State. The power of appointment of sheriffs was at first given to the legislature. An amendment was submitted providing for their election by the people. The act in question, passed before the amendment was adopted, prescribed the manner in which the election should be conducted in case the amendment proposed became effective. It was held to be quite within the power of the legislature to pass such a law.

It is asserted, however, that the surrender on the part of the people of a State of the power themselves to elect a Senator by direct vote, or even to fill a vacancy, is not to be presumed from any statute general in character, however comprehensive its terms, and not passed obviously in view of the provision of the amendment under consideration.

The people of each State are entitled to an opportunity to make a deliberate choice as to whether they will or will not invest their chief executive with the extraordinary power contemplated by that part of the amendment upon which the validity of the appointment being considered must rest. The people of the State of Alabama have exercised no such choice. The amendment further contemplates that in case the people of any State should see fit, through their legislature, to repose in their governor the power of temporary appointment, they should likewise designate the time the appointee should serve; that is to say, when the election should be held at which a Senator is to be chosen to displace him. One State might require that a special election be held within 30 days, another 60, another 90, and another might, in the interest of economy, provide that the governor's writ should require the election to fill the vacancy to be held at the time of the next general election. It is conceivable that some State might fix the time of election so that it would coincide with the expiration of a term, and under such a law the person appointed would serve for the unexpired term, but the State on conferring the authority on the governor to appoint must, under the amendment, fix the time for the election.

Such a statute would probably not violate even the spirit of the amendment in cases in which the vacancy occurred in reasonable proximity to the time when the election is to be held to choose a Senator for the full term. It is sufficient for the present to advert to the fact that the very language which contemplates action by the legislature to invest the governor with the power of appointment contemplates that, in connection therewith, it shall make provision for the holding of an election to fill the vacancy. It would be a grievous wrong to the people of Alabama to attribute to them a design in the enactment of the statute to which reference has been made to exercise the grave right with which the amendment invests them in respect to the filling of vacancies in the representation of that State in the Senate by temporary appointment. It would be scarcely less unjust to assert that they had inadvertently done so.

No just analogy exists between such a statute and general statutes on the subject of elections sufficiently comprehensive in their scope to cover the case of an election of United States Senator enacted prior to the ratification of the amendment. The validity and applicability of such, in connection with the election of Senators, may be abundantly justified, though statutes such as the one here considered be held ineffective to warrant an appointment by the governor. Such statutes are rarely enacted, except in view of the probability that officers other than those who are, at the time they become effective, elected by the people may, by subsequent laws, be required to be chosen in the same manner. It is rare that they do not apply to all officers alike. It is difficult to conceive of the likelihood of a State's providing one method of electing Senators and another of electing Members of Congress and State officers. The purpose of the people of a State to make general election laws, long since adopted, applicable to the election of United States Senators, should the right to elect such by direct vote be accorded them, may well be presumed. Territorial statutes have, with unvarying regularity, been held to be effective for the election of Members of Congress upon the admission of a State into the Union. It appears that some question was raised touching the right of the first Representatives of the State of Minnesota because, being chosen at the election at which the constitution was adopted, they were not elected under any law enacted pursuant to section 4 of Article I, providing that—

"The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators."

The objection was not, however, considered by the House as serious. (1 *Hinds' Precedents of the House of Representatives*, sec. 159, p. 642.)

It is not intended here to express any conclusion concerning the question of whether statutes now in force and enacted prior to May 31, 1913, may be made available for the purpose of conducting an election for United States Senator. Whatever view may be taken of that subject, the conviction that the governor of Alabama is without power to make the appointment under which Mr. CLAYTON claims his seat seems inescapable.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I am directed by the Committee on Privileges and Elections to submit the following resolution, which I ask may be read.

The resolution (S. 249) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That FRANK P. GLASS is not entitled to a seat in the Senate of the United States as a Senator from the State of Alabama.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report and accompanying resolution will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, in connection with the submission of the report, I desire to submit a request on behalf of the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BRADLEY]. That Senator is ill. He desires to be allowed four days in which to file views of the minority. I ask unanimous consent that the senior Senator from Kentucky be permitted to file a minority report within four days from this date.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and permission is granted.

SENATOR FROM MARYLAND.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. On behalf of myself and the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] I beg leave to submit the views of the minority on the credentials of BLAIR LEE as a Senator from the State of Maryland. I ask that the views may be printed in the RECORD and that they also may be printed in the usual form.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The views of the minority submitted by the Senator from Utah will be printed in the RECORD and also as a Senate report.

The views submitted this day by Mr. SUTHERLAND are as follows:

[Senate Report 160, part 2, Sixty-third Congress, second session.]

CREDENTIALS OF BLAIR LEE AS SENATOR FROM MARYLAND.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (for himself and Mr. DILLINGHAM), from the Committee on Privileges and Elections, submitted the following views of a minority, to accompany Senate resolution 247:

I find myself unable to agree with the majority of the Committee on Privileges and Elections in holding that BLAIR LEE is entitled to a seat in this body as a Senator from the State of Maryland. The report of the committee in support of the applicant's right to the seat, while it recites the facts in detail and discusses at some length the contention of Senator JACKSON, the sitting member, that he is entitled to retain his seat until the adjournment of the Maryland Legislature, fails to set forth the reasons for the conclusion of the committee that the election of BLAIR LEE was valid. The precise ground upon which this conclusion of the committee rests is therefore more or less a matter of surmise.

1. It was contended before the committee that the election of Mr. LEE could be sustained upon the grounds (1) that the provisions of the seventeenth amendment, that "When vacancies happen in the representation of any State in the Senate the executive authority of such State shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies," carries with it as an incident the power on the part of the governor, thus authorized to issue a writ of election, to fix the conditions upon which the election shall be held; and (2) that the laws of Maryland in force prior to the adoption of the seventeenth amendment constitute sufficient legislative foundation for the election. I am unable to agree to either view.

1. The seventeenth amendment provides that two Senators from each State shall be elected by the people thereof, instead of being chosen by the legislature, as provided in the original Constitution. This amendment, however, left intact paragraph 1, section 4, article I of the Constitution, which provides:

"The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof, but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators."

This provision is mandatory and exclusive in form. The right and duty of prescribing the various elements of an election is thereby devolved upon the legislature alone. The legislative authority is not limited to general elections; it applies to all elections, special as well as general.

By the seventeenth amendment when a vacancy happens the authority of the executive is limited to issuing the writ of election, a purely ministerial act. If there were no other provision in the Constitution governing the subject, there might be reason for claiming that the authority to issue a writ of election carried with it by implication the authority to fix the time, places, and manner of holding such election, but here the Constitution in express terms devolves the latter power upon the legislature, and it is contrary to all reasonable rules of construction to hold that an authority thus expressly vested in one body is taken away and given to another by mere implication. The meaning of the Constitution seems to be perfectly clear. It is that the legislature must fix the time, places, and manner of holding all elections, including elections to fill vacancies, and, this having been done, in case of a vacancy the governor issues his writ of election, but such legislative foundation must exist before the executive act of issuing the writ can be effective. The reasons are obvious. The legislature will prescribe these conditions by general law which will be the same in all cases, while if the power is held to be in the governor to fix them in connection with the issuance of his writ the rules may differ in every case. In one case he may call an election upon 2 days' notice, in another upon 60 days' notice; in one case he may prescribe that the places of holding the election shall be at the various polling precincts, in another at the various county seats; in one case that the manner of voting shall be by Australian ballot, in another by a totally different form of vote. If the governor has the incidental power to fix the time, it follows, of course, that he likewise has the power to fix the places and manner, since all are equally necessary to an election. Every condition of an election would therefore rest not upon uniform law but upon the unrestrained discretion of the governor in each case. Such a result, as it seems to me, was never contemplated by the Constitution.

The legislature has been directed, without qualification, to prescribe the time, places, and manner of holding elections. Is not a special election an election? But to hold that the governor has this power in case of a vacancy is to read into the constitutional provision an exception denying the power of the legislature in the case of special elections and to introduce a limitation, which the Constitution does not contain, confining the power of the legislature to one class of elections, when the plain words extend it to all elections. I can not assent to the view that a power which has been expressly vested in one body can be thus held to belong to another by implication.

If the power to fix the time, places, and manner is to be exercised by the governor in the case of elections to fill vacancies, what becomes of the reserve power of Congress to "make or alter such regulations"? In the general clause already quoted the Constitution has been careful to

reserve to Congress the power to make or alter such regulations; namely, such regulations as the legislature is authorized to prescribe. It was evidently contemplated that the legislature might in some instance fail to prescribe the time, places, and manner of holding elections, in which event Congress could supply the omission by itself making the regulation; and it was further contemplated—and this is no less important—that the legislature might make unwise or improper regulations, in which event Congress could correct them by alteration; but if the power to make regulations in the case of special elections belongs to the governor Congress is powerless to interfere, however much it may disapprove the action of the governor, since no supervisory power over the action or want of action on the part of the governor is reserved. It is not to be supposed that the Constitution intended that the supervisory power of Congress deemed so essential in the case of elections generally should be entirely wanting in the case of special elections.

2. It is, however, contended that if legislative authority for the holding of this special election be necessary, such authority is to be found in the statutes of Maryland in force prior to the adoption of the seventeenth amendment. It is conceded that no such legislation has been passed since the adoption of the seventeenth amendment.

The report of the committee unfortunately contains no reference to any such statute, so that I am not able to refer with certainty to the provisions of the Maryland law that are particularly relied upon. I have, however, read with some care the various sections of the Maryland election law which by any possibility could be held to apply to the election of a United States Senator, either for a regular term or to fill a vacancy. I have not been able to find any language which in terms or by the most liberal construction seems to me to apply. The constitution of Maryland provides for the election in specific terms of various State officers, naming them separately, and the laws of Maryland provide specifically for the election of certain other State officers and, in addition, for the election of Representatives in Congress and presidential electors. Certainly these constitutional provisions and statutes applying in terms to specifically named officers can not by any stretch of interpretation be held to apply to a United States Senator. The other statutes of Maryland relating to elections simply prescribe the character of the election officials, their duties, the registration of voters, and similar matters. In addition to this there is a specific primary law expressly applicable to United States Senators. This law prescribes how nominations for United States Senators shall be made at primary elections and provides that the names of persons for whom the greatest number of votes were cast by each political party, respectively, shall be certified to both houses of the General Assembly of Maryland (acts of 1908, ch. 400, sec. 7), and provides further that the candidate so receiving the greatest number of votes cast by the voters of said party in any county, etc., shall be entitled to and receive the votes of the candidates of such political party who may be elected to represent said county, etc., in the general assembly next ensuing, for the position of United States Senator for the term to be filled by the said general assembly (idem, sec. 9).

It not only appears, therefore, that there is no affirmative provision in the Maryland statutes covering the election of United States Senators by the people, but any such construction of the statutes is negated by this primary law affirmatively providing for a popular nomination by the people and an election by the legislature.

The attention of the committee, however, was called to the general interpretation clause found in the article on elections, which reads as follows: "The word 'election' as used in this article shall be construed to include elections had within any county or city for the purpose of enabling voters to choose some public officer or officers under the laws of this State or of the United States," and it was urged that this evidenced an intention on the part of the legislature that the laws by which the election machinery is provided and regulated should apply to United States Senators. An interpretation clause, however, as it has been many times held, will not alter the sense of a word or phrase the specific meaning of which to the contrary is made perfectly clear by the context.

The legislature sometimes recognizes this rule by express language, as for example in section 1 of the Revised Statutes of the United States where the interpretation of various words is declared "unless the context shows that such words were intended to be used in a more limited sense." But the rule is the same whether included in the interpretation clause or not. Thus in *Dean of Ely v. Bliss* (2 De G. M. & G., 471) it is said:

"There has been a great deal of discussion, which I am not surprised at, in regard to the meaning of the words; but it is to be observed that although the meaning of the words is defined by the statute, yet that statute declares (what would have been supplied if it had not been so expressed) that the words are not to have that meaning attached to them in the interpretation clause if a contrary intention appears."

The general rule is stated in *Wilberforce on Statutes*, page 297, that—"The real purpose of an interpretation clause is to define the meaning of words when nothing else in the act is opposed to the particular sense which is thus placed upon them."

In *Second Sutherland's Statutory Construction*, section 359, some English cases are cited to the effect that the statutory interpretation clause "could be satisfied by applying it to the word where there was nothing in the context to interpret it otherwise," and that the clause "should control where the words occur without being accompanied by any others tending to show their meaning; or to interpret words which are ambiguous or equivocal, and not so as to disturb the meaning of such as are plain." And again, in section 360, the same author says:

"On the other hand, general statutory definitions and rules of interpretation will apply when the statute in question is not plain; or, in other words, does not define and interpret itself. Where positive provisions are at variance with the definitions it contains, the latter, it seems, must be construed as modified by the clear intent of the former, on the principle that the special controls the general."

So it is said in 36 Cyc., 1106:

"But the interpretation clause should be used only for the purpose of interpreting words that are ambiguous or equivocal and not so as to disturb the meaning of such as are plain."

In *L. R. 7, H. of L., 493*, it is said:

"Even for the purpose of the act of Parliament, it appears to me that the interpretation clause does no more than say that where you find in the act those words 'personal chattels' they shall, unless there be something repugnant in the context, or in the sense, include fixtures."

In the case of the *Queen against the Justices of Cambridgeshire*, 7 Ad. and El., page 491, the court said:

"But we apprehend that an interpretation clause is not to receive so rigid a construction; that it is not to be taken as substituting one set of words for another, nor as strictly defining what the meaning of

a word must be under all circumstances. We rather think that it merely declares what persons may be comprehended within that term where the circumstances require that they should."

Other cases to the same effect might be cited.

Applying these rules to the case under consideration, it seems clear that the interpretation clause can not be held to extend the various or any of the election laws of Maryland to the election of a United States Senator, since in every case where the word "election" is used the intention of the legislature to not have it so applied unmistakably appears. Not only is this so, but this intention is emphasized by the specific provisions of the Maryland statutes providing for the nomination of United States Senators by the people and their election in pursuance of such nominations by the legislature. That the interpretation clause is not to receive the rigid application for which Mr. LEZ's advocates contend is apparent upon a moment's reflection. The language of this clause is that the word "election" is to include elections of officers under the laws of the State or the United States.

Specific provision is made for the election of Representatives in the Congress of the United States. Is the word "election" as here used to be construed to include elections of State officers or to include the election of any other than Representatives in Congress? Clearly not. Again, provision is made for the election specifically of the mayor of Baltimore City on the Tuesday next after the first Monday in the month of May, 1899, etc. Is the word "election" here to be construed to include the election of officers to be elected under any law of the United States or any other officer than the one specifically named? Again, clearly not. These illustrations emphasize the rule laid down by the authorities that the interpretation clause is intended only to be resorted to in cases of doubt and is not to be followed where the contrary intention is clearly apparent in the substantive legislation.

II. I find myself also unable to agree with the majority of the committee with respect to the time when Senator JACKSON's term of office will expire.

The seventeenth amendment contains the following saving clause:

"This amendment shall not be so construed as to affect the election or term of any Senator chosen before it becomes valid as part of the Constitution."

I think this provision was inserted out of abundance of caution to prevent the seventeenth amendment being so construed as to legislate any sitting Member out of office. In the case of a Member elected for a regular term its effect is to preserve to him his seat until the expiration of the term for which he was elected. In the case of such a Senator the precise day when his term ends is fixed, but it seems to me it can not be doubted that it was also intended to save the seat of a Member who had been chosen by the governor to fill a vacancy. True, in that case the term does not end upon a particular day; it ceases upon the happening of an event, or, rather, as will be shown in a moment, upon the happening of one or the other of two events.

In this view, when does Senator JACKSON's term expire? The clause was intended to allow the sitting Member to serve the term which he would have served if the seventeenth amendment had not been adopted. Senator JACKSON was appointed to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Senator Rayner, under the provisions of article 1, section 3, paragraph 2, which provides that—

"If vacancies happen by resignation or otherwise during the recess of the legislature of any State, the executive thereof may make temporary appointments until the next meeting of the legislature, which shall then fill such vacancies."

It has been several times held by the Senate, after thorough consideration, that the appointee in such case holds until the incoming legislature elects his successor or finally adjourns without an election. If this holding is not to be repudiated by the Senate it follows that the term of Senator JACKSON was until the happening of one or the other of these events, namely, the election by the ensuing legislature of his successor or the final adjournment of the legislature without an election. Under the seventeenth amendment the legislature is now precluded from electing a successor, and Senator JACKSON's term would, therefore, not expire until the adjournment of the Legislature of Maryland, which, by constitutional limitation, must occur by April 7 of this year.

It is said, however, that inasmuch as the seventeenth amendment provides for election by the people and inhibits an election by the legislature, that Senator JACKSON's term would expire when his successor was elected by the people. But to so hold does violence to the language of the saving clause. True, the seventeenth amendment provides for an election by the people, but notwithstanding this the term of Senator JACKSON is not to be affected by this or any other provision of the seventeenth amendment. It is therefore as though the saving clause had said: "The foregoing provision for an election by the people is not to be so construed as to affect the term of any Member heretofore chosen." In other words, the provision for an election by the people does not become operative so far as Senator JACKSON's seat is concerned until he has served the term which he would have served if the amendment had never been adopted.

The former decisions of the Senate as to the term of an appointee of a governor are borne out by the language of the Constitution. The executive is authorized "to make temporary appointments until the next meeting of the legislature, which shall then fill such vacancies." Obviously the phrase "until the next meeting of the legislature" qualifies the power of the governor to appoint and not the term of service of his appointee. The power of the governor to make a temporary appointment must be exercised before the next meeting of the legislature. The meeting of the legislature puts an end to his power. The Constitution in this particular recognizes two authorities having the power to choose Senators: (1) The legislature, being the primary appointing power; and (2) the governor, being the secondary appointing power.

When a vacancy happens during the recess of the legislature that primary authority is incapable of acting and continues to be incapable of acting so long as it is in recess. During that period, and that period only, the secondary appointing power, namely, the governor, may act. Having acted, the Constitution contemplates that the next incoming legislature must select his successor, because it says, speaking of the legislature, "which shall then fill such vacancies." If the vacancy be filled, the appointee's term is at an end; if not filled, the legislature has failed to carry out the mandatory provision of the Constitution, and by clear implication the temporary appointment lapses.

I concur in the foregoing views.

GEORGE SUTHERLAND.

WILLIAM P. DILLINGHAM.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. PERKINS, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 4007) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enter into contract for use by the Government of dry docks at Hunters Point, San Francisco, Cal., reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 163) thereon.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (S. 2773) to increase the limit of cost of the public building authorized to be constructed at New Orleans, La., asked to be discharged from its further consideration and that it be referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, which was agreed to.

Mr. RANSDALL, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 126) to permit citizens of the United States to be admitted to Government tuberculosis hospitals, asked to be discharged from its further consideration and that it be referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine, which was agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. STERLING (for Mr. JACKSON):

A bill (S. 4126) amending the act of Congress approved June 26, 1912, regulating the admission of pupils to the public schools of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SHERMAN:

A bill (S. 4127) granting an increase of pension to William Day; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KENYON:

A bill (S. 4128) for the relief of Abraham Judd; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 4129) granting a pension to Milton W. Hollister (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4130) granting a pension to Arabella Roberts (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 4131) granting an increase of pension to Eliza J. Sumner; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHIVELY:

A bill (S. 4132) to correct the military record of William H. Richhart; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 4133) granting an increase of pension to Willis Layton; and

A bill (S. 4134) granting an increase of pension to George W. Hayes (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURLEIGH:

A bill (S. 4135) granting an increase of pension to Henry M. Chase; to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. WEEKS. By request I introduce a joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment relating to the Federal control of insurance.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 103) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. KENYON submitted an amendment providing for the use of the money due the estates of deceased colored soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Civil War, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the District of Columbia appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

COOPERATIVE AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION WORK.

Mr. STERLING. I submit an amendment, in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by me to the bill (S. 3091) to provide for cooperative agricultural extension work between the agricultural colleges in the several States receiving the benefits of an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and of acts supplementary thereto and the United States Department of Agriculture. I ask that the amendment lie on the table and be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. JONES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 7951) to provide for cooperative agricultural extension work between the agricultural colleges in the several States receiving the benefits of an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and of acts supplementary thereto and the United States Department of Agriculture, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed.

RAILROADS IN ALASKA.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (for Mr. LA FOLLETTE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to the bill (S. 48) to authorize the President of the United States to locate, construct, and operate railways in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

THE TELEGRAPH AND TELEPHONE AS ADJUNCTS TO POSTAL SERVICE.

Mr. NORRIS. I desire to make a motion to discharge the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads from the further consideration of Senate resolution 242. I have reduced the motion to writing in the form of a resolution. I ask that it be read, and then, I believe, under the rule, it will have to lie over for one day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 250), as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads be discharged from further consideration of Senate resolution 242, directing the Postmaster General to send to the Senate certain information relative to governmental ownership and control of the telegraph and telephone facilities.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will go over one day under the rule.

LABOR CONDITIONS IN MINING DISTRICTS IN COLORADO.

Mr. THOMAS. I submit a resolution and ask to have it read and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The resolution (S. Res. 251) was read and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, as follows:

Whereas a difference between the coal miners and the operators of coal mines in Colorado, and notably in the counties of Huerfano and Las Animas in said State, culminated in a general strike in September last, which is still unsettled and which disturbed condition has resulted in violence, bloodshed, and disorder; and

Whereas the military forces of the State were mobilized in October last by the governor of the State for the protection of life and property, and have since then been in occupation and control of said counties, notwithstanding which the said strike continues with no prospect of an early termination; and

Whereas it is asserted—

(1) That a system of peonage has been established in said counties by certain of the employer companies in order to confine the operation of their mines.

(2) That the immigration laws of the United States have been and are being violated by some of said operating companies for the same reasons by bringing in laborers under contract.

(3) That many persons have been arrested, imprisoned, and subjected to arraignment, examination, and punishment without due or any process of law, and in violation of their constitutional rights as citizens of the United States.

(4) That a republican government has had no existence in fact in said counties for many years, all the officials thereof having been nominated, chosen, and maintained in their several positions by some of said operating companies, through whose agencies many foreign employees have been naturalized without regard to the requirements of the Federal statutes in relation thereto, and whose votes have been under the control of said companies.

(5) That military tribunals have been created and are in operation for commitment, trial, and conviction, notwithstanding the courts are and have at all times been open and engaged in the administration of justice.

(6) That all attempts and overtures at arbitration or a settlement of the matters in dispute between employers and employees have been rejected or have come to naught; and

Whereas an investigation of the said labor conditions with the view of ascertaining the facts and conditions hereinabove outlined, and the causes leading to said strike, and the reasons, if any, why the same has not been adjusted is imperatively demanded and is desired as well by the executive authority of the State and a large proportion of the citizens of the State as by the miners involved: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Education and Labor is hereby directed to make a full investigation of the industrial conditions existing in said counties of Las Animas and Huerfano and in such other portions of said State as are involved therein for the purpose of ascertaining whether the matters and things hereinabove set forth are true, and why the disputes and differences causing said conditions have not been adjusted, and to make such report and recommendations as in its judgment are pertinent and justified by the facts. Said committee or any subcommittee thereof is hereby empowered to sit and act during the sessions of Congress, or of either House thereof, at such time and place as it may deem necessary; to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance of witnesses and production of papers, books, and documents; to employ stenographers at a cost not exceeding \$1 per printed page; to take and make a record of all evidence taken and received by the committee and keep a record of its proceedings; to have such evidence, record, and other matter required by the committee printed. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses. Subpoena for witnesses shall be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or subcommittee thereof. Every person who, having been summoned as a witness by authority of said committee or any subcommittee thereof, wilfully makes default or who having appeared refuses to answer any questions pertinent to the investigation herein authorized, shall be held to the penalties provided by section 102 of the Revised Statutes of the United States. The expenses of such investigation shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate on vouchers ordered by said committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on Contingent Expenses.

ELECTION OF SENATORS.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that on Friday next, January 23, at the conclusion of the routine morning business, I shall ask the Senate to take up for consideration

Senate bill 2860, providing a temporary method of conducting the nomination and election of United States Senators.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Latta, executive clerk, announced that the President had, on January 20, approved and signed the following act and joint resolution:

S. 3484. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911, being chapter 231 of Thirty-sixth Statutes at Large; and

S. J. Res. 5. Joint resolution providing for the appointment of a commission to consider the need and report a plan for national aid to vocational education.

REVIEW OF DECISIONS OF HIGHEST STATE COURTS.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, according to the notice that I gave yesterday, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 94) to amend an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911. The bill was reported by me yesterday from the Judiciary Committee, and, as I stated, a similar bill has already passed the Senate once. Twice, after full consideration, it has been unanimously reported from the Committee on the Judiciary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Secretary read the bill; and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 2, line 3, after the words "have been," to insert "in favor of the validity of the treaty or statute or authority exercised under the United States or may have been," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 237 of chapter 10 of an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911, is hereby amended by adding thereto the following:

"It shall be competent for the Supreme Court to require, by certiorari or otherwise, any such case to be certified to the Supreme Court for its review and determination, with the same power and authority in the case as if it had been carried by appeal or writ of error to the Supreme Court, although the decision in such case may have been in favor of the validity of the treaty or statute or authority exercised under the United States or may have been against the validity of the State statute or authority claimed to be repugnant to the Constitution, treaties, or laws of the United States, or in favor of the title, right, privilege, or immunity claimed under the Constitution, treaty, statute, commission, or authority of the United States."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning business is closed.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask to have read a request for a unanimous-consent agreement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rule, the Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	James	Perkins	Smoot
Bacon	Johnson	Pittman	Stephenson
Bankhead	Jones	Pomerene	Sterling
Borah	Kenyon	Ransdell	Stone
Bristow	Kern	Reed	Sutherland
Bryan	Lane	Robinson	Swanson
Burleigh	Lippitt	Root	Thomas
Burton	Lodge	Saulsbury	Thompson
Chamberlain	Martin, Va.	Shafroth	Walsh
Chilton	Martine, N. J.	Sheppard	Weeks
Cummins	Nelson	Sherman	Williams
Dillingham	Norris	Shively	Works
Gallinger	Oliver	Simmons	
Hollis	Overman	Smith, Md.	

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I am requested to state that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] is absent from the Senate on account of business connected with the committee of which he is chairman.

Mr. BRYAN. I desire to state that my colleague [Mr. FLETCHER] is absent from the city and is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN].

Mr. RANDELL. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. THORNTON] is absent on account of sickness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-four Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] presents a request for a unanimous-consent agreement, which will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

It is hereby agreed, by unanimous consent, that on Monday, the 2d day of February, A. D. 1914, immediately upon the conclusion of the routine morning business, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of Senate joint resolution No. 1, the same being a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women; and that, at not later than the hour of 4 o'clock p. m., on Friday the 6th day of February, A. D. 1914, the Senate will proceed to vote upon all amendments that may then be pending, all amendments that may then be offered, and upon the said joint resolution, through the regular parliamentary stages, to its final disposition: *Provided, however*, That during the debate thereon each Senator, if he so desires, shall be entitled to speak for 10 minutes and no longer upon each amendment that may then be pending or that may then be offered to the said joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. BRYAN. I object, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There being objection—

Mr. ASHURST. I move that so soon as Calendar No. 114, being Senate bill 3491, relative to cooperative agricultural extension work, shall have been disposed of—which, if I understand the parliamentary situation, follows the present unfinished business—the Senate shall then proceed to the consideration of Senate joint resolution No. 1, being Order of Business No. 52, which has been recommended by and unanimously reported from the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I would like to ask the Senator from Arizona if it would not be very much better for him to request that the joint resolution be made a special order, rather than to make a motion of the kind which he has made, at this particular time?

Mr. ASHURST. I appreciate the question and the experience of the Senator from Utah, but I fear that if the joint resolution is made a special order, consideration for one moment only would deprive it of its position on the calendar, whereas I wish it to have such parliamentary status that it would require unanimous consent to lay it aside; in other words, I want a vote taken on the joint resolution and to have it disposed of. If making it a special order would put it in a position where it may not be laid aside except by unanimous consent, of course I would cheerfully agree to that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Arizona what is the status of the joint resolution upon the calendar?

Mr. ASHURST. This joint resolution, which proposes an amendment to the Constitution conferring the right of suffrage upon women, occupies the first place on the calendar, which, however, gives it no preference at all.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It does, in this way, that when the time comes to take up the calendar, naturally this joint resolution becomes the first matter for consideration unless a motion is made and carried or unanimous consent is obtained—one or the other—to take up something else.

Mr. ASHURST. But when the calendar is taken up for consideration under Rule VIII, one objection will carry the joint resolution over. I want to get it into a situation—

Mr. WILLIAMS. But after a certain time the Senator from Arizona can move that the Senate take up the joint resolution for consideration.

Mr. BACON. The Senator can make the motion at that time that the joint resolution be taken up, notwithstanding the objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator can move that the joint resolution be taken up after a certain time.

Mr. BACON. No; notwithstanding there is objection, the joint resolution may be taken up by a majority vote.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It comes up first on the calendar.

Mr. ASHURST. I will say to Senators that I have no pride of opinion on the subject. I do not care how or by what method we reach the consideration of the joint resolution so long as the joint resolution is voted upon.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I suggest to the Senator to let the joint resolution come up in its regular order when the calendar is being considered. The joint resolution comes up first upon the calendar. For one, I do not think that any exceptional methods ought to be pursued with regard to its consideration.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

Mr. ASHURST. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. THOMAS. I think the motion of the Senator from Arizona is appropriate and is the best method of bringing up this joint resolution for the consideration of the Senate. The calendar is frequently called when it is not expected by a great many of us that it will be reached, and as a consequence important measures may go over at a time when, if that were not the case, they could be taken up in regular order.

It is true that while this measure, because it occupies the first place on the calendar, is not entitled for that reason to any special consideration, it is also true that it is an im-

portant measure and it ought to be disposed of. If the Senate is not prepared to give its assent to the measure, let us know it and get it off the calendar. If, on the contrary, as a good many of us hope, it will command a majority vote of the Senate, then the sooner that is done the better; and if some special arrangement can be made concerning it whereby we will know when it is to come up it will be much better than to leave it in a position where it may come up at some time when some of us who desire to participate in its discussion may be absent.

I do not think that the suggestion made by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] is entirely pertinent; that is, that there is no reason why we should make this joint resolution the subject of any special consideration. The same suggestion would have been applicable, at least, to many measures, among which would be that which is now the unfinished business and upon which we will vote to-morrow. I have observed that the way in which to get the attention of the Senate to measures is to assign them by special motion to some particular time and occasion. When that is done we can transact a good deal of business, and when it is not done these matters go over from day to day on objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator will pardon me, what I said was that I did not want this resolution to be given any exceptional standing except by unanimous consent. Of course, there are motions that can be made with regard to it under the plain, parliamentary law of the Senate, and those motions, of course, would be voted upon when made. I was merely suggesting to the Senator from Arizona that he would obtain no advantage by the adoption of his motion, because, so far as taking it up is concerned, whenever the calendar is sounded it comes first, anyhow.

Mr. THOMAS. That is true.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Only unanimous consent could displace it.

Mr. THOMAS. But the calendar is not reached every day, as the Senator well knows. I do not want to insist upon any exceptional method by means of which this matter is to be brought to the attention of the Senate, nor do I understand that the motion of the Senator from Arizona is an exceptional one. On the contrary, he is following the course which I observe has been taken here whenever Senators desire to get any measure of importance before the Senate for consideration. In consequence I hope that his motion will prevail.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I was only trying to assist the Senator from Arizona—

Mr. ASHURST. I appreciate that.

Mr. SMOOT. In getting this matter before the Senate. Under the rules of the Senate I believe the Senator from Arizona can proceed in only two ways. One is to ask—

Mr. THOMAS. May I say a word?

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator will wait until I finish—

Mr. THOMAS. I was simply going to say that I have no desire to insist obstinately upon the motion made by the Senator from Arizona. I would also be very glad to yield to the superior knowledge and experience of the Senator from Utah as to the method to be pursued.

Mr. SMOOT. As I was saying, I think the Senator from Arizona has two ways to proceed in this matter. One is by asking unanimous consent, which, as I understand, he has done and it has been refused. The other way, in my opinion, for the Senator to proceed is to give notice that, at the conclusion of the consideration of the Smith-Lever bill, he will then move to take up Senate joint resolution No. 1 for consideration.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I will suggest to the Senator from Arizona, in addition to that, that if that motion prevails the joint resolution then becomes the unfinished business. I concur with Senators who have suggested to the Senator from Arizona that it would be better to give notice of a motion of that kind. Under the rules, I think we could hardly vote that we should take up at a given time a certain bill and at another given time a certain other bill. We do not know what will be before the Senate; but the Senator can give notice of a motion to take up the joint resolution, and I feel very sure that the motion will prevail, whatever the fate of the resolution itself may be.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, my first duty is to thank the Senators who have indicated what I believe to be the best way to reach the situation. Therefore I will withdraw the motion I just made, and will give notice that, immediately upon the disposition of the cooperative agricultural extension bill, to wit, Calendar No. 114, Senate bill 3091, I shall then immediately move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate joint resolution No. 1, Calendar No. 52, which motion, if carried, will make the joint resolution the unfinished business of the Senate.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator—I have not had time to examine the calendar—whether there has been any arrangement made for the disposition of the agricultural-extension bill?

Mr. ASHURST. Nothing more than that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] has given notice, which appears upon the calendar, that, immediately upon the final disposition of the Alaska railroad bill, he will move to proceed to the consideration of the agricultural-extension bill.

Mr. JONES. Of course, no one knows how long that bill will be under consideration by the Senate or whether or not it may be displaced by something else, so that it leaves the time when the Senator will make his motion, it seems to me, very uncertain. I want to suggest to the Senator—I may be mistaken, but, as I understand, in the morning hour when the ordinary routine or morning business is concluded a Senator can ask unanimous consent for the consideration of any particular measure, and if that is refused he can then make a motion, notwithstanding the objection, to proceed with its consideration, and if adopted that consideration will continue until 2 o'clock on any day unless the matter is sooner disposed of.

Mr. ASHURST. I appreciate all that the Senator from Washington says.

Mr. JONES. I thought that might be the better way to do it.

Mr. ASHURST. I am inclined to follow the suggestion made by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], although I appreciate the interest manifested and the suggestions made by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES. I just thought that possibly the Senator might give notice, for instance, that on Friday next, after the routine morning business shall have been concluded, he will ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution, and that this might get his resolution sooner before the Senate.

Mr. ASHURST. I shall give close attention to the progress of business, and at the conclusion of the agricultural-extension bill, when that bill is disposed of, I shall immediately rise and ask permission to be heard to make this motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The calendar, under Rule VIII, is in order. The first business on the calendar will be stated.

The first business on the calendar was the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women.

The Secretary read the joint resolution.

Mr. THOMAS. In the absence of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], who, I see, is not in his seat, I suggest that the joint resolution go over.

Mr. BRISTOW. Why should it go over, Mr. President? Why not pass it?

Mr. GALLINGER. Why not take the vote now?

Mr. THOMAS. I simply call attention to the fact that the Senator is not here.

Mr. BRISTOW. But what is the use of putting it over? Why not vote on it and pass it? Perhaps we can pass it and get it out of the way.

Mr. THOMAS. I understood the Senator from Arizona had announced the course he would follow with reference to it, and it might not be observed by proceeding with it now. I am ready to take it up now.

Mr. BRISTOW. I should not think the Senator would want it passed over if we can pass it now, unless he wishes to make an address on it.

Mr. ASHURST entered the Chamber.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I see the Senator from Arizona has entered the Chamber.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I was called into the marble room by a gentleman from Arizona, and upon my return I find that Senate joint resolution No. 1 has been taken up for consideration.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Why not go ahead and let some of the Senators make their speeches upon it now?

Mr. GALLINGER. Why not vote on it?

Mr. LODGE. All right; let us vote.

Mr. ASHURST. I think the measure is so important that something should be said on it. As soon as I can get my breath I propose to be heard on it.

Mr. GALLINGER. But the Senator will have only five minutes under the rule. If the Senator can get the joint resolution passed, will he not forego his speech and deliver it in Arizona at some time?

Mr. ASHURST. I shall be very glad to do so.

Mr. THOMAS. If the Senator will assure us that it will pass—

Mr. GALLINGER. Let us vote. We can not give that assurance, of course.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution is in the Senate as in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the joint resolution will be reported to the Senate.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution is in the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is, Shall the joint resolution be read a third time?

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, much as I should like to forego the delivery of what I have prepared, I am balancing in my mind whether or not it is my duty to deliver this speech.

Mr. LODGE. I suggest that the Senator deliver the speech after the joint resolution is passed.

Mr. ASHURST. If we can have a roll call, Mr. President—

Mr. GALLINGER. We will have a roll call.

Mr. LODGE. We will have a roll call right off.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I think this matter is of enough importance to justify our hearing the Senator upon it. I assume there is not a Senator here who will insist upon the five-minute rule being applied to the Senator from Arizona in the discussion of the joint resolution. The question is not one that can be laughed down by the Senate when the Senator gets up to address the Senate, and the people of this country will be heard from in reference to it.

I think, therefore, the joint resolution ought to be treated with the greatest courtesy and the greatest consideration, as it will be by the people of some of the States, even if there is a disposition on the part of some persons in the Senate to laugh the matter out of court. I think the Senator from Arizona ought to deliver his speech, and deliver it now, and let the RECORD show who objects to its further consideration.

Mr. ASHURST. I will do so.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, there has been no disposition to laugh the question out of court. There was a very natural disposition, in which the Senator from Arizona joined, to laugh at his embarrassment for a moment because the question had been precipitated upon him unexpectedly. It is not only a serious question, but it is about the most serious question with which the American people have been faced for quite a long time. Men assuredly can have permission to laugh when a fellow Senator finds himself in an embarrassing situation; and the dignity of the Senate should not forbid that momentary cheerfulness and mirthfulness in which all human beings are permitted to share.

Mr. GALLINGER. As I made an observation concerning the matter, I wish to assure my friend from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] that there was no levity on my part. I shall vote for the joint resolution when it is submitted to the Senate; but it occurred to me that as we had reached it, and there was a disposition manifested to vote on it, we might forego speech making in connection with it.

I should like to hear the Senator from Arizona, but he will not change a vote. Every Senator has made up his mind how he is going to vote on the joint resolution, and no oratory will change a single vote. So it occurred to me that if we could vote on the joint resolution immediately, and dispose of it, it would be better to do so than to postpone it and open it up to general debate.

That was my feeling; and any suggestion from me was made by a friend of the joint resolution.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I have no pride of expression but I believe the adoption of this amendment to the Constitution of the United States is one of the most important reforms we can put into effect. I do not want to imitate the bad example which was set during the trial of the seven bishops, in 1688. When the court was about to rule in favor of the defendants, one of the attorneys—I forget whether it was Finch or Pollexfen—was so anxious to make a speech that he thereby nearly lost his case by reason of other witnesses coming in during the delay.

I do not wish to occupy such an attitude as that; but since I had the honor to be chosen to report the joint resolution, and since it proposes an amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America and has to do with the political liberty of 30,000,000 people, I do think I ought at least to say something about it. It may be that I shall not change a vote. Certainly there will be no oratory on my part that will change a vote, because, even if I could, I should not attempt or essay any oratory in the delivery of this address.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

Mr. ASHURST. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. McCUMBER. Before the Senator proceeds, this being an important subject, running under the five-minute rule now, and

since we can not dispose of it in that time, I ask that the matter may go over. The Senator can take it up at another time in the proper order and discuss it. I ask that it go over.

Mr. ASHURST. Of course, if I am to be limited to five minutes, it would be useless for me to attempt the delivery of my address, because it would take an hour and a half for me to do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would be compelled, of course, to rule that, except by unanimous consent of the Senate, the Senator would be limited to five minutes.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I ask unanimous consent that the five-minute rule be not applied to the Senator from Arizona in discussing this matter this morning.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I join in that request.

Mr. McCUMBER. I object to the request unless it is applied to everyone who may address the Senate upon this subject.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I will enlarge the request to that extent.

Mr. McCUMBER. I do not think the rule ought to be suspended simply with reference to one Senator, and I do not think we ought to dispose of this matter in one day. No one expected it would come up for final disposition at this time. We ought to discuss it at length and fully. For that reason, in order that the Senator himself may not feel embarrassed in its full discussion and may not have to hurry, and in order that the Senate may have time to ponder upon the words he shall say in reference to it, I make the suggestion and object to the present consideration of the joint resolution and ask that it be passed over.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, so far as this particular joint resolution is concerned, the five-minute rule shall be suspended with regard to all Senators who choose to address themselves to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. During the morning hour?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; during the morning hour.

Mr. LODGE. That would block the whole calendar.

Mr. SMOOT. That only applies until 2 o'clock to-day, and the Senator will not be through with his speech by that time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. During this morning hour and other morning hours, as long as the joint resolution is before the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. Such a unanimous-consent agreement would block the calendar absolutely.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It would until the joint resolution is disposed of, or until some agreement is made to take it up.

Mr. LODGE. Why would it not be much better at the proper time to move to take it up? There is no objection on the part of the Senate to taking it up, as I understand.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The practical result of it would be that the Senator from Arizona could go ahead this morning and open the discussion.

Mr. LODGE. If it applies only to this morning, I have no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. That is all.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then, to-morrow morning we can take it up and do the same thing over again for somebody else, or refuse to do it, as we choose.

Mr. BRISTOW. Why does not the Senator from Arizona move to take up the bill? That will obviate the five-minute limitation.

Mr. SMOOT. He can not do that until 2 o'clock.

Mr. BRISTOW. At 2 o'clock the joint resolution would have to give way to the unfinished business; but the Senator can move to take it up, and then the five-minute rule will not apply.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is true.

Mr. BRISTOW. He could discuss it until 2 o'clock, when it would be displaced by the unfinished business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would like to know a little something about the rules. The Chair has been of the opinion that during the morning hour a Senator could not move to take up a bill if there was an objection to it—

Mr. BRISTOW. An objection would put it over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. But that after 2 o'clock a Senator could move to take up a bill.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is right.

Mr. BRISTOW. As I understand the rules, an objection on the part of any Senator will put over any bill during the morning hour, under Rule VIII.

Mr. LODGE. Oh, no.

Mr. BRISTOW. But if a motion is made to take it up and the motion prevails, it is before the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. The rule is clear, I think, if the Senator will permit me.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has no opinion at all in regard to the matter.

Mr. LODGE. I will read Rule VIII:

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

At the conclusion of the morning business for each day, unless upon motion the Senate shall at any time otherwise order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the Calendar of Bills and Resolutions and continue such consideration until 2 o'clock; and bills and resolutions that are not objected to shall be taken up in their order, and each Senator shall be entitled to speak once and for five minutes only upon any question; and the objection may be interposed at any stage of the proceedings, but upon motion the Senate may continue such consideration.

All motions made before 2 o'clock to proceed to the consideration of any matter shall be determined without debate.

The Senator has nothing to do but to make his motion, and if it is carried he can continue his remarks without limitation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the Chair make a further inquiry. If the motion is made and carried, the joint resolution becomes the unfinished business, does it not?

Mr. GALLINGER. Oh, no.

Mr. LODGE. Not in the morning hour.

Mr. GALLINGER. It falls at 2 o'clock.

Mr. LODGE. It falls at 2 o'clock.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will say that it has been ruled otherwise in this body and has displaced other unfinished business.

Mr. SMOOT. Let me call attention to section 3 of Rule VII:

Until the morning business shall have been concluded and so announced from the chair or until the hour of 1 o'clock has arrived no motion to proceed to the consideration of any bill, resolution, report of a committee or other subject upon the calendar shall be entertained by the presiding officer unless by unanimous consent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That was the view of the Chair.

Mr. LODGE. But the morning business has been concluded for some time.

Mr. SMOOT. But not until 1 o'clock.

Mr. LODGE. Oh, yes; it says "or until 1 o'clock." The morning business has been concluded. Of course it is open to the Senator to move to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution. That lasts until 2 o'clock.

Mr. ASHURST. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate joint resolution No. 1.

Mr. LIPPITT. I understand that action will allow the Senator to go on until 2 o'clock?

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes; if the motion is carried.

Mr. LIPPITT. I had intended to relieve myself of some remarks and ideas that I had upon monopoly in connection with Alaska about 2 o'clock or some time during the afternoon, and I do not want the Alaska bill displaced.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It can not be displaced.

Mr. GALLINGER. The motion is not debatable.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Arizona that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate joint resolution No. 1.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I rise to address the Senate in favor of Senate joint resolution No. 1, which was, on June 13, 1913, reported favorably from the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Observant persons will not fail to notice that marked changes in the political and social affairs in the United States are now slowly taking place. Conditions under which we have been living are changing, for society and government are dynamic, not static, in character.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS.

Only a few years since some of the most profound citizens of this Republic believed that by reason of the complicated procedure and large majorities required it was difficult, if not impossible, to amend the Constitution of the United States, and some eminent statesmen even urged that strained constructions should be placed upon the Constitution so as to change somewhat the structure of our political system, bring it into conformity with the dynamic conditions of the day, and thus secure needful reforms.

Dacey says of amending the Constitution of the United States:

The sovereign of the United States has been roused to serious action but once during the course of 90 years. It needed the thunder of the Civil War to break his repose, and it may be doubted whether anything short of impending revolution will ever again rouse him to activity. But a monarch who slumbers for years is like a monarch who does not exist.

Speaking in the Senate of the United States on the 5th day of July, 1909, Hon. H. D. Money, a scholar, orator, and statesman whose services here added glory and usefulness to this body, said:

Mr. President, I am one of those who believe that there will never be another amendment to the Constitution of the United States. * * * I do not believe this amendment—*income-tax amendment*—to the Constitution will ever be a part of it. * * *

But, contrary to the opinion which a few years since prevailed among many thinking people, within the past 10 months two amendments to the Constitution of the United States have been proclaimed, and they were adopted under the procedure which is indisputably complicated and involved. The adoption of these amendments, in addition to the valuable reforms they will bring about, has convinced the American people that our Federal Constitution is a living, breathing, dynamic force that protects persons as well as property, and that it is not a crustean bed of fixity, incapable of amendment or change.

The belief that the Constitution of the United States may be amended, and that in some particulars it ought to be amended, is not confined to any one political party. It extends to all of them, thus demonstrating that the "let-alone," noninterference, careless, laissez faire policy does not meet the demand of the present day. Indeed, one of the most needful of all reforms would be a constitutional amendment which will remove the obstacles, prolixities, and delays now incident to securing an amendment to our Federal Constitution, and unless an amendment be adopted providing for an easier method of amending the Constitution there will soon be a widespread demand for a national constitutional convention.

The "fathers" of the Constitution were not sanguine enough to suppose that the organic law which they framed was so perfect that it would never be altered. The experience of the Government under the Articles of Confederation had produced the belief that there was need of a system of amendment by which the Constitution could be made to conform to the requirements of future times.

The idea that some provision should be made in the instrument of government itself for the method of its amendment is peculiarly American. Provision for the regular and orderly amendment of an instrument of government first appears in the Pennsylvania frame of government of 1683. A similar provision reappears in the act of settlement of 1683, in the Pennsylvania frame of 1696, and in the Pennsylvania charter of privileges of 1701. Each of these documents provides that it shall not be altered, changed, or diminished "without the consent of the governor" "and six parts of seven of the assembly."

It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that it was the expectation of the members of the Federal Convention that a frequent use of the amending power would be exercised. They doubtless thought that the plan adopted would secure the desired end whenever the popular will would justify a change. But whatever may have been the view of the "fathers," it is now obvious that the methods of amendment as provided in the Constitution are so unreasonably clumsy and unwieldy that it is the duty of the statesmen of the present day to submit some plan whereby amendments may be brought about within a reasonable time and by a method less complex.

A government which assumes to be fixed and unalterable will soon become wholly unsuited to the circumstances of the nation and will have a tendency to degenerate into a despotism or will produce a revolution.

While it is quite true that marked changes in our political and social conditions are occurring, it is none the less true that these changes are taking place slowly. Indeed, it is impossible that it should be otherwise, for no wound or disease of the body politic ever healed except by slow degrees. Many honest and well-intentioned persons "view with alarm the hasty judgments of the people"; but, in truth, the judgments of the people are not hasty. The judgments of the people are extremely deliberate. The great mass of the people patiently bear present ills; they turn from old ideas, customs, forms, and ways with much reluctance, and usually with doubts and misgivings. It is almost a natural habit to try to preserve what is established. Those who "view with alarm the hasty judgments of the people" may give their perturbed spirits rest, for if any fault be found with the mass of the people, it is not because they act too hastily but because they act too slowly and with too much deliberation and conservatism. Consider, for instance, how long the American people permitted themselves to be poisoned by impure and adulterated foods; reflect with what patience the people have suffered the delays and defeats of a pure-fabric bill; think how uncomplainingly the people still pay for woollens and frequently receive shoddies, because we will not pass the pure-fabric bill; reflect how many years the people permitted Members of Congress to ride on free passes over the railroads. Consider how long the people permitted public men to publish recommendations of patent medicines and other nostrums. Consider how uncomplainingly workingmen face danger in mines, in the fields, on the railroads, and in the workshops. Consider how long the American people tolerated a protective-tariff system which robbed the many for the enrichment of the favored few. Think how cheerfully and how

regularly the poor tax themselves to support the Federal Government, the State, the county, and the city. Consider with what patience the people permitted the Armor-plate Trust to take \$77,000,000 from the Public Treasury and then furnish only \$52,000,000 worth of armor plate to the Government. When we hear a timid "statesman" expatiating on the "hasty action of the masses," let us reflect that these same masses have been trying for 22 years to get a seamen's bill enacted into law, so that human life at sea may be made safer and our seamen released from an odious, involuntary servitude which has been imposed upon them, but that even to this good hour the bill is not yet a law.

When we hear a "reactionary" stating how fearful he is of the tumultuousness of the masses and their inordinate and impatient "demand for hasty legislation," we should ask that reactionary how many years the people waited in vain for a parcel post, although everybody in the United States wanted a parcel post save and except the express companies. Consider how faithfully—and generally with what good nature—a large number of our fellow citizens toil in unsafe places or with unsafe machinery. Let us hear no more of our constitutions, institutions, and laws being overthrown by the hasty judgments of the "masses and the mobs." No people except the patient American people would have so long and so uncomplainingly suffered these abuses, looking the while with the eye of faith and optimism into a future which inevitably would correct these evils in the fullness of time. The American people seem to believe that "the foresight that waits is the same genius that creates."

A vast majority of the people are busy earning a subsistence and have not the time necessary to give to the constant agitation necessary to the promotion of these great reforms, and they must of a necessity leave to their public servants, in large measure, the duty of putting into execution these needful changes, and if we, as their chosen, honored, and well-paid officials, fail to exert ourselves to the uttermost to accomplish these reforms which the people demand, and to which they are so justly entitled, we are faithless trustees.

There is no doubt that the invention and adoption of improved means of transportation; the ready communication among the people afforded by the telephone, the telegraph, and the post office; the facilities for obtaining information and intelligence afforded by the schools, the newspapers, and the magazines have been powerful factors in the removal of many delusions, much ignorance, injustice, prejudice, and superstition that has hindered and hampered civilization in its efforts to make human life broader, more useful and beautiful; but in value, power, and utility, over, above, and beyond all these inventions and accomplishments of civilization which have rendered human existence more comfortable, stands political liberty.

Political liberty invests the citizen with an appreciation of his or her duties and responsibilities. Political liberty is not a means to an end, but is itself the end. Political liberty is valuable to a citizen, because it secures to the citizen safety of person, secures the power to assist in selecting public officials, secures the opportunity to rebuke by ballot the extravagance of public officials. It makes the individual citizen part and parcel of the sovereign—that is to say, the ruling—power. It makes the individual citizen the peer—the equal—of every other individual citizen. It stimulates and excites the individual to aspire to excellence for himself and the Government.

When the workingmen—that is to say, the men who perform physical labor—were denied the right to vote, their condition was little better than that of the slave. Indeed, it is doubtful if their economic situation was as comfortable as that of the serf. In the Colonies at the time of the Revolutionary War much, if not most, of the physical labor was performed by slaves and indentured servants. Wages of the workmen were not quite \$1 a day, and the elevation of the laborer above a mere serf has been accomplished largely by his ballot and his adherence to organization and the trade-union. One of the wisest things which organized labor has done was to cease its passive attitude toward woman suffrage and to commence an earnest, active contest in its behalf.

As late as 1834, in England, six agricultural laborers were convicted and sentenced to seven years' penal servitude for unitedly asking for an increase in wages of 1s. per week. Under the laws in force in England at that time this was treated as a conspiracy, and these men were promptly convicted and transported to Australia. They became famous in history as the "six men of Dorset." One of these, George Lovelace, wrote in his diary a vivid description of the horrors they underwent while being transported. Then arose in Eng-

land a tremendous agitation for their release, and 50,000 workmen, in a procession, marched by the official residence of the then premier, Lord Melbourne, to present a petition in behalf of the "six men of Dorset." Their release finally came in 1837, and in May of last year a monument was erected in their native village in Dorsetshire to these martyrs in the cause of political liberty.

History is largely an account of man's struggle for freedom, and from the beginning of the human race down to the present time its tendency has been toward liberty—mankind reaching out for freedom and immeasurably attaining it.

American civil liberty is the fruitage of many centuries of earnest and patriotic endeavor. The preservation of civil liberty will always depend upon the vigilance and zeal of those who love freedom, and if a people do not love liberty well enough to contend for it, if a people prefer turgid quietude to the boisterousness of liberty, they may be sure that the usurpers of power will sooner or later impose tyrannies and despotism upon them.

AMERICAN CITIZENS.

The rights attaching to an American citizen may be divided into two classes—that is to say, civil rights and political rights. On the ground of public policy minors, incompetents, and others are frequently denied political rights. The right of suffrage—that is, elective franchise or the right to vote—is a political right which, upon grounds of sound public policy and due regard for the genius of our form of government, should never be withheld from a class of citizens fairly and in good faith proved to be worthy of possessing such right.

This question as to who is an American citizen was left somewhat in doubt by the Constitution of the United States until the adoption—if, indeed, it were really adopted—of the fourteenth amendment, in 1868, when that amendment, in the first section thereof, created a distinct Federal citizenship, as follows:

ARTICLE XIV.

SECTION 1. All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside.

The right to vote is a political right, and under our American theory and practice of government restricted suffrage is the only character of suffrage which has ever existed in any of the States of our Federal Union.

Under our American system the right to vote is a political right granted by the majority to those who are deemed worthy and competent to participate in the management and functions of government. No such thing as a national voter, in the real, true, and strict sense of that term, is known to our system. The very fact that the qualifications of voters in the various States of our Federal Union are not uniform, and that a citizen may be a qualified voter in one State and yet not be a qualified voter in another State, demonstrates that the qualifications of voters are fixed and determined by the State. A great many persons—indeed, a vast number of well-informed persons—believe that the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments to the Federal Constitution made all citizens national voters, but such is not the case. Neither the fourteenth nor fifteenth amendment, nor the two amendments in pari materia, made every citizen a voter.

I have no sympathy with the fifteenth amendment to the Constitution. It is true that the amendment, as was said by the United States Supreme Court in *United States v. Reese et al.* (92 U. S., p. 214; 23 L. Ed., 563), does not confer the right of suffrage upon anyone, but simply prevents the States from giving any preference in respect to suffrage to one citizen of the United States over another citizen on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

The fifteenth amendment should not have been adopted, and, above all things, it should not have been adopted in the spirit that prompted it. The fifteenth amendment was the result of a bitter, vindictive, ungenerous, and unjust feeling that surged through the country after the Civil War. It was a part and parcel of reconstruction days, when magnanimity, generosity, moderation, restraint, and justice were practically obsolete national virtues. It was part of the wild saturnalia such as usually follows long and destructive wars, in which the base and sordid passions and vices have riotous indulgence. It was a part and parcel of carpetbag times—a part of the times when graft permeated every department of Government, and an obscene brood of harpies, in the form of ignorant negro officials, were imposed upon the white people of the Southern States.

The fifteenth amendment was not adopted to aid the negro or to ameliorate his condition, but it was adopted for the purpose of irritating, vexing, and humiliating the South by forcing corrupt government upon the southern people. But, sir, the

southern people could not be humiliated nor degraded, for they were as brave a people as ever drew a sword or wore a plume, and amidst the shock and desolation of war, when the earth beneath their feet seemed to slip and the stars above their heads to shift, they did nothing unbecoming or unworthy of their inspiring, gallant, and heroic history and lineage. Thus the fifteenth amendment remains as an angry scar upon our American system and serves as a warning to any who would attempt to legislate for an ignoble or unworthy purpose.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey in the chair). Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. ASHURST. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. The fifteenth amendment reads as follows:

The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

Does the Senator say that he takes issue with that amendment of the Constitution as to the principles enunciated?

Mr. ASHURST. I want to be courteous to the Senator. I have just stated what I thought about that amendment.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am greatly at a loss to know why the Senator, who is so earnestly and eloquently advocating the extension of the right of suffrage to a class to which it is now denied, should take issue with the fifteenth amendment, which is along the same line.

Mr. ASHURST. I appreciate the suggestion of the distinguished Senator, but nevertheless that is my firm opinion of the fifteenth amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona will proceed.

Mr. ASHURST. In order therefore that a widespread misapprehension regarding the effect of the proposed amendment may be cleared away, I will state that the ratification of this proposed amendment, if submitted to the States, will not, ipso facto, confer the right of suffrage upon anyone, for, I repeat, that the right of suffrage is not a necessary attribute of national citizenship, as was held by the Supreme Court of the United States in *The United States against Reese et al.*, above quoted. The right to vote comes from the State, but the right of citizens to be exempted from certain discriminations comes from the United States. The right to vote has not been granted nor secured by the Federal Constitution, but the right to be exempt from certain discriminations is granted and secured by the Federal Constitution; thus, this proposed amendment, if adopted, secures to females the right to exemption from being discriminated against because they are females. This amendment, if adopted, would not interfere with the "grandfather" clause in the constitution or laws of any of the States. It would not interfere with the constitution of any State which exacts of its citizens certain requirements and qualifications before they are permitted to vote, save and except that the State would not be permitted to deny to a citizen the right to vote simply, solely, and only upon the ground that that particular citizen was a female. The adoption and ratification of the proposed amendment would have precisely the same effect as if the amendment read as follows:

No State, when it enacts its laws fixing the qualifications requisite for its voters, shall refuse to permit a woman to vote for the sole and only reason that she is a woman.

Political liberty was by no means achieved either by the successful conclusion of the Revolutionary War or by the formation of our Federal Union. The Federal Constitution of 1787 provided in section 2, Article I:

The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

Thus leaving each State to prescribe the qualifications of voters in such State.

At the close of the Revolutionary War the lingering vestiges of monarchy, aristocracy, and class rule were to be observed. The historians tell of the boldness with which these vestiges of aristocracy and class rule were attacked, and further tell us that in the States which, upon the advice of the Continental Congress of 1776, took up civil government and formed constitutions in the early days of the Revolutionary War—very little of what would now be called the rule of the people was recognized. Political rights were hedged about with restrictions which would now be thought unbearable. The right to vote and to hold office was not dependent on manhood, patriotism, integrity, virtue, or learning, but on acres of land, on religious opinions, on dollars, pounds, shillings, and pence. In one State the qualification of a voter was 50 acres of land or personal property to the value of £30. In another State it was a

property tax. In still another State the voter had to be a quiet and peaceable man with a freehold of 40 shillings or personal estate worth £40. To be a voter in South Carolina the man must have believed in a future state of reward or punishment and possess a freehold of 50 acres of land. To vote in New York the man must have been seized of a freehold worth £20 York money, or pay a house rent of 40 shillings a year, have his name on the list of taxpayers, and exhibit a tax receipt. In Massachusetts the requirements were a freehold estate yielding £3 a year income or the possession of an estate worth £60. In Connecticut the qualifications were an annual income of \$7 from a freehold or real estate rated on the tax list at £134.

The right to vote, even when secured, did not carry with it the right to hold office. Thousands of men who on election days went to the polls were by the law debarred from holding even the office of sheriff, taking a seat on the bench, becoming a member of the legislature, or reaching the high place of governor of a State. No infidel, no agnostic, no atheist, no free-thinker, no Jew, no Catholic could be governor of New Jersey, New Hampshire, Connecticut, or Vermont.

Not content with restrictions such as these, the constitutions of many States went further and required that the governor should not only be rich, but pious. In one State he must have an estate of £100, and in another £500, in another £5,000, in another £10,000; in yet others he must own 250 or 500 acres of land. For a seat in either branch of the State legislature qualifications were of the same kind. The people of New Hampshire thought it necessary that each Senator should be seized in his own right of a freehold estate worth £200. Massachusetts placed her requirements still higher, and would suffer no man to become a member of the upper branch of her general court who did not have a freehold of £300 or personal property of £600. For the lower branch the sum was one-third as great. A man who aspired to a seat in the Council of New Jersey or to the Senate of Delaware must have owned £1,000 of real or personal estate; in Delaware, 200 acres of land. Senators in North Carolina were required to own 300 acres; representatives in South Carolina must have owned 500 acres and 10 negroes; and in Georgia, 250 acres.

When the Constitution of the United States was written no forward step was taken on this particular subject, for no man could vote for a Member of the National House of Representatives who could not vote for members of the most numerous branch of his State legislature, and thus the various restrictions imposed on suffrage by the constitutions of many of the States were reimposed by the Constitution of the United States. The spirit of democracy, of civil and political liberty, however, was strong. During the 10 years which followed the inauguration of George Washington 8 State constitutions were made or amended, and by almost every one political liberty was greatly extended.

Pennsylvania abolished her religious test and left the ballot in the hands of every tax-paying male. South Carolina opened the polls to Catholics and Jews. New Hampshire abolished forever the religious qualifications once required of her governors and legislators, took off the tax, and gave suffrage to every male inhabitant 21 years old.

Delaware enfranchised every free man who had resided two years in the State and had paid his taxes, and no longer asked him if he believed in the existence of the Trinity and in the divine inspiration of the Testaments. Kentucky and Vermont went further, and by the constitutions of these States manhood suffrage—that is, qualities of head and heart—were for the first time in our history made a part of the political system of the United States.

Thus it was that between the day when Washington was inaugurated President and the closing of the eighteenth century many of the old limitations on the civil and political rights of man were effaced from the law of the land. In general, it may be said that the property qualification was greatly reduced and that the democratic principle of suffrage, based on patriotism and integrity, was fast spreading.

CONTEST FOR FREE PRESS JUST AS STRENUOUS AS CONTEST FOR A FREE BALLOT.

The privileges which the English-speaking people hold to be of inestimable value—to wit, suffrage based upon patriotism and integrity instead of upon property, a free press, and freedom of religion—have not been easily acquired or easily maintained. The contest for a free and untrammelled press has been just as keen and intense as the contest for a free ballot.

In England, until the expiration of the licensing act, May 3, 1695, it was by no means certain that the publication of a newspaper was not illegal. The Court of Star Chamber delivered an opinion that it was unlawful to publish without license, and, indeed, near the close of the reign of Charles II

the judges pronounced that it was a misdemeanor at common law to publish any news of a political nature without the express approval of the licensors of the King. Even John Milton's *Paradise Lost* narrowly escaped severe mutilation, and with difficulty obtained "leave to print" from the King's licensors.

A fair sample of the unfriendly attitude of the aristocratic classes toward the newspapers at this time is well disclosed by Sir Roger L'Estrange, who, in May, 1680, in first exercising his authority as licensor and censor of the press, and in explaining the attitude of the privileged and ruling classes, amongst other things, said:

A newspaper makes the multitude too familiar with the actions and councils of their superiors and gives them (the multitude) not only an itch, but a kind of colorable right and license to be meddling with the Government.

Article I of the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States was a rampart reared for the protection of the American people against those persons who believed that republican governments were dangerous delusions, and for the security of the people against legislative, executive, and judicial usurpations, just as the Bill of Rights and the Great Charter were reared by the English people for their own protection against the encroachments of the royal prerogative.

Even the Congress of the United States once passed a law—act of July 14, 1798—which declared it to be a crime to publish any false, scandalous article concerning Congress or the President, and making it unlawful to stir up sedition against the United States. The manifest purpose of this sedition law was to shield the Federal Government from damaging criticism and, among other things, to assist in the reelection of John Adams as President by preventing any criticism of his administration. The sedition law was of a transient nature, limited to short duration and expired by effluxion of time on March 4, 1801.

The constitutionality of the sedition law was vigorously assailed with great ability and earnestness, and was defended with equal vigor. This sedition law was impugned as being directly opposed to the letter and spirit of the Constitution of the United States and as wholly inconsistent with the rights of citizens and the liberty of the press. It never came before the United States Supreme Court, but Mr. Vice President John C. Calhoun, writing in August, 1832, said that from the date of the formation of the Constitution in 1787 down to 1832 only one question of a political character had been settled in the public opinion, and that that question was the unconstitutionality of the sedition law.

In some attempts to vindicate the sedition law of July 14, 1798, it was contended that the freedom of the press guaranteed by the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States was only such freedom as was guaranteed to the press by the common law of England, and that under and by the terms of this amendment to the Constitution Congress was simply prohibited from abridging the "common-law freedom" of the press. A mere statement of this contention will at once disclose to our view its extreme danger and harmfulness, for had such a construction been adopted it would have guaranteed only a very narrow, restricted, or, rather, no freedom of the press, for, as above pointed out, the judges in England, at the close of the reign of Charles II had pronounced it a misdemeanor to publish any news of a political nature without the authority of the duly appointed licensors.

It is difficult to estimate the number of prosecutions conducted under this sedition law, but sufficient it is to observe that each prosecution still further served to swell the tide of indignation against it and its authors, and the heat of popular resentment against the sedition law was undoubtedly one of the features of the campaign which promoted the triumph of Thomas Jefferson and the defeat of John Adams in 1800.

Of course it will be remembered that "liberty of the press" does not mean that anyone is thereby licensed to print false scandals of other persons, but it simply means that all persons have the right to speak and print their opinions upon any subject whatever, without any prior restraint or on any subsequent penalty for publishing, so long as they do not injure another in his or her person, reputation, or property, and do not attempt forcibly to subvert the Government.

We must not forget that in many of the governments of antiquity liberty degenerated into license, and that with many of the ancient rulers the word "liberty" became an excuse or pretext for measures which transformed liberty into license and destroyed the very things which made liberty valuable. Indeed, the history of the world furnishes us with many painful and shocking examples of men who have spoken rapturously and sometimes with flaming eloquence of liberty and patriotism but who simply used such speeches as a disguise or mask to

conceal the fact that they were subverting true liberty and plundering the public revenues.

We in this age who are not restrained to establish and publish a newspaper or print our sentiments therein and who march in a phalanx on election day to the polling places, there to exercise our great American prerogative, seem to think that these rights were born with us, are inherent in us, and seemingly it never occurs to us that our patriotic ancestors gave up their liberty, shed their blood, and sacrificed their lives in order that we might enjoy these privileges which we of to-day accept as a matter of course and sometimes perform grudgingly; but these rights, nevertheless, mean very much to a people who value true freedom. American citizenship is an inheritance which has been achieved and maintained only by virtue of stupendous sacrifices that have been made by those who have gone before to secure for us this inestimably valuable boon.

Under a government where citizens enjoy freedom of speech, freedom of religion, and a free ballot extended to all competent persons the people will probably have equity and justice and will enjoy equal opportunity. Under a government where justice and equity prevail, where freedom of speech, freedom of religion, and the ballot are extended to all who are worthy will also be found true success and happiness. It is such a State that children should be taught to revere. It is such a State whose history men and women will read and treasure. It is the example set by such a State that other States will seek to emulate. It is the State which guarantees liberty of opinion, freedom of speech, freedom of religion, justice, equity, and equality of opportunity for which men will fight, but when the State fails to preserve equity, justice, equal opportunity, freedom of opinion, freedom of speech, and freedom of religion patriotism will not be robust. The physical, mental, and moral condition of the people making up a State have very much to do with determining the good fortune and prosperity of that State.

If a people do not have equality of opportunity, if they do not enjoy justice and equity, if those who perform physical labor are obliged to work so continuously to earn a mere subsistence that they have no time remaining for rest, relaxation, or repose, no time remaining to devote to music, philosophy, poetry, or history, no time remaining to devote to the family, there can not be in the true and real sense any prosperity in the State.

Markets, trade, and material prosperity, of course, mean much to the glory of a nation, but they do not mean so much as do equity, justice, equal opportunity, a free ballot, and a fair count. The citizen who possesses the right to vote holds in his or her hand the attribute of sovereignty; that is, the right and power to be and remain one of the rulers.

The American people have already surmounted incredible difficulties and accomplished stupendous achievements, and in order to obtain a clear view of what will be accomplished in the future by this marvelous American people we should for a moment here review the Nation's progress during the 125 years that have run through eternity's glass since George Washington was inaugurated as the first President.

Commencing with the inauguration of President Washington, April 30, 1789, and extending down to this good hour, a great Nation was, and still immeasurably is, in the making; fundamental principles of government of infinite importance to the human race are being applied and tested; new ideas are constantly taking hold, new truths constantly being discovered; reforms have been made in manners, customs, institutions, and laws; time-honored usages and a ruling aristocratic class have been swept aside; a population has pushed its way westward, founded towns, cities, and States, built roads, bridged rivers, joined great lakes by waterways and canals, built factories, mined for metals, and dealt on a gigantic scale and in a new manner with the economical and financial problems in a vast country where nature has poured forth her treasures and resources with such generosity and extravagance that imagination's most remote excursion does not measure them. Never before has any other people presented to the world a more interesting spectacle.

During all this progress the larklike voices of millions of Americans have been heard singing in Freedom's morn, for through the veins of the American people there flows that ethereal fluid, the ichor—the red blood which animated Rienzi, Winkelried, and those who gave us the story of William Tell—the spirit of liberty. Amidst all their vicissitudes the American people have been preserved by the God of eternities, who holds safely in the hollow of His hand the destiny of nations as easily as He would grains of sand.

It must not for one moment be imagined that we have reached the zenith in improvement in our laws, institutions, or national progress. There are myriads of secrets still locked within the bosom of the hills and mountains. Undiscovered secrets are lurking in the air above us and in the earth beneath our feet. Raging rivers which now pour their destructive and seemingly uncontrollable flood to the seas will yet be harnessed and made to do man's imperial will.

Human life could be prolonged an average to our entire population of 14 years in the United States if the people were properly informed in self-preservation, as was demonstrated in the report on national vitality.

The annual death loss in the United States is approximately seven to the thousand in excess of what it should be under improved conditions, making an unnecessary loss of life in 90,000,000 of people of approximately 630,000 men, women, and children annually, whose lives ought to be saved. This annual loss, upon any reasonable basis, may easily be estimated at the commercial value of two thousand millions of dollars annually.

Nearly as great a loss is due to the loss of efficiency and the loss of productive power of nearly 3,000,000 persons who are sick, on an average, during the year and who must be cared for during such preventable illness.

During the Spanish War, in four camps—Chickamauga, Alger, Meade, and Jacksonville—there were over 19,000 cases of typhoid fever, with a loss of 1,460 of the finest young men in America, nearly all of which was preventable.

The preventable deaths in the United States were caused by polluted water, impure and adulterated foods and drugs, foul air, bad ventilation, ignorance of the health laws, of hygiene, of exercise, of foods, and of self-care, and to epidemics and various preventable diseases, such as tuberculosis, typhoid and malarial fevers.

A splendid illustration of what can be done is shown in the control of yellow fever in Cuba. In 1896 yellow-fever deaths in Habana, Cuba, amounted to 639 to each 100,000, but after the American occupation and the great discovery of James Carroll, Lazier, Walter Reed, and Agrimonte the death rates fell in 1900 to 124; in 1901, to 6; in 1902, in 1903, and in 1904, to none.

Except for this discovery it would have been impossible for the United States to have built the Panama Canal, and on the Panama Canal the death rate, even in that tropical country, is not much more than one-half what it is in the United States." See report on Senate bill No. 1, Sixty-second Congress, second session.

One hundred and twenty-five years ago the person who would have suggested the possibility of the locomotive, the telephone, the telegraph, gas jet, or electric light would have been regarded as a lunatic.

Reviewing, therefore, the enormous progress this Nation has made, and considering the spirit which animates our people, it would be just as sensible to attempt to draw out leviathan with an hook as to attempt to stop or stay our progress; as well attempt "to bind the sweet influence of the Pleiades, loose the bonds of Orion, bring forth Mazzaroth out of his season, or guide Arcturus and his shining sons" as to try to circumscribe or set a limit to the destiny of the American people.

It is nearly 400 years since the celebrated chancellor, Sir Thomas More, gave to the world that curious philosophical work under the title of "Utopia," in which he described an imaginary country and people and added a new word to the English language. Nearly every proposed plan for the improvement of government and society since More's time has been called Utopian. While experience has probably proved that many of More's suggestions were indeed Utopian because they were incompatible with some of the inherent and congenital qualities of human nature, it is also quite true that many of his suggestions are to-day recognized by people of humanitarian impulse as principles which make for the strength, happiness, and progress of a state. For instance, he wrote:

If you suffer people to be illy educated and their manners to be corrupted from their infancy, and then punish them for those crimes to which their first education disposed them, what else is to be concluded from this but that you first make thieves and then punish them?

He also wrote:

And can it be thought that those who heap up an useless mass of wealth not for any use that it is to bring to them, but merely to please themselves with the contemplation of it, enjoy any true pleasure in it? The delight they find is only a false shadow of joy.

Mr. President, a contest to be met in the future, indeed, one of the greatest constructive works remaining to be accomplished is the abolition of poverty. This will not be done by force or violence, but by that progressive and forward-moving spirit which has always animated the American people. It will be accomplished by statesmen who realize that "bad straw makes

bad brick," and that the way to treat governmental, economical, and political problems is to analyze them and test them just as a chemist in the laboratory tests his problems.

I realize, of course, that there are many profound thinkers who believe that poverty is a thing inseparable from mortal life and human destiny; that it is an insolvable problem; and that the abolition of poverty is Utopian or phantasmagorical, but just so surely as at midnight there is busy a centrifugal force which in due time will whirl the world into the gladsome presence of the morning, just that surely in the fullness of time will poverty be abolished. Sweatshops, crowded slums, and starving children will some day be only a horrid memory. The extension of the ballot to women will be a helpful influence in assisting to solve this great problem of the future.

Antoine Frederick Ozanam, writing in 1840, referred to "the duty to bring solace to the suffering classes and seek the abolition of poverty."

Ozanam pointed out that the worker, whether physical, intellectual, or moral, had a natural right to a wage which, in addition to providing for proper support for the worker and the support and education of his family, would also provide that the worker might retire in old age and enjoy the fruits of his toil. He further points out that if the worker receives any less than these things he has practically sold his life.

Our countrymen, however, are a trifle impatient with those public men who so continuously direct attention to abuses and evils, but who omit to suggest a remedy. Therefore I shall suggest one of many remedies that might be applied; and I have not the slightest doubt that the application of the one I propose would reduce poverty to a degree where it would cease to be a national evil.

At the present time we are expending, in round numbers, about \$500,000,000 annually to pay the expenses of wars of the past and in preparing for wars we pretend to think may come in the future. Let us appropriate two-fifths of this sum each year, or \$200,000,000 annually, for a "home reserve fund," to be expended as follows:

Let the United States Government annually acquire, by purchase, if necessary, 50,000 small farms throughout the various States as may be most suitable and practicable, build commodious dwelling houses thereon, and each year place 50,000 citizens, without any expense or cost to such citizens, into actual possession of these farms, carefully providing that these "home-reserve farm lands" shall not be alienated, hypothecated in any way, or transferred under any pretext by the citizen inducted therein. It would be necessary carefully to provide that the citizen installed into such tract of land and home could not be divested thereof under any pretext or pretense whatever, but would hold the same for his or her lifetime, and upon his or her death the same would revert to the Government home-reserve lands, again to be utilized for like home-reserve purposes.

It should clearly be set down that the investiture of a citizen with such allotment of land would not preclude his or her acquiring any other lands by purchase, gift, devise, descent, or in any other legitimate way, but that whenever the needs and requirements of the Government made it necessary to acquire more lands for home-reserve purposes and no public lands were available all lands in excess of 5,000 acres belonging to any one person or corporation might be condemned under the law of eminent domain and such excess land applied to home-reserve purposes, after condemnation proceedings in a court of competent jurisdiction and upon just compensation being paid by the Government to the owner thereof for taking from such person or corporation the lands owned by him or it in excess of 5,000 acres.

The home-reserve plan would not, of course, be made compulsory upon any citizen, but optional only, and should provide that such land must be cultivated in good faith.

These tracts of land, with decent dwelling houses, could be provided at an average cost to the Government of about \$4,000 per farm.

Along with this plan, as a direct concomitant thereto and in connection therewith, should go the building of good roads, so that the isolation of rural life would be lessened and the produce of the farm taken to market easily.

This plan would afford industrious and worthy citizens of the United States an opportunity to engage in small farming and other ways of independent living—would afford them an opportunity to get from under the landlordism of another—an opportunity to get back to the soil.

Thus, within a generation, millions of people who previously had been poverty stricken would be, if not on the road to wealth, at least removed from the terror of the ever-present rent gatherer—would feel that no matter how fiercely the

inclement winds of winter raged they would at least have a place whence they could not be driven and where by careful, honest, and industrious lives they could make the land furnish forth their daily fare. In this manner the unwise and unhealthy congestion of population in our great cities would soon be absorbed.

Population in the United States has overtaken production of foodstuffs. Ten per cent of our population is without food; we have built up cities at the expense of rural life, and must now turn our attention toward making agriculture a preferred vocation.

The building up and maintaining the fertility of the soil is a vast problem, and upon its correct solution depends the future of America. It is a problem of enormous magnitude.

Only 12 per cent of the arable land of our Nation is yielding anywhere near the maximum return, and less than 40 per cent of our arable land is cultivated at all. Thus, along with the home-reserve farm plan should come the problem of systematic attention to inducing the people scientifically to cultivate the soil under the instructions of trained farm demonstrators or county agents, who would teach each farmer how to apply the best methods, how to breed and care for live stock, how to increase his yield, and how not to exploit his soil, but how to enrich and preserve it.

Thus the people, if given this opportunity and encouragement, would annually turn millions of tons of plant food and live stock into the market. This plan would take from the cities broken, discouraged, and heartsick men and women and convert them into dignified, honest, industrious, and happy citizens.

This plan would promote law and order. It would increase patriotism and loyalty to country. The Government which affords a place in which the citizen may, within his little domain, be supreme, the country which affords a place in which the citizen may command even a king not to enter unbidden, is the country for which men will face shotted guns and will resolutely fight.

This plan may be opposed by some persons as "socialistic," "maternalistic," or "paternalistic," but no matter by what epigram you choose to stigmatize it, how Utopian you may deem it, how impracticable or visionary it may appear at first glance, it nevertheless will bear the closest investigation, and you will observe at once its simplicity. A truth is usually simple and without involvements or complexities. The proposed remedy is infinitely better than the present brutal and degrading system which forever precludes a large majority of our citizens from getting from under the landlordism of others.

The plan is constitutional and will run the gantlet of the most unfriendly court. In addition to its being constitutional, it is that which is also important, it is "institutional." It would not be "confiscation," it would simply be "restoration."

Between the 28th day of September, 1850, and June 30, 1909, public lands aggregating 159,125,734 acres of the property belonging to the people were by Congress directly and indirectly granted to various railroad companies, and of the vast amount of land thus granted the patents have issued for 115,473,986 acres thereof. These lands were granted to the railroad companies without the corporations paying to the Government so much as a penny or a sprig of peppercorn therefor; and it has been calculated that these lands are to-day worth at least \$600,000,000. To those, therefore, who shake their heads, who wash their hands with imperceptible soap in invisible water, and reject this proposed plan. I say it is equally as moral, righteous, and constitutional to build a home for the worthy, deserving citizen and to assist him and give him an opportunity to make his life worth the living as it was to give away these 159,125,734 acres of land to the railroad companies, and it must not be forgotten that along with these grants of the public lands which went to the railroad companies it was enacted and nominated in the bond in some of the grants that the railroad companies should not pay any taxes on their roadbed, superstructure, or rolling stock.

It should not so much be the duty of Government and business to extend charity as to dispense justice, and we would better learn now than later that in the end, as a Nation, it does not cost one-fifth the sum of money to keep people out of the jails and hospitals that it does to maintain them therein. So, I repeat, the extension of the ballot to women will increase the number of voters who desire to bring about the reduction of poverty.

The first prominent man in the United States to declare for woman suffrage was he who went from the ground floor of a log cabin to the highest eminence of human distinction—Abraham Lincoln. In 1836 he published in the Sangamon County Journal a letter to his constituents, stating that he was

in favor of granting the ballot to all citizens possessed of certain qualifications, "by no means excluding females."

The equal-suffrage movement in the United States, however, owes, if not its origin, at least its earliest and ablest discussion, to the sisters Grimké. Sarah and Angelina Grimké were both born in Charleston, S. C.; Sarah in November, 1792, and Angelina in February, 1805.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a suggestion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. ASHURST. Certainly.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Will not the granting of the right of franchise to women open up to them many occupations in which women have not now the opportunity of obtaining labor, thereby increasing the demand for their labor, and consequently increasing the compensation which will be paid women?

Mr. ASHURST. That is very true, and I thank the Senator for that valuable suggestion.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Is the Senator going to cover that subject in his remarks?

Mr. ASHURST. I think the very terse statement of the Senator from Colorado covers it better than I could myself, and I thank him.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I should like to hear the Senator from Arizona on that subject, for his speech is very interesting to me.

Mr. ASHURST. Of course, I am delighted to have the attention of the Senator.

To resume; they were the daughters of Hon. John Grimké, a colonel in the Revolutionary War and later a judge of the Supreme Court of South Carolina.

A Representative in Congress declared from his seat that women had no right to send up petitions to Congress, whereupon Angelina Grimké fully and eloquently answered him. Her reply convinced thousands of the correctness of her views and was in part as follows:

Every citizen should feel an intense interest in the political concerns of the country, because the honor, happiness, and well-being of every class are bound up in its politics, government, and laws. Are we aliens because we are women? Are we bereft of citizenship because we are the mothers, wives, and daughters of a mighty people? Have women no country, no interests staked on the public weal, no partnership in a nation's guilt and shame? Has woman no home nor household altars, nor endearing ties of kindred, nor sway with man, nor power at the mercy seat, nor voice to cheer, nor hand to raise the drooping or to bind the broken? The Lord has raised up men, whom he has endowed with "wisdom, understanding, and knowledge," to lay deep and broad the foundation of the temple of liberty. This is a great moral work in which they are engaged. No war trumpet summons to the field of battle, but Wisdom crieth without, "Whosoever is of a willing heart, let him bring an offering." Shall woman refuse her response to this call? Was she created to be a helpmeet for man—his sorrows to divide, his joys to share, and all his toils to lighten by her willing aid, and shall she refuse to aid him with her prayers, her labors and her counsels, too, at such a time, in such a cause as this?

But, Mr. President, it is sometimes argued that when women vote men will no longer be chivalrous toward them. Sir, the language of eulogy has been exhausted over that work of Miguel de Cervantes, Don Quixote, which for 300 years has delighted mankind. Cervantes, by his book, is said to have overthrown chivalry; but whether or not that be true, whether or not it be true that the age of chivalry has gone, of one thing I am certain, and that is the age of justice is at last here.

It is, or at least ought to be, an axiom of American liberty that a class of persons obedient to the laws as are the women; a class of persons which has a peculiar care for the rights of others; a class which is taxed upon its labor and property for the support of the Government, which is liable to punishment for acts which the law makes criminal; which is patriotic, learned, and in a large measure capable of the highest degree of efficiency in the useful arts and sciences; which is patient beyond estimate and constantly pouring forth costly sacrifices for the common good of the species, should not be denied a voice in the enactment and enforcement of the laws and concerns of the Government.

"Government is simply a tool in the hands of the people for the fashioning of that people's civilization." Government is strong or weak, capable or deficient, according to the people who control and make up that government. In this Republic the "people" constitute the Government. They are its creators and its maintenance; they are the Government. That the granting of the elective franchise to women would add to the strength, efficiency, justice, and fairness of government I have not the slightest doubt, and this is especially true in the United States, where all power is reposed in the people with universal suffrage as the primal basis of its exercise. "The people" includes women who can not be denied those political privileges and responsibilities without doing violence to the fundamental principles of our Government.

It is anomalous and archaic in a free Republic, professedly made up of, controlled by, and administered for all the people, to deny to one-half of its citizens the right of exercising a valuable function of citizenship, to wit, the elective franchise, and thus preclude that one-half from the right and power to say what law or polity shall be its rule of conduct. And this anomaly becomes odious and abhorrent when we reflect that the particular one-half of citizenship thus excluded is the identical one-half from which springs so much wisdom, courage, cheer, hope, and good counsel. In this Republic we are in constant warfare against fraud and violence, avarice and cupidity, and in behalf of liberty and justice whose success will be accelerated by extending the franchise to women, in whom the materialistic is generally submerged for the idealistic; a class of voters which looks to all laws and movements as to how such laws and movements will affect her children; how such laws and conditions will promote morals, human health, and human progress, more specifically than as to how this or that particular law or polity will develop or serve material or property interests. In other words, as has been said, "Man looks after the affairs of life, but woman looks after life itself."

Woman's sphere, her ideals and her duties, make her the incapable and essential conservator of human life, charged as she is with the duty of conserving the human race; and it is in harmony with political and natural justice to accord to her the right to say what laws shall assist her in bringing about the betterment of her economic conditions.

There are some persons who believe that when women vote all human problems will easily and expeditiously be solved; indeed, there are some persons who imagine that woman suffrage is the panacea for all ills—that it will teach us how to find the pot of gold at the rainbow's end and will teach us how to eat our cake and keep it. Such persons, of course, are doomed to severe disappointment. Woman suffrage will not of itself bring Nirvana; it is not the magical alembic which will transmute the baser metals into gold, but woman suffrage will, as the years glide by, bring a gradual, general change in our social and economic conditions, and more and more will be observed a truer justice, a spirituality, a morality, and an idealism running through our laws.

Amongst the many reforms that woman suffrage will probably assist in bringing about are the following:

A strict attention to the laws concerning sanitary regulations, food supply, educational, and moral conditions.

Scientific conservation of the public health.

Laws providing for good roads, so that the transportation of crops and all plant foods may be easier and cheaper. The road builder is a valuable person, as good roads are the bands which will hold in unity, amity, and friendship the people of our Nation.

Laws which will make for a system which will see to it that the workers who create wealth and prosperity shall have an equitable share of that wealth and prosperity which they create.

Laws which will make for a system allowing those whose labor creates wealth ample time for relaxation, for pleasure, and reading, so that life shall no longer mean to the worker a ceaseless toil for a subsistence, but will mean happiness, improvement, health, good cheer, and an opportunity to enjoy some of the blessings of the prosperity which he deforms himself to create.

Laws requiring employers to provide reasonably safe places in which to work and reasonably safe machinery with which to work.

With woman suffrage a public office will truly become in spirit and in letter a public trust. When women vote no longer will public office be viewed as booty or plunder that has been captured from a defeated enemy, but will be viewed simply as an honorable opportunity to serve the common good of all the people.

When women vote we shall have wholesome prison reform. Until recently we assumed, to say the least, an ungenerous, if not inhuman, attitude of remorseless revenge toward a man who walked away from the prison gate. Very often the "ex-convict" was kicked out of every place he attempted to make his abode, and was met on all sides by averted glance and civil leer. An "ex-convict" who succeeded in concealing his identity and in making a good citizen out of himself in a community where his past was unknown was immediately ostracized and annihilated if found out.

The prison has been defined to be the connecting link between civilization and savagery. The system of brutally maltreating prisoners has never produced any good whatever, but it has increased crime, poverty, and sorrow. Brutality never reforms the offender.

We have been very slow to learn that it is our duty to reform and reclaim, save and rehabilitate, instead of ruin people convicted of crime. What possible good can come to the State by beating, starving, brutalizing, torturing, and degrading persons convicted of crime I have never been able to discover.

Some years ago a very eminent man advanced the theory that "the criminal is born, not made." This same man published a large number of sweeping assertions referring to the criminal as "of a race apart"; but these assertions have been upset and exploded by scientific researches, and the students of criminology to-day lay the responsibility for a large proportion of criminality at the door of society.

Should a philosopher desire to study human nature experimentally he could do so very well at a prison, for undoubtedly nine-tenths of the prisoners are there by occasion—that is to say, their lapse or crime is due mainly to bad social conditions.

Twenty years hence, when the muse of history shall come to write of the magnitude of the social revolution and of the changing of the old order which is occurring in our Nation now, but which we do not see because it is so near us, it will then be pointed out that woman suffrage was made a part of our American system because for centuries governments had been going to war without asking the consent of the women that furnished the sons, who after the carnage of battle, are heaped into a trench in "one red burial blent."

The waste of all governments through war is world-wide. Through war and its related agencies the taxes of the world are about double what they were in 1896.

Through militarism the world is living beyond its means and is borrowing the means of the coming generations.

Since the formation of our Federal Union, in 1787, for each dollar that as a Nation we have paid out for promoting the arts of peace, the development of agriculture and the mechanical sciences, for the facilitation of internal trade and intercourse, and for the diffusion of knowledge, we have paid out \$700 for the purpose of military aggression or defense.

On February 12, 1849, the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives submitted a report indorsing the views of the Secretary of the Treasury, together with a bill creating a new department of the Government to be known as the Department of the Interior, and in support of the bill the report, among other things, stated as follows:

The general fact remains unaffected that war and preparations for war have been regarded as the chief duty and end of this Government, while the arts of peace and production whereby nations are subsisted, civilization advanced, and happiness secured have been esteemed unworthy the attention or foreign to the objects of this Government. It seems to us that this should not always continue, but that we should, as a wise people, reorganize the Government so far as to fulfill these duties also, which are suggested by the nature, aspirations, and wants of our race as physical, moral, and intellectual beings; that it should do something toward protecting the people against those internal enemies—ignorance, destitution, and vice—as well as against those foreign foes who may invade or who it is apprehended may assail us.

The pen of the future historian will point out that the women of the world became weary of passing through the valley of the shadow of death, bearing sons as a bloody sacrifice to the Moloch of war. If their sons are to be thus sacrificed, they demand that they shall have a voice as to when war shall be declared.

"But," say some persons with fertile and winged imagination, "women do not go to war, hence they should have no voice in determining the matter." The conclusion is not well founded, for female courage, female patriotism, and female influence are a "war power," or, rather, are just as much sinews of war at times as are ball cartridges. I reply that women do the work of the Red Cross and the hospital, and frequently the heavier and more important work which the men leave behind them. Their patriotism is just as virile, their devotion to country just as unswerving, as that of the men. History records many instances of the bravery, daring, dauntless courage, and prowess of women on the battlefield.

Let no man believe that when women vote the Nation will be any the less quick to avenge a wrong, or that the American people will fail at any proper time to unsheathe their swords in defense of Liberty's altars.

But, sir, while I have enumerated certain laws which will probably be enacted in the future under the influence of woman suffrage, I am not so simple-minded as to suppose that all reforms can really be accomplished by statute laws. Reforms, humanitarian impulses, morality, equity, and justice, even happiness itself, come from within us, not from without. You can not make people wise, virtuous, or just by legislative enactment. You can not legislate discernment into a fool. No law, however beneficent, can give wisdom to the simpleton, frugality to the spendthrift, virtue to the debauchee, nor liberality to the miser. The patient must minister to himself. A man may be a well-

lubricated intellectual machine, but if his springs of justice and equity are dried up, if his patriotism and ideality lie dead or dormant, he is really of little value to his country.

Until we realize that education, correct examples, fair play, the cultivation of ideals, and a spirit of brotherhood are more important than legislation, we shall continue to suffer abuses in spite of the most beneficent statute laws.

The argument has frequently been made that in the early days of the Government woman did not need the ballot for her protection, and that, therefore, she does not need the ballot now. Putting aside the question as to whether women needed the ballot in the early or formative period of our American system as academic only, we must view the question as it presents itself to us in the light of the facts, conditions, and circumstances of this present day.

In the early days, or formative period, of our Government the situation regarding both men and women was vastly different from what it is to-day, for before steam and electricity were harnessed, before the factories were built, all or nearly all of the clothing and other necessities of life were manufactured in the home by a system of cottage industry, and each home was a private factory. The woman was largely the spinner and the weaver; she prepared the food and made the clothing for her own household; and even the food supplies offered for sale in the cities and villages were prepared by cottage industry. The household was the center of production, and most of the supplies were manufactured or prepared by rudimentary hand processes. Home life and industrial life were one and the same, and women were not obliged to cope with the industrial problems that present themselves to-day. With the advent, however, of steam and electricity, the construction of factories, and the enormous industrial and economic development, beginning about the year 1830, the cottage industry declined. With the advent of many ingenious contrivances and machines to which steam and electricity were applied household industry vanished. The women have gone into the factory, and now we have in the United States over 7,000,000 of women wage earners and 2,000,000 of children wage earners. The woman is now required to study wages, dividends, tariffs, organizations of labor, transportation, the safety of machines, and factory sanitation. Therefore it will be seen at a glance, since the system of cottage industry has been abandoned and woman has been taken from her spinning wheel and wool carding at home to the factory, there to work with hundreds of others, under the eye, perhaps, of an employer whose sole desire is to wring from her labor the largest amount of profit she is capable of producing for him, that the necessity of the ballot in order that the women may have a voice in the shaping of proper laws for their protection is apparent.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. ASHURST. Certainly.
Mr. SHAFROTH. If the Senator will yield, I wish to say right here that the influence of women upon the laws of the State of Colorado, especially with relation to the rights of property and the treatment of children, has been such as to place the people of that State, according to the opinion of the Interparliamentary Union which met in London three years ago, in the position of having the very best laws with relation to child treatment and child labor of any people in the entire world.

Mr. ASHURST. In my researches in the preparation of this paper I was especially attracted to the fact to which the Senator from Colorado has so properly adverted. I thank him for the suggestion.

The housewife to-day does not weave or spin, as she did during the days of cottage industry, but must purchase clothing for those under her care. She pays for woolens, but usually gets a fabric that is half cotton, because we have been remiss in our duty respecting the passage of a pure-fabric law. I opine that if the women could vote they would soon see to it that a law was passed which provided that when they paid for woolens they received woolens. The majority of the women are equally powerless now in the matter of food supplies. In the days of cottage industry she had her own smokehouse and knew the kind of meat she was serving to her household, but now, since her sphere has been expanded far beyond her home, in a large measure she must buy beef, mutton, bacon, and hams, and in assuming that it is pure she must trust to the inspectors she had no voice in appointing. Under the present conditions she must trust to the integrity and capability of the inspectors and supervisors, whom she had no voice in selecting, to pass upon the quality of the milk for her household, and the only practical way in which to enable her to see to it that she re-

ceives pure fabrics, clean and wholesome food supplies, and other things which mean the physical, and even the moral, health of her children is to invest her with the right to a voice in selecting these various governing agents which are to manufacture, prepare, and inspect these necessities.

Whether the present system is superior to the cottage industry is a question I do not discuss, but this much is true, that our present industrial system has taken from the women the opportunity they had under cottage industry to inspect all these details.

We hear the opponents of equal suffrage say that "It is woman's place to direct her house and her children." Sir, that is indeed a choice assortment of words, but how about the brutality of a system which denies to woman the right and opportunity to have sensible and wholesome laws and regulations to assist her in procuring pure foods, pure fabrics, and sanitary houses?

Therefore, to those who say that women did not need the ballot in the early or formative period of the Government, I say in reply that the problems which presented themselves for solution in the early period of the States differ vastly from the problems now demanding attention and solution.

One of the arguments the antisuffragists have advanced, or rather the statement iterated and repeated by them with the most assurance, is that "The right to vote detracts from woman's nobility of character and would unsex her."

The argument is not sound, and those who advance it seem to forget that there would have to be a new creation, a new heaven, and a new earth to transform the feminine into the masculine, to make the mother forget her child and turn a deaf ear to the supplication of the helpless.

The nervous energy, time, effort, and prudence which women exercise daily in their personal, individual problems in the matter of attempting to inspect, select, and purchase food, clothing, and shelter for the protection of those within their household is a sufficient guaranty that they will not be degraded or lose any of their nobility of character by spending half an hour every two years going to the polls.

Even the fiercest tumults and ravages of war do not detract from the nobility of character of some men.

When Sir Philip Sidney lay mortally wounded on the battle field a cup of cold water was brought to him; lifting it to his parched lips, he saw an expiring private soldier staring at the cup with burning and anguished eyes, and he handed the water to the dying soldier, saying, "Friend, thy necessity is yet greater than mine."

The long and weary years of the Revolutionary War, filled as they were with misfortunes, disasters, and desperate carnage, did not disturb the quiet dignity of George Washington, and at all times his pride and honor revolted from the thought of doing what did not become a true man.

Andrew Jackson inherited or imbibed from his mother a love of purity, and from the days when as a small boy he saw the British dragoons sweep along the red roads of Waxhaw Creek and dye them yet a deeper red with the blood of American militiamen, all through his long and tumultuous career, down to the time when for him the tattered flag of war was folded forever, he was stainless.

A hundred battles did not harden nor indurate Robert E. Lee, and he was from first to last the accurate gentleman, the brave soldier.

The thunder of the guns never caused Stonewall Jackson to lose his innate gentleness, and every night, looking upon the "serene and shining pathway of the stars," he held communion with his God.

Voting will not lessen affection, and political affairs can not make women false to their inborn instincts or cause them to lose one jot or tittle of their soft and loving tenderness.

Women are particularly qualified for and entitled to political liberty. As a class they always stand against violence and fraud; they always support the cause of liberty and progress and have been the chief mainsprings which have inspired, encouraged, and consoled great and useful men.

The history of woman is the history of her effort to assuage pain and purify society. Her history is one of temperance, frugality, and industry.

Moreover, women are especially qualified to vote and act as a balance wheel to men in great contests, for they have demonstrated that fortitude and passive courage are the virtues of misfortune, sorrow, and defeat, while moderation, coolness, and restraint are the virtues of victory and prosperity. Women voters are capable of as much restraint as men, for we do not forget that men's passions and spirits amid the whirlwinds, simooms, siroccos, and tornadoes of politics rise to such a high

tide that we frequently do things for our political parties that we would under no circumstances do for ourselves.

De Quincey says, in his autobiography:

I do not wish, in paying my homage to the other sex and in glorifying its possible power over ours, to be confronted with those thoughtless and trivial rhetoricians who flatter women with false lip worship and, like Lord Byron's buccaniers, hold out to them a picture of their own empire built only upon sensual or upon shadowy excellencies. Though the sexes differ characteristically, yet they never fail to reflect each other, nor can they differ as to general amount of development; never yet was a woman in one stage of elevation and man—of the same community—in another.

Mr. President, I am about to conclude, and I have spoken at some length, because I believe the subjects that I have discussed are vital to our best interests as a nation.

With justifiable and patriotic pride many Americans boast of their belief that our beloved country now takes her position as the mightiest and greatest of the nations of the earth, but the question obtrudes itself: Is the Nation really great, or is its position simply fickle and hollow but imposing? The answer is that a nation's greatness is not to be measured by markets and stock exchanges.

Of what avail to the State are the brazen gates, the swelling domes, and widening arches, if within the State equity may not be found? Of what avail to the State are the sculptured architraves, fluted pilasters, the roofs of fretted gold, if social and economic justice be denied so completely to the working masses that there is invisibly, but nevertheless indelibly, written upon them the legend which appeared on the metal ring of the serf of the feudal lord, "Gurth, son of Beowolph, is the born thrall of Cedric of Rotherwood." or "Wamba, son of Witless, is the thrall of Cedric of Rotherwood."

The State is not prosperous nor truly great if within its borders there exists an industrial system under which a great majority of the people are crushed and stupified by poverty, and the physical workers completely give up their lives to the exactions of toil, but nevertheless scarcely obtain a subsistence and enjoy none of the beauties, comforts, luxuries, and glories of civilization which they have created. The Nation is not truly great if its women are denied the right to become a part of the governing power.

Therefore I indulge the hope that the Senate may adopt this resolution, and so far as in our power lies, write justice, equity, equal opportunity, and idealism into our laws and thus proceed one step further in seeing to it that this shall be a nation of courageous, constructive people, a land of opportunity and hope, where justice as well as charity shall prevail.

During the delivery of Mr. ASHURST'S speech,

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

Mr. HOLLIS. If it is agreeable to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside until the Senator from Arizona has completed his remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection—

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I was going to say that I believe there is one Senator who is prepared to address the Senate on the unfinished business, but if he has no objection I should like to have the Senator from Arizona conclude his remarks. I think it will take only a short while for him to do so.

Mr. LIPPITT. I suggest that perhaps a very proper way would be for the Senator from Oregon to have the Alaska bill laid before the Senate, and if the Chair should see fit to recognize me, I would then be very glad to yield to the Senator from Arizona to finish his remarks.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I will make that request. I ask that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 48) to authorize the President of the United States to locate, construct, and operate railroads in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Rhode Island upon the unfinished business.

Mr. LIPPITT. If the Senator from Arizona should like to have me yield to him, I would be very glad to do so. May I ask about how long a time he expects to occupy?

Mr. ASHURST. I shall speak as rapidly as I may.

Mr. LIPPITT. I hope the Senator will not.

Mr. ASHURST. I think I will finish in about half an hour.

Mr. LIPPITT. I hope the Senator will take a reasonable time to finish.

Mr. ASHURST. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona will proceed.

After the conclusion of Mr. ASHURST'S speech,

RAILROADS IN ALASKA.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 48) to authorize the President of the United States to locate, construct, and operate railroads in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, the steps which have led to the introduction to the Senate of the Alaskan question in its present form were taken because for some years now, in fact since 1906, the conditions of the Territory of Alaska and of the people of Alaska have constituted the most disappointing feature of American progress. Up to that time the Territory was expanding; its people were hopeful. At that time, owing to circumstances which it is not now necessary to consider, the coal lands were withdrawn from entry by ex-President Roosevelt. Since then the people of Alaska have been using every possible effort to have those coal fields opened in some way, so that their resources might be made available. It is that they have been disappointed.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. LIPPITT. Yes.

Mr. GALLINGER. There are so few Senators present that I make the point of no quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gronna	Martine, N. J.	Shively
Bacon	Hitchcock	Nelson	Smith, Md.
Bankhead	Hollis	Norris	Smith, Mich.
Borah	James	Overman	Smoot
Brandegee	Jones	Perkins	Stephenson
Bristow	Kern	Pittman	Stone
Bryan	Laue	Pomerene	Sutherland
Burton	Lea	Ransdell	Swanson
Chamberlain	Lippitt	Reed	Thomas
Cummins	Lodge	Robtson	Thompson
Dillingham	McCumber	Root	Vardaman
Fall	McLean	Saulsbury	Williams
Gallinger	Martin, Va.	Sheppard	

Mr. BACON. I desire to say that my colleague [Mr. SMITH of Georgia] is necessarily absent from the city.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. TOWNSEND] from the Senate to-day on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-one Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, when I was interrupted by the roll call, I was stating the conditions in Alaska which led to the introduction of the pending bill. In consequence of them a commission was appointed about a year ago to study the situation in regard to its railroad development and to report to the Congress. That commission, after a very hurried visit to Alaska, reported upon lines of railroad which they thought would serve the interests of that community, and recommended that those railroads, which would cost about \$35,000,000, be built by the Government. Promptly two bills were introduced to accomplish that end, and referred to the Senate Committee on Territories. The Senate Committee on Territories proceeded to take those bills under consideration, and to give hearings, which are contained in a report of some 700 pages that has been submitted to the Senate. That report divides itself under three heads.

Certain people appeared and testified in regard to the resources of Alaska in an attempt to justify the construction of railroads and to show that the amount of money that has been suggested to be appropriated could be wisely spent. Certain other people then appeared, not in opposition to the construction of railroads in Alaska, not in opposition to the statements which had been made about the value of the resources of Alaska, but protesting against Government construction of railroads, and saying that they and their associates were willing and would be glad to build railroads in that Territory if the restrictions that tied up the coal fields were removed, and one or two other conditions of less importance were properly adjusted.

That testimony left the proponents of this bill in the situation that they had advanced no important argument in favor of Government ownership of railroads, and in answer to the claims of those who wished to build the roads themselves, they put in in rebuttal, through Mr. WICKERSHAM, the Delegate from the Territory, an attack upon some people who had been connected with Alaska, claiming that the entire resources of that Territory were monopolized. On page 614 of the hearings Mr. WICKERSHAM testifies:

Mr. WICKERSHAM. There can be no railroad building in Alaska except by two influences, one the Government and the other the Morgan-Guggenheims. That is all there is to it. They have got that country

by the throat, so far as transportation is concerned, and unless the Government comes to the rescue of its own property in the Territory of Alaska it will all be taken over by these big interests.

He submits various statements to support that assertion. Mr. President, I have examined those statements with great care, I have studied the testimony as carefully as I know how, and I think that no more unfounded, frivolous charge of monopoly was ever put forward, and that it is nothing more than an attempt to stampede the judgment of the country in favor of this step toward Government ownership of railroads by influencing them to believe that no other power can open Alaska.

The testimony in regard to the resources of Alaska has been very ably, eloquently, completely, and, I think, very fairly set forth by the Senators who have spoken in favor of the pending bill. I do not want seriously to question the testimony that has been given in regard to those resources. I am not, however, quite so enthusiastic about some of Alaska's possibilities as are a number of these gentlemen. I agree that Alaska has agricultural possibilities for the production of garden stuff, possibly for the production of grain, for the production of hay, and for the pasturing of cattle to some extent. I think perhaps that feature of it is properly summed up in the testimony of Prof. Piper, one of the Government officials in connection with the Agricultural Department who testified on this subject, when he said that he thought Alaska might raise agricultural products for local consumption but not for export.

Alaska, without doubt, has great mineral resources, particularly gold. She probably has great copper resources. There are gentlemen—the Guggenheims and their associates—who have made a very expensive attempt to develop what seemed to them the most promising of those copper resources. It is in evidence in the hearings that in reply to a question from one of the stockholders of their company asking when they might expect dividends or some return from that development, the officers of the company said that they could not tell, but that it would certainly be many years. So that, while those copper resources are perhaps rich, they have not yet brought any return to the gentlemen who have spent many millions of dollars in developing them.

Alaska has very large coal fields. They consist of one coal field about 25 miles from the coast opposite Controller Bay, called the Bering River field, said to contain somewhere in the neighborhood of 50 square miles. Then, there is what is called the Matanuska field, a little farther north, which is said to contain in the neighborhood of from 80 to 100 square miles. The character of the coal in these two fields is said to be substantially similar, being in part anthracite and in part bituminous and in part at least of high quality; but it is very badly broken up in its geological formation, so that there is great doubt whether the veins are continuous, and it is also so crushed that there is difficulty in finding lump coal suitable for some purposes. In addition to these two fields, there is a field of lignite coal, called the Nenana field, near Fairbanks, in the interior, which is of value perhaps to the people in the interior but not valuable for export purposes.

The evidence presenting these facts is the evidence in regard to the resources of Alaska. I might go much further in describing them, but anyone who is interested in that phase of the subject will find it so thoroughly presented in the speeches which have already been delivered here that it is unnecessary for me to repeat it.

The next testimony presented was in regard to the construction of railroads by private individuals. There have been in Alaska three serious attempts to build railroads. One is the Copper River Railroad, which has been built from Cordova up the Copper River by what is known as the Alaska Syndicate, composed of the Guggenheims; the firm of J. P. Morgan & Co., and their associates. That road was built chiefly for the purpose of developing the copper mines in which those gentlemen were interested.

There is, then, at the next point along the coast, a proposal by a Mr. Ryan to build a road of about 25 miles in length to open the Bering River coal fields. There is at the next point north, at Seward, a partially-constructed railroad of which, under the hands of different owners and through many difficulties, about 71 miles are built toward the Matanuska coal fields, the intention being to go on into the interior of the country to the Tanana River and to Fairbanks.

The other transportation of Alaska consists of a line or lines of steamboats which run from St. Michaels down the coast to the mouth of the Yukon River, and up the Yukon River and the Tanana River to various points in the interior, and I may say that this great river system will always be a very important means of transportation in any development that may come to Alaska.

Mr. President, I do not want to go into these questions in unnecessary detail. I hope to confine my remarks to a short space, so I will simply say here that there is in the testimony plenty of evidence by different people, in the first place, that the Ryan road to the Bering River coal fields will be built; that the parties interested in it intend to build it, want to build it, and have the capital to build it, provided only that those fields are opened to entry and coal can be obtained from them when the road is built. In the same way, there is plenty of evidence that the road from Seward to the interior will be built to the Matanuska coal fields, and will be built to Fairbanks, provided the coal fields are open.

This is the evidence of Mr. Jemmett, who is now the manager of 11 allied banks in Canada, who, with their associates, own that property, and it is the evidence of Mr. Patrick, who is the attorney of those gentlemen. They testified that they were willing and would be glad to extend the road and that they could get the capital to extend it.

In regard to the Copper River Railroad, the extension of which is not so important, the evidence is not so strong, but Mr. Jemmett testified that he was told by the owners of that road that they also would build on into the Tanana Valley if they could get coal. The testimony up to this point, therefore, is that Alaska has resources; that those resources are unjustifiably tied up; that she has energetic and enterprising people of the same type as the Americans who opened the plains and won the West; and that they are ready to attempt the opening and development of Alaska, provided the crushing hand of Government interference is removed from her resources.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. LIPPITT. I yield.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. What does the Senator think about the contract, which was offered in evidence and which is in the Senate hearings, between the representatives of the so-called Cunningham claims and the Guggenheim interests, which places practically the best part of the Bering River coal fields in the hands of the Guggenheims, who own the transportation into Chitina?

Mr. LIPPITT. The claims of the Cunninghams were for about 6,000 acres of the Bering River coal fields, the testimony in regard to which shows that it is more than 50 square miles in area. Whether they take up the best part of them is something that no living man knows, because no living man knows what is the best or where it is, or, if he does, he has not testified, so far as I know.

In regard to the Cunningham claims, that is a subject of the long ago, about which there was much discussion on both sides, with which I am not very familiar, and which has little bearing upon the present subject of discussion. The contract to which the Senator refers was one by which the Cunninghams proposed to give to the Alaska Syndicate, who were then contemplating the building of the Copper River road, a right to those 6,000 acres, and one of the Guggenheims, in behalf of the Alaska Syndicate, agreed to accept the option which they gave them for the purpose of having coal, or of knowing that they could get coal, which they could develop, provided they extended their railroad up to the Bering River fields. Not getting the property represented by the option, because it was held up by the Government and the claims were disallowed, the Copper River Railroad never did build up to the Bering River fields.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield further to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. LIPPITT. I am simply stating what I understand to be the facts. As I have stated, they never did build the railroad into the Bering coal fields. Without knowing anything about the legality or otherwise of the Cunningham claims, I will say that whatever may be the right or wrong of that matter I do not believe that any possible profit can ever come to the people of this country as a whole that will in any way compensate them for the great loss that has arisen because that extension of the Copper River Railroad was not built and the production of coal in Alaska was not begun at that time.

I now yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I simply call attention to that to show the disposition of the syndicate which had built the Cordova & Northwestern Railroad. They had already acquired at the end of the line the Kennicott mines, the most valuable copper mines in the country. That is conceded.

Mr. LIPPITT. I do not concede it.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. It is pretty generally conceded, and it is conceded, the Senator will find, in the evidence.

Mr. LIPPITT. The evidence is that they have tried for several years to make a dollar out of them, and they have not been able to make a cent, and they can not tell when they will.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. The evidence does not show that. The evidence shows that it is the most valuable copper mine in Alaska, and, further than that, it shows that the company built the road for the purpose of bringing out the ore.

Mr. LIPPITT. Certainly.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. But I call attention to the attempt of the syndicate to obtain control of the coal mines in the Bering River field for the purpose of showing that the same syndicate was undertaking to control not only the copper mines of Alaska, but the coal mines as well; and, as evidence of that, just as soon as those coal mines were held up the Alaska Syndicate abandoned the extension of its road into the coal fields.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, there are two or three questions which I should like to ask the Senator from Rhode Island. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. LIPPITT. Yes.

Mr. BURTON. The Cordova & Northwestern Railway is the same as the Copper River Railway, is it?

Mr. LIPPITT. Yes.

Mr. BURTON. What is the distance from the main line of that railway to these coal fields? About 30 miles?

Mr. LIPPITT. There are two different routes, I think. I do not remember exactly; but one is in the neighborhood of 30 miles and the other in the neighborhood of 50 miles.

Mr. BURTON. Which is the one that was proposed—the Copper River Railway?

Mr. LIPPITT. I do not know which one they proposed at the time they built their road, but the report of the commission which investigated the conditions recently suggested two alternative routes—I think I am right—from the Copper River road to the Bering River coal fields.

Mr. BURTON. One of about 30 miles and the other of 50 miles?

Mr. LIPPITT. About that.

Mr. BURTON. Which is regarded as the better harbor—Controller Bay or Cordova?

Mr. LIPPITT. Cordova.

Mr. BURTON. Quite the better?

Mr. LIPPITT. Quite the better.

Mr. BURTON. Did the commission come to the conclusion that a good harbor could be developed at Controller Bay?

Mr. LIPPITT. The commission did not visit Controller Bay; but Mr. Ryan, who represents the parties interested in building a railroad from Controller Bay to the coal mines, which would be only some 23 miles long, is confident of being able to build a harbor there at a cost of somewhere in the neighborhood of a million and a half dollars. Mr. WICKERSHAM, the Delegate from Alaska, in the course of his testimony, says that he thinks Mr. Ryan's plan for getting out coal from the Bering River coal fields is by far the best; and Mr. Jemmett, the manager of the Alaska Northern, says he has no doubt that road will be built if the coal fields are opened.

Mr. BURTON. Which is the Alaska Northern—the one that goes to the Bering River coal fields?

Mr. LIPPITT. The Alaska Northern is the one that goes from Seward to the Matanuska coal fields.

Mr. BURTON. What is the distance from Cordova to the nearest point of the Bering River coal fields?

Mr. LIPPITT. About 90 to 100 miles.

Mr. BURTON. So it would be about 60 miles on the main line, and then 30 miles on the proposed branch?

Mr. LIPPITT. Thirty or forty miles; somewhere in that neighborhood.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Thirty-eight miles.

Mr. LIPPITT. I am informed by the Senator from Oregon that it is about 38 miles.

Mr. BURTON. Thirty-eight miles is the length of the proposed branch from the Copper River line to the Bering River coal fields?

Mr. LIPPITT. Yes. I will say in regard to that matter that Mr. Ryan testifies that he can take coal from the Bering River coal fields at 96 cents per ton less than it can be taken down over the Copper River Railroad, and he states that he is willing to take a contract from the Government to land coal at tide-water there for \$2.50 per ton.

Mr. BURTON. What is the obstacle in the way of building that road?

Mr. LIPPITT. The fact that the Bering River coal fields are tied up, and nobody can enter a claim there.

Mr. BURTON. There is no obstacle in the way of right of way?

Mr. LIPPITT. There is no obstacle in the way of right of way.

When I was interrupted by the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] I was on the point of taking up an examination of the claims of monopoly. The only strong argument that has been advanced in favor of having this railroad built by the Government, at an initial expense of \$35,000,000 and at an ultimate expense which nobody will undertake to say, is the argument that unless the Government builds railroads in Alaska nobody but Mr. Morgan's firm or the Guggenheims can build them there. Let us first examine the evidence which is relied on to establish that claim in connection with the Alaska Northern Railroad, running from Seward about 71 miles into the interior at present and planned to run farther on.

This road at one period of its career was called the Alaska Central, and was owned by Frost & Osborne, of Chicago, promoters interested in several other schemes, evidently ambitious, vigorous, and enterprising men. They took their securities to the Sovereign Bank of Toronto, Canada, and borrowed money from it. The Sovereign Bank of Toronto, Canada, was a bank with resources of about \$22,000,000 in 1905 and in 1906, when this event occurred. It had branches in numerous parts of Canada, and the firm of J. P. Morgan & Co. had a stock ownership in it amounting to about one-sixth of the total capitalization, which was slightly under \$4,000,000, and acted as its New York agent.

Frost & Osborne failed. Their failure caused the failure, or the approaching failure, of the Sovereign Bank of Canada. Eleven banks of Canada—the allied banks, as they have been since called—in order to prevent the catastrophe which that would have brought upon the Canadian banking system, undertook to give help to the Sovereign Bank. They took over all the assets and all the liabilities of that bank, among which were the bonds of the Alaska Central Railroad running from Seward, afterwards and at present known as the Alaska Northern. They have practically wound up the affairs of the Sovereign Bank of Canada, except that they never have been able to realize anything upon the interest they have in this railroad at Seward. They testify that the face of the obligation left against those bonds is somewhere in the neighborhood of \$3,000,000, and that with interest charges the total amount of the obligation will be between four and five million dollars.

All the interest that the firm of J. P. Morgan & Co. have in this railway is the possibility that this stock in a bankrupt bank of Canada, whose assets for nearly eight years have been in course of liquidation, and on which it has been impossible to realize, may at some time pay something back. Mr. Jemmett, the manager of these allied banks, who has charge of this failed institution, says that he does not believe they will ever get anything. Others who have had experience in that sort of an operation, I think, will be very strongly inclined to agree with him.

I have no doubt that the firm of J. P. Morgan & Co. have long ago crossed off from their books and marked as worthless any interest they may have in the assets of that bank. Even if they get anything out of it, it probably will not be either the stock or the bonds of this railroad. It will be what is received in the form of cash or securities by the allied banks. They can only get something provided some capital, either their own or that of somebody else, goes into the development of that road. As it stands, it is worthless, and always will be.

To attempt to say that this possible residuary interest, far off in the future, controls in any way the construction or the operation of that railroad, is too far-fetched a proposition for my business mind to conceive. Mr. Jemmett testifies that neither Mr. Morgan nor any representative of his has any voice or management in the disposition or control of these funds, the way they stand now.

The testimony on the point of the Morgans not having an interest in this road is repeated in various places in this testimony by Mr. Jemmett and by Mr. Patrick. Nevertheless, Mr. Wickersham repeatedly and continually claims that they have a large interest. I want to read some of it. I read from Mr. Wickersham's testimony at page 633 of the Senate hearings. Mind you, this bank failed eight years ago, and this testimony was taken within a few months.

The truth about this Alaska Central is that the J. P. Morgan bank in Canada, the only J. P. Morgan bank in Canada, put up this money, and the J. P. Morgan bank to-day owns the whole of the Alaska Northern.

Was there ever a more unfounded assertion?

Senator CHAMBERLAIN. That is denied, I think?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. No; Mr. Jemmett told the facts, from which that inference may be fairly and justly drawn.

Senator CHAMBERLAIN. I think that was denied by Mr. Patrick, if I remember, at the time the hearings were had before the Territories Committee before.

Mr. PATRICK. They do not own one dollar of it.

Then, further over, in another place, on page 653, I find the following:

Mr. PATRICK. Neither the Morgans nor the Sovereign Bank own the road nor own any interest in it. I will state that the securities were transferred to the Canadian banks which aided the Sovereign Bank.

Mr. BALLIANCE. Transferred the trusteeship only.
Mr. PATRICK. And if there should be any equity left, if the security should be more than sufficient to pay back the money advanced, then the Sovereign Bank might have some equity in the proceeds—the money that might result after settlement. But no title and no ownership and no interest exists in this railroad property. It is owned by the railway company, in which the Sovereign Bank is neither stock nor bond holder.

And the only connection Mr. Morgan has with it is through the Sovereign Bank.

Mr. President it seems to me that with that testimony clearly and repeatedly given anybody who undertakes to say that that road is monopolized by Mr. Morgan or Mr. Guggenheim must do so for some ulterior purpose. We know what the purpose is. It is to try to convince the public of this country, who do not examine these subjects and who can not do it, that there is a great and overpowering monopoly there.

So much for the Sovereign Bank and Morgan monopoly of the Alaska Northern. Now, let me go a step further.

We have Mr. Ryan wanting to build to Controller Bay to get the coal out of the Bering fields. Mr. WICKERSHAM, in his testimony, read to the committee the charter which Mr. Ryan got from the State of New Jersey. He put the charter in evidence. It is in the testimony. It is signed by four or five people, as was required by the State of New Jersey. None of them are names that are well known in any way. Mr. WICKERSHAM promptly says that those are dummy incorporators, and because they are dummy incorporators they must represent Mr. Morgan. The question was asked Mr. WICKERSHAM, "Is this all you know about it?" Mr. WICKERSHAM replied: "Yes; that is all I know about it."

Mr. Ryan himself promptly comes forward and says that the firm of Probst & Wetzler are the people that are backing it, and that neither Mr. Morgan nor Mr. Guggenheim has any interest at all in the property. He brings before the committee a representative of that firm, who, under oath, testifies to the same fact. Nevertheless, the charge is still made that Mr. Ryan's road is dependent upon these interests. Mr. Ryan appeared in my office yesterday, not solicited by me, and confirmed to me these statements. There is repeated evidence about them in the testimony.

Now let us come to one other, and really one of the most remarkable of all of the statements. Up the Yukon River, starting from St. Michaels, there runs a line of steamboats. It is owned by the Northern Navigation Co. The people interested in the Northern Navigation Co. also own the Northern Commercial Co., this being a trading company with stations, posts, and stores at various points on the Yukon River, which are supplied by the steamers of the allied navigation company. The navigation company runs on up to Fairbanks on the Tanana, and up to Dawson on the Yukon.

There has been great competition on that river. It was thought in the past that there was a great deal of business to be done there, and various people came in and ran steamboats there. That has resulted in the business being so overdone that there are to-day 43 idle steamboats on that river. It has resolved itself, for the moment, into the hands of these people running from St. Michaels up the river from the mouth, and steamers connected with the White Pass Railroad, approaching from the other direction of Alaska, running down the river to Dawson and to Fairbanks.

The claim is repeatedly made by Mr. WICKERSHAM that Mr. Morgan owns and dominates either the Northern Navigation Co. or the Northern Commercial Co., or both. They are not very large companies, as I understand; nevertheless, they do all the business that there is there.

The attorney for those companies in Washington is Mr. John Sidney Webb. He appeared in my office yesterday and showed me some telegrams from the owners of those properties, denying that Mr. Morgan or Mr. Guggenheim had any interest in them whatever. I told him that perhaps he might have it made more definite. He telegraphed to his people, who are the managers of that line and the principal owners—that they are the principal owners, at least, is undenied—the Sloss people, of San Francisco, and their associates. He telegraphed to them, and received in reply a long telegram which I will put into the RECORD.

An analysis of that telegram shows that the stock of these two companies, the Northern Commercial Co. and the Northern Navigation Co., is owned by the Alaska Commercial Co. to the extent of 65.24 per cent, by the Alaska Goldfields Co. to the extent of 26.77 per cent, by the International Mercantile Marine

Co. to the extent of 5.34 per cent, and that they have in the treasury 2.65 per cent.

The stockholders of the Alaska Commercial Co. are given in detail here. The stockholders of the Alaska Goldfields Co. are all people in London except some gentleman by the name of Liebes. The board of directors is given here. It consists of the Slosses, Mr. Gerstle, Mr. Fairbanks, and other gentlemen, all of whom live in the West, I believe, and none of whom have any connection with Mr. Morgan, as I understand. By the way, the telegram denies that either Mr. Morgan or Mr. Guggenheim has any control or power over that railroad in any way.

I ask permission to incorporate this correspondence in the RECORD without reading.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none.

The correspondence referred to is as follows:

[Copy of night letter.]

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., January 20, 1914.

JOHN SIDNEY WEBB,
Bond Building, Washington, D. C.:

Capital stock of Northern Commercial Company, three twenty-four thousand shares preferred at five dollars; sixteen thousand two hundred-eight shares common at hundred dollars. Northern Navigation Company, two hundred twelve thousand two hundred shares preferred at five dollars; sixteen thousand two hundred-eight shares common at hundred dollars; held in following percentages of both companies: Combined Alaska Commercial Company, sixty-five decimal two four; Alaska Goldfields, twenty-six decimal seventy-seven. International Mercantile Marine, five decimal three four. Treasury, two decimal sixty-five. Only stockholders of Alaska Commercial Company, Sloss, Gerstle, Niebaum, and Greenwald families, Washburn, and Louis Greenbaum. Stockholders Alaska Goldfields—all London people except Liebes. Alaska Commercial represented on board directors by Leon and Louis Sloss, Mark and William Gerstle, Fairbanks, Greenbaum, Greenwald, Daniels; Alaska Goldfields, by Phillips, Isaac and Julian, and Leon and Arnold Liebes; International Mercantile Marine by T. H. Clarke. Fifteenth director in Camden, New Jersey. We reiterate all statements made in our telegrams February twelfth and thirteenth, nineteen twelve.

LEON SLOSS, President.

[Analysis of telegram.]

Northern Commercial Co. stock: Preferred, 324,000, at \$5 per share; common, 16,228, at \$100 per share.
Northern Navigation Co. stock: Preferred, 212,200, at \$5 per share; common, 16,228, at \$100 per share.

	Per cent.
Alaska Commercial Co.-----	65.24
Alaska Goldfields Co.-----	26.77
International Mercantile Marine-----	5.34
In treasury-----	2.65
	100.00

Stockholders of Alaska Commercial Co.: Sloss, Gerstle, Niebaum, Greenwald family, Washburn family, and Louis Greenbaum.

Stockholders Alaska Goldfields Co.: All London people, except the Liebes.

Board of directors: Leon Sloss, Louis Sloss, Mark Gerstle, William Gerstle, William Fairbanks, Louis Greenbaum, Greenwald, Daniels, Isaac Phillips, Julian Phillips, Leon Liebes, Arnold Liebes, and T. H. Clarke, Camden, N. J.

Mr. LIPPITT. The only way of connecting Mr. Morgan with this company as a grasping monopolist, which is the position in which he is being represented in this matter, is that the International Mercantile Marine Co. owns the small amount of 5½ per cent of the stock. That came about years ago, when the International Mercantile Marine Co. was formed, by their having some steamers out on the Pacific coast which were taken into these properties and were paid for in stock. Mr. Morgan's firm, as is well known, formed the International Mercantile Marine Co. His firm undoubtedly still have a powerful influence in the direction of that company. Because, however, this small amount of stock in it is owned by the International Mercantile Marine Co., which is a company of enormous size, which extends its activities into many parts of the world, which is a trans-Atlantic steamship company; because it happens through the failures and the difficulties of doing business away out on the coast of Alaska to have this small percentage of interest in that transportation company, it is pretty far-fetched to claim that Mr. Morgan owns and controls and dominates it, or has anything to do with the matter. The fact undoubtedly is that he has not.

Those are the facts in regard to the three companies that are doing and are talking about doing transportation business in Alaska. If anybody can see in those facts anything to justify the claim that all Alaska is in the hands of a crushing monopoly, he can see something that is beyond my vision. I can not imagine why either the firm of J. P. Morgan & Co. or the firm of Guggenheim Bros. should wish to invest another dollar in Alaska. They have already made an investment there of many, many millions. They are the only ones who have really, seriously, and energetically, and with capital behind them, taken hold of the resources of Alaska to try to see if something was to be gotten out of them. The testimony given by Mr. Dickson,

the manager of the White Pass Railroad, is that they have not made a dollar in dividends, and they can not tell when they will.

If any further evidence is needed on this question, Hon. JAMES S. DAVENPORT, a Member of Congress from the State of Oklahoma, wrote to the firm of J. P. Morgan & Co. in regard to the question whether they did or did not have a large interest in the transportation systems of Alaska. He handed me their answer this morning. I knew nothing about it until two or three minutes before it was put into my hands. It is dated yesterday—January 20. I will ask to have the Secretary read it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

[J. P. Morgan & Co., Wall Street, corner Broad, New York; Drexel & Co., Philadelphia; Morgan, Grenfell & Co., London; Morgan, Harjes & Co., Paris.]

New York, January 20, 1914.

Hon. JAMES S. DAVENPORT, M. C.,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 19th instant calling our attention to a statement made during a debate on the Alaska railway bill that the Alaska Syndicate held or exercised a control of the White Pass & Yukon Route and the Alaska Northern Railway, and asking for a specific reply as to whether or not the Alaska Syndicate, our house, or M. Guggenheim's Sons have any interest or control in any railway or water lines in Alaska other than the Copper River Railway and the Alaska Steamship Co.

The Alaska Syndicate owns the Copper River & Northwestern Railway, running from Cordova, on the coast, to Chitina, with a branch line from Chitina to the Kennicott mines.

The Alaska Syndicate owns 41 per cent of the capital stock of the Alaska Steamship Co.

Neither the Alaska Syndicate, M. Guggenheim's Sons, nor ourselves have or ever had any interest in the White Pass & Yukon Railway.

The Alaska Syndicate, M. Guggenheim's Sons, or ourselves have not and never have had any interest in the Alaska Northern Railway or its predecessor, the Alaska Central Railway.

The firm of J. P. Morgan & Co. were stockholders in the Sovereign Bank of Canada, but were not represented on the board, nor did they have anything to do with the management of the bank. The bank failed and was placed in the hands of a receiver. At the time of the failure we learned that the bank had made loans either to the Alaska Central Railway or to its successor, the Alaska Northern Railway, or to the builders or promoters of such railway, taking the bonds of said railway, or one of them, as collateral. We had no previous knowledge of such loans nor any interest therein.

We paid our double liability as stockholders in said bank in cash and received therefor shares in the International Assets Co. (Ltd.), a Canadian company formed to liquidate the bank, which company, we believe, now holds whatever interests the Sovereign Bank had in the Alaska Northern Railway. If the liquidation should leave any surplus over the debts of the bank, which, we are informed, is not at all probable, we should receive our share of such surplus. We are not represented on the board of the liquidation company, nor have we anything to do with its management.

The above statement of facts covers the entire interest of the Alaska Syndicate, Messrs. M. Guggenheim's Sons, and ourselves in any rail, water, or other transportation lines in Alaska.

Messrs. M. Guggenheim's Sons authorize us to say that they concur in the statements in this letter, in so far as the same refer to the Alaska Syndicate, the firm of M. Guggenheim's Sons, or the individual members thereof.

Trusting we have given you the desired information, we remain,
Yours, very truly,

J. P. MORGAN & CO.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I have put in denials from almost everyone connected with the management of these properties of the statement that they are dominated and controlled by the interest which Mr. WICKERSHAM asserts is throttling Alaska.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. May I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. LIPPITT. Certainly.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I did not happen to be in when the first part of the letter was read. Was there any denial of the statement which Mr. Ballaine made in reference to Mr. Perkins and what he had to say about the loan for railway construction?

Mr. LIPPITT. There was no denial of the fact that Mr. Perkins, as representing the house of J. P. Morgan & Co. in 1909, was strenuously urged by Mr. Ballaine to induce his company to finance an extension of the Alaska Northern Railroad; that Mr. Perkins visited Alaska to consider the question; that subsequently Mr. Ballaine went to New York hoping that he would receive a consent to his proposition and financial support; and that he was told that the firm of J. P. Morgan & Co. did not care to entertain the proposition. In other words, the testimony the honorable Senator from Oregon has referred to is to the effect that the firm of J. P. Morgan & Co. were earnestly solicited to build a line which, if they had consented to do, would have given them this very control that it is now claimed they have; that they refused to do it, although if they wanted this thing which they are claimed to want and claimed to have, here was the easy, manifest, ready way of doing it; and that instead of showing this grasping spirit they said that for various reasons they did not care to enter into the transaction.

Mr. President, what I was about to say before this interruption is, that if all these charges were absolutely true that have been made of monopolizing the transportation systems and resources of Alaska and we were still in the conditions in which our Government was and the conditions of doing business that we were in 20 years ago we might seriously consider it; but today, with an all-powerful Interstate Commerce Commission controlling the railroad situation in this country, with laws that are so powerful that even great railroads commanding hundreds and hundreds of millions of capital can be broken apart almost with the stroke of a pen, what danger is there of new railroads up in that undeveloped, barren, and almost waste country being developed by the same men? If I were an Alaskan, I would not care whether the railroads were owned by one man or a hundred or a thousand men so long as the Interstate Commerce Commission were here to fix their rates, to dictate to them how they should run their trains, what kind of cars they should run, and all the other details of railroad management. The day has gone by when this country needs to be stamped by any such cry of monopoly.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. LIPPITT. Certainly.

Mr. LANE. I should like to say to the Senator from Rhode Island that if I were in Alaska trying to get freight in there or food to last for a year's supply and had to pay \$120 a ton to get it, and if I had only a few hundred dollars in my pocket, I would take a good deal of interest about who was collecting the toll on the freight.

Mr. LIPPITT. Of course in that case he would not get his freight in.

I was saying, when the distinguished Senator from Oregon interrupted me, that I think the Interstate Commerce Commission has ample power to handle any such situation if it existed. I see no signs of its existence.

Under these circumstances the whole question resolves itself into the proposition whether or not in this country we are to abandon our time-honored policy of trusting to the initiative and the courage and the enterprise of our own citizens, our private citizens, our individual citizens, to develop our resources. Mr. President, the glory of our country and its strength lie in the individual men who for the last 20 years have been grappling with just such problems as are presented to us to-day in Alaska. They have won their way across the deserts to the Pacific coast and they have built up industries of every kind.

Mr. President, we hear the much-abused phrase "private interests." It is the private interests that have built up this country—private interests run by private men. Farms and factories and forges and furnaces and mines and railroads, all the instruments of agriculture and commerce and manufacture, have been built up by private individuals who have put their energy, their lifeblood into the separate and special control of the separate and special industries that were under their eye-sight.

The question that has now come to us is whether we are to abolish all that long continuous system of development that has built up the prosperity of which Americans so often boast.

If the only thing that had been developed were such things as farms and factories, probably we might hesitate, but, Mr. President, I picked up the other day a book by Mr. Howard Elliott, who has recently been made president of the New York, New Haven & Hartford. He gives the rates of transporting freight in this country and abroad. I will put the tables into the Record. Before I do so let me state that for the United Kingdom of Great Britain the cost per ton per mile is 2.33 cents, for Germany it is 1.41 cents, for Austria 1.45 cents, for Holland 1.32 cents, and for the United States of America 0.741 cent. That is a marvelous result to be obtained in a new country, a sparsely settled country, like ours.

But let me go on and show you something of the conditions under which it has been obtained. The cost of labor shown in another part of this volume is 60 per cent of the whole cost of the railroad business, and the average wages paid railroad employees per year in the United Kingdom are \$270, in the German Empire \$388, in France \$260, in Austria \$277, and so on for the different countries.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President—

Mr. LIPPITT. May I finish the sentence? Whereas in the United States of America the wages are \$733. In other words, the rate of wages is more than double the wages paid in the other railroad countries of the world, while we have a rate for transportation that is from one-half to two-thirds only of the

rate that is charged in those countries. I will now yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WALSH. I desire to inquire of the Senator from Rhode Island, without intending at all to combat the conclusion to which his argument would lead, whether the discrepancy between the cost of transporting freight in this country and in Europe is not assignable in a very large measure to two facts: First, that in Europe, taking Germany particularly, the vast tonnage of low-grade freight is transported by canal, thus elevating, as a matter of course, the average cost of transporting such freights as are carried by railroads; and, second, inasmuch as the distances over which freight is carried in Europe are very much less than in this country, the terminal charges necessarily become a higher factor in the cost of transportation.

Is it not a fact that those two elements may account for very much of the difference which thus is most fortunately in our favor in the matter of freight?

Mr. LIPPITT. It is quite possible that some of the conditions which the Senator from Montana instances may account for some of this difference. Passengers are not largely carried on freight boats, and there is a very material difference in the passenger rates between this country and abroad. The first-class passenger rate in Germany is 3 cents a mile, in England 4 cents, and there are different figures which I will not take the time at this moment to read. But in addition to all that the fact remains that whatever may be the conditions which might modify this result, nobody accustomed to commercial matters can question for a moment that it is enormously creditable that the great men who for these long years have been building up our railroad system in this country should have been able to give us an average rate that is anywhere near the average rate abroad, when the cost of labor here is more than double the cost of the labor that they have to use abroad.

The table referred to is as follows:

	Cents.
United Kingdom	2.33
Germany	1.41
France	1.32
Russia	.95
Austria	1.45
Hungary	1.31
Denmark	2.16
Holland	1.32
Switzerland	2.91
United States	.741

And here are some figures for capitalization per mile of road:

United Kingdom	\$275,000
Germany	114,000
France	144,000
Russia, including Siberia	81,000
Austria	118,000
Hungary	67,000
Denmark	58,000
Holland	82,000
Switzerland	117,000
United States	60,000

And here are the average wages paid railroad employees per year:

United Kingdom	\$270
German Empire	388
France	260
Russian Empire	196
Austria	277
Hungary	283
Italy	287
Switzerland	292
United States	733

The argument which I want to make out of this circumstance is simply this: That we have organized in this country a set of railroad builders who have given us magnificent results under the system which we have so long used; that they are perfectly ready to undertake the problem of Alaskan transportation; and that there is no necessity of stepping outside of an agency that we know all about to employ one the results of whose management no man can foretell.

Mr. President, when the inhabitants of this country shall come to look to their Government for the direct management of their commercial development I think they will begin to lose the characteristic which is the most valuable that the people of a nation can possess, the faculty of initiative, of courage, and of independence. Anyone who has had experience in the employment of men knows that the one difficult and almost impossible thing to procure is a man of personal initiative, a man who will go outside of the beaten track, who will do something to-morrow differently from what he did yesterday, who will discover effective ways of meeting new problems. It is the possession of that faculty which has built up this country. The circumstances of our development has educated for us a class of men who are preeminent among all the people of the world in that respect. This Government ownership is the first

step toward diminishing that independent spirit among our people.

Government building and Government management lead to extravagances of all kinds. It leads to a government by a bureau instead of a government by your neighbors and friends. I believe that one of the very worst things that could be done to Alaska would be to take away from her the opportunities which a great country like that possesses for the development of men and substitute for it a system of business that is controlled by a Government several thousand miles away which is too busy and too dilatory to give it the close attention that it needs.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I want for a few moments to address the Senate upon an amendment to the bill that has been printed and that I expect to offer when the proper time arrives. I should like to have the Secretary at this point read the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be read.

The SECRETARY. On page 8, after line 20, add:

The President of the United States is hereby further empowered, authorized, and directed to construct or cause to be constructed, not less than 10 nor more than 20 vessels suitable and appropriate for the freight and passenger service between the ports of Alaska and other ports on the eastern and western shores of North America and the ports on the eastern and western shores of South America. Said vessels shall be constructed as near as may be so that they will be suitable for use in aid of the Navy of the United States as a merchant marine. After the same are constructed, the President is hereby authorized, upon such terms as he may deem best, to lease the same to the Panama Railroad Co. For the purpose of building said vessels the President is hereby authorized to raise money and to expend the same in accordance with the terms provided in this act, not exceeding the amount of \$15,000,000.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, in my judgment, if this amendment were added to the bill it would go a great ways toward the carrying out of the purposes and the objects of the proposed law providing for the building of railroads in Alaska.

I am just informed that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] had expected to follow the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT].

Mr. DILLINGHAM. It makes no difference. I would just as soon follow the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. I had a talk with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], and he told me that he did not know of anyone who was going to address the Senate on the bill to-day, but I am perfectly willing to yield to the Senator.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I am perfectly willing to wait until the Senator has discussed his amendment, and then I will take the floor.

Mr. NORRIS. It will be seen, Mr. President, from the reading of the amendment that it probably goes a great deal further than is necessary for the carrying out of the objects of the bill, and yet I believe it must be admitted, from the evidence that has been presented before the committee and statements made on the floor here by Senators in discussing the bill, that the bill itself is not complete unless we make provision for the carrying of the products of the mines of Alaska from the shores of Alaska to the different ports of the country.

I confess, however, that while in my judgment I think it would strengthen the bill and carry out its purposes more completely, the greater purpose in my mind in offering the amendment, and the greater object I have in view, is to develop the commerce between the ports of North and South America—to develop if possible the trade that everybody admits ought to be developed with the ports of the different countries of South America.

The Panama Canal, now nearing completion, will be used mostly by ships of foreign nations. If we should pass this kind of an amendment it would enable the Government of the United States to put vessels upon the waters of the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans to ply between the ports of North and South America, so that the trade that every American citizen is anxious should be developed between this country and South America could be developed and could be brought to us, where, as a matter of geography and as a matter of business and as a matter of commerce, most of it ought to be.

It is undisputed, I think, that while the combinations existing in Alaska have made it necessary, in the judgment of those who are behind this bill, to urge the building of railroads by the Government of the United States in that Territory, in addition there is a combination between the owners of vessels that ply between the shores of Alaska and the ports of the Pacific coast. This was brought out quite extensively by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH]. It was mentioned in some detail by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES], and also by the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER]. So, after we have developed the coal fields of Alaska and the mines and have brought her products to her shores, they must be shipped to the ports of the Pacific coast and other places upon vessels

owned by men who, it is conceded, I believe, are already in control of the situation, and who would have it within their power to exact such rates as would practically nullify the legislation that we would pass here, as far as the railroads are concerned.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I think it is safe for me to say that heretofore there has been rather a wide difference of opinion between the Senator from Nebraska and myself as to the best means of rehabilitating our almost entirely vanished merchant marine.

Mr. NORRIS. I am going to discuss that subject, I will say to the Senator, before I conclude.

Mr. GALLINGER. I assume that the Senator in this amendment has in view the probable development, to some extent at least, of the American merchant marine, which is a commendable object; but I will call the attention of the Senator to one fact in connection with his amendment. Heretofore we have thought that in developing our trade with South America it was desirable to have ships that left our great ports, like Boston, New York, Baltimore, and Philadelphia, carrying the commerce of our great country. It seems to me that this amendment provides simply that the products of Alaska shall be carried in these ships to South and Central America. Does the Senator think there will be a commerce of sufficient consequence to warrant the investment of, as I think, from ten to twenty million dollars in building ships for this purpose?

Mr. NORRIS. No; and the Senator has not grasped the real object of the amendment. Of course, as a parliamentary proposition, I had to prepare an amendment that would be in order on this bill. I think the fact that these railroads will come down to the ports of Alaska makes it in order as a parliamentary proposition to offer this amendment, although I have not believed, and I do not believe, that the ships I have provided for here would all be used or could all be used in carrying coal from Alaska. I do not believe that you can put that kind of a construction on the amendment. If the amendment were adopted, I think the President would have some of those necessary vessels engaged in the carrying of coal from Alaska to other ports, wherever the other ports might be found to be located, with a view of making the traffic profitable, but the larger number of them would undoubtedly be engaged in the general carrying of freight and passengers between the eastern and the western ports of both North and South America. That is the object of the amendment. If it would not bear that construction, then I am mistaken in its language.

Mr. GALLINGER. I trust that the amendment will bear that interpretation. I fear that it does not or can not bear the interpretation. However, that is a matter which can be carefully looked into.

Mr. NORRIS. Oh, yes; I will say to the Senator if it can not bear that interpretation any amendment that is necessary to give it that interpretation would not only be desirable, but would be readily supported by myself.

Mr. President, I am not going to take up the time of the Senate in discussing the question of trade with South America. I assume that all Senators and all citizens of the country are anxious that the trade with South America shall be developed. We have spent about \$400,000,000 in digging the canal. We brought all those ports, commercially speaking, much nearer to our ports than they were before. The whole world is making preparations to use the canal. South of us all the countries of South America are trading almost entirely with Europe, and it strikes me that everybody in the United States is desirous, if it can be done, of getting at least a portion of that trade which we do not now possess, and that we will not possess until some steps are taken in some way to put the necessary ships on the ocean to develop it.

Mr. WALSH. May I interrupt the Senator?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WALSH. The Government of the United States owns quite a line of steamships now.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes, sir; I expect to take that up and discuss it shortly.

Mr. WALSH. Is it the opinion of the Senator that when those ships are released from the duties that have been devolved upon them during recent years in connection with the construction of the canal they would not be available for the purpose he has in mind?

Mr. NORRIS. I think they would be available. I am going to discuss that, I will say to the Senator, shortly. I want now to mention the merchant-marine proposition. That is a question which has been discussed and has been an issue in a good many political campaigns. While, as far as I know, men of all political beliefs are anxious that we should develop a merchant marine, men have disagreed very widely as to how we should obtain it. I think the methods that have been proposed in the past, that were advocated by the Presidents who have preceded the present occupant of the White House, have met such serious objections, in my judgment objections well founded, that there will be no attempt to revive the agitation of obtaining a merchant marine in the method which has been advocated in the past.

I do not believe the American people are in favor of a ship subsidy; I do not believe it is necessary that we should have one in order to develop our merchant marine; but everybody concedes that we are seriously handicapped in that respect, and that in case of war we should be at the mercy of those who owned the ships; we should be compelled to pay what might be asked for them; and in many cases we should be unable to get them at all. So our Navy, to a great extent, would be rendered useless.

When our naval fleet went around the world and when it made its recent trip to the Mediterranean, from which it has just returned, we heard it said that it was necessary to engage foreign ships in order to carry the coal to supply our Navy. It seems to me that the adoption of my amendment would furnish a method of getting a merchant marine that would not be expensive, and that the United States would be able to obtain vessels, in case it needed a merchant marine, without paying a dollar for the use of the ships which are provided for in the amendment. The amendment provides that the President may lease these ships when they are constructed to the Panama Railroad Co. It is my theory that, if the amendment be adopted and the ships should be constructed, the President will avail himself of this discretion to lease the vessels to the Panama Railroad Co.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BRISTOW. Why not simply make an appropriation and authorize the Panama Railroad Co. to construct the ships and operate the line—is there to do it if the means are provided—instead of going the roundabout way of having the ships constructed by the Government and then leased to this corporation, the stock of which is owned by the Government?

Mr. NORRIS. That would do very well; but such an amendment would not be in order, as a parliamentary proposition on this bill. A separate bill to that effect, if enacted into law, would accomplish the same thing which this amendment seeks to accomplish; but every Senator knows that between the introduction of the bill and the reaching of the stage of parliamentary procedure, which we have now reached on the pending bill, there are many dangerous steps and a great many obstacles to encounter.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Nebraska will permit me, I think the Senator is somewhat influenced by the rules of another body in reference to the parliamentary procedure. We have no rule of relevancy here in the matter of amendments, except in reference to appropriation bills, and I feel sure that the Senator's amendment would be equally relevant and pertinent to this bill if he should draft it along the line suggested by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BRISTOW].

Mr. NORRIS. It would not be any better, in my judgment, than my amendment, although I concede it would be just as good, and I would just as soon support it; but I should like to say, while it does not bear directly on this question, in reply to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], that my observation for several years, and my experience for a very much shorter time, of what is in order and what is out of order in the Senate, depends to a great extent upon the individual opinions or perhaps the wishes of some of those Senators who have been here so long that they carry in their minds and in their recollections rules that are not printed in the book. I think I have seen a good many instances where points of order have been made, and made by those Senators, and everybody has conceded at once that the points of order were well made. I do not want to run up against that kind of a proposition.

Mr. President, the Panama Railroad Co., as the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BRISTOW] has said, is a corporation, every dollar of the stock of which is owned by the United States. It has been operating a railroad in Panama and a line of steamships

from Colon to New York and part of the time to Philadelphia, I believe, ever since we have been engaged in the construction of the Panama Canal. It is a corporation that goes into the market the same as any other corporation engaged in transportation, advertises, and does business in exactly the same way, and attempts to get business the same as do other corporations, excepting, perhaps, that it does not charge, and has not charged, the Government as high a rate in transporting articles to Panama as the owners of private steamships have charged.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. NORRIS. I again yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. BRISTOW. I desire to say that the Panama Railroad Co. competes for Government business with private lines, and, if the private lines underbid it, it loses the business.

Mr. NORRIS. Certainly; but, as a matter of fact, to the extent of their capacity, as a rule, they underbid the private lines.

Mr. BRISTOW. Very frequently it loses important shipments because the private lines underbid it.

Mr. NORRIS. I have here in my hand the official report of the board of directors to the stockholders of the Panama Railroad Co. for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1913. It is a very comprehensive and full report, showing operations both of the railroad and the steamship lines; and I have found from an examination of the figures that are itemized here that, as a rule, they have carried freight cheaper than any other line between New York City and Panama, and that, as a rule, the Government has paid less per ton to them than to anyone else.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, if the Senator from Nebraska will kindly yield—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BRISTOW. I think it has to do it or it does not get the business.

Mr. NORRIS. That may be; but my statement is that it does do it and that it does get the business.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator if the statement to which he alludes shows the profits and losses of this corporation?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. GALLINGER. Has it been a profitable corporation?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; I will give those figures. I am about to come to that point in my address where I expected to put those figures into the Record.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is important in giving the figures, I think, Mr. President, that the initial cost should be taken into consideration.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not have that, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. CUMMINS. I ask the Senator from Nebraska whether it be not true that shortly after the United States acquired the stock of the Panama Railroad and the steamship company there was not a very marked reduction in the general freight rates from New York to Colon or to Panama? I am under the impression that those who are familiar with it believe that the ownership of this property by the United States brought about a reduction of about \$3 a ton in those rates. I think I got that from the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BRISTOW] in some fashion or other, and if the Senator from Nebraska can not answer the question, I am sure that the Senator from Kansas can.

Mr. NORRIS. I had not expected that the question would be asked or I should have marked it, but in this report somewhere—I do not feel as though I am justified in taking the time of the Senate to look it up now—there is a statement as to the price per ton charged by various transportation companies from New York to Colon; and I was impressed with the fact that the price per ton by the Panama Railroad Co. was lower than any of them. I want to say to the Senator that I am under the impression—I do not believe there is any doubt about it—that what he has stated is true; that when the Panama Railroad Co. commenced to engage in the business of transporting freight and passengers from New York to Colon, it did reduce the freight charges very materially.

Mr. CUMMINS. My understanding is that not only did they charge less than the rates formerly prevailing, but that these competitive influences reduced the rates of the independent carriers between those points.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes,

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BRISTOW. I do not now remember the exact figures, though I was very familiar with them at one time; but I was told by one of the general officers of the Panama Railroad Co. that so great was the reduction in rates between New York and Colon as a result of the competition between the Panama Railroad Co. and Steamship Line and other steamship lines that at one time he was approached by the representatives of some European line with the view of entering into an agreement as to rates and increasing the rates over what they were, because those representatives of foreign interests said the rates were too low, these gentlemen, of course, not understanding that the stock of the Panama Railroad Co. was owned by the United States Government, thinking that it was still a private line, as it was during the French ownership of the company. He declined because he said the business was very profitable to the Panama Steamship Line, and there was no occasion for any advance in rates.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I am very much obliged to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BRISTOW] for that observation, and I want to say that it is in accordance with my recollection of the situation. I do not believe there is any doubt whatever about it.

Mr. President, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1913, the steamship line operated by the Panama Railroad Co. had a total revenue of \$2,151,157.99 and a total expense of \$1,929,668.07, leaving a net revenue after the payment of all expenses of \$221,489.92. I have an itemized statement of the income and of the expenses, but unless some other Senator desires it put into the Record, I shall not encumber the Record with it.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think it would be very important in making that estimate that we should have the interest on the original cost of those ships—

Mr. NORRIS. I think so.

Mr. GALLINGER. And that we should have also the expenses, the overhead charges, as they might be called.

Mr. NORRIS. As I understand, they are all included.

Mr. GALLINGER. Do they include the salaries of the officials who have control of those ships, or are they Government officials who receive salaries for other reasons?

Mr. NORRIS. It includes all the salaries of officials of the Panama Railroad Co., and those who control these ships are such officials; but it does not, of course, include Government officials.

Mr. BRISTOW. If the Senator will pardon me for interrupting him so often, I desire to say that the officers employed by the Panama Railroad Co. are not Government appointees at all, any more than are the officer and employees of the Santa Fe Railroad Co. or of any steamship line. They are simply the employees of a corporation which is run just exactly like any other corporation. The directors are selected by the Secretary of War, who holds the stock in trust for the United States Government.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am not talking about the Panama Railroad Co. I am talking about the steamship company.

Mr. BRISTOW. The steamship line is operated by the Panama Railroad Co.

Mr. NORRIS. That is only one of the operations of that railroad company. They operate, as I said in the beginning, the railroad and also a line of steamships.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Government owns the steamships, does it not?

Mr. NORRIS. The Government owns all of the stock of this corporation. The Panama Railroad Co. owns the railroad and owns some of the ships and charters other ships. I will give a list of them shortly.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is very evident, of course, Mr. President, to the most casual thinker that if the Government is going into business in competition with private parties and the Government constructs factories and runs them in opposition to private parties, the private concerns are necessarily going to the wall in competition with the Government, it seems to me.

Mr. NORRIS. I take it that the Government could do that; but I do not have the remotest idea that the Government would want to do anything of the kind.

In the next place, this is not building a factory, but supplying what the Senator himself a while ago suggested ought to be supplied in some way, although I do not mean to insinuate that it ought to be supplied in this way.

Mr. GALLINGER. No.

Mr. NORRIS. But it will supply a need of the Government; I think we will all admit that.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have no doubt that the Government can do anything and everything it chooses. The Government can take over every private business in this country if it wishes to do so.

Mr. NORRIS. But I am speaking, if the Senator from New Hampshire will permit me, particularly now of the merchant marine. The Senator from New Hampshire as well as myself and all other Senators are anxious that the Government should be supplied; and I think this would supply it—at least to the extent of the ships that we would build.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, my conviction is—I may be wrong about it; time will demonstrate that if it is ever attempted that it will be the most expensive merchant marine that any country ever engaged in building or in operating.

Mr. NORRIS. My own idea is that it would be much cheaper for the Government to construct these ships, lease them to the Panama Railroad Co., and have them used for the purpose of developing commerce between our country and South America and Central America and Mexico, and between our own ports, than it would be to engage to pay a subsidy to private persons to build the same ships to go into the same business, and then, when we need the ships, if we ever do, to take them over at a cost that would perhaps be increased greatly by the very exigency of the occasion.

Mr. GALLINGER. All of the ship lines which are now receiving what the Senator chooses to call "a subsidy," which is simply mail pay, do so under the act of 1891; and there is a provision in that statute that the Government may take the ships at any time that it chooses when there is an exigency.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; but it has to pay for them.

Mr. GALLINGER. It has to pay for them, of course.

Mr. NORRIS. In this case it could take them from the Panama Railroad Co., a corporation which it owns, and it would not be necessary to pay for them.

Mr. GALLINGER. But somebody must have paid for them in advance.

Mr. NORRIS. Certainly; the Government will pay for them in advance.

Mr. GALLINGER. They did not grow down in the region of the Panama Canal; they had been constructed at somebody's expense.

Mr. NORRIS. Nobody contends anything to the contrary; but whatever benefit there would be, the necessity of the Government being able to get ships in case it needed them would be met at least to the extent of the number of ships that we would build, and there would be no probability or possibility of the Government being held up at the time it took the ships.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President—

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. BRISTOW. I merely want to say, in connection with this matter, that I do not believe the Panama Railroad, if it were owned and operated by the Government in a direct way, as we operate the Post Office Department, would ever pay. I think the only practicable way to operate the Panama steamship line and the Panama Railroad is just as it has been done, as a separate, individual corporation that is run as a private business and not as a Government function. The facts are that the Panama Railroad Co. and its steamship line in their entire operation are run just the same as any chartered corporation that is under the ownership of private proprietors. If anyone will study—if the Senator will pardon me for taking so much of his time—the operations of the Panama Railroad since its stock has been acquired by the United States Government, and what that company has done in connection with Panama and in the construction of the canal, he will perceive that it stands out to-day as the greatest achievement in history in civil administration.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to add to what the Senator has said that during all the time the Government has been operating this road I have yet to hear of the first instance where there has been in connection with the operation and the management of the Panama Railroad Co. one single instance of graft, with the exception of the one instance which was recently given some publicity in the newspapers and which I think is now under investigation. That is a record which very few railroads in the world can boast of in the same length of time.

Mr. President, it might be interesting—it does not bear directly on the ship proposition, but I am going to call attention to it, because there has been so much said about the Panama Railroad Co.—it might be interesting to notice and call attention to the total revenues and expenses of the Panama Railroad Co. outside of the operation of its ships. The total revenue for the same year was \$1,516,734.43. The total expense of the railroad, outside of the ships, was \$813,795.25, leaving a net revenue of \$702,929.18. That, of course, is the net revenue of

the operation of the Panama Railroad Co. proper and has nothing to do with the operation of the ships, which I have mentioned before.

Mr. GALLINGER. But, Mr. President, is not that revenue in one sense a fictitious revenue—that is to say, is it not due to the tremendous amount of business given that railroad because of the construction of the Panama Canal?

Mr. NORRIS. Oh, yes.

Mr. GALLINGER. And is it not a fact that as soon as the canal is completed that revenue will largely disappear?

Mr. NORRIS. So far as that railroad is concerned, I think that is true; yes, sir.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me again—

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. BRISTOW. I would not want that statement to go without question, because it is the belief of a great many who have studied the transportation situation in Panama—

Mr. NORRIS. Before the Senator goes on, I will say that I made a mistake in the figures which I gave. I read from the wrong column the figures which I have just given in regard to the Panama Railroad Co. I want to correct them, if the Senator from Kansas will permit me, while we are on that subject.

The total revenue of the railroad proper was \$4,599,163.13. The total expenses were \$2,770,310.45, leaving a net revenue of \$1,828,852.68. The figures which I gave before were the figures applying to the Panama Railroad Co. proper since the end of the fiscal year. That would be for four months, commencing with the 1st day of July and ending October 31.

While I am on that subject, and before the Senator interrupts me again, I should like to give for that same length of time, those same four months, the figures in regard to the operation of the ships proper. The total revenue during those four months—that is the latest report we have—ending October 31 from the operation of the ships was \$755,026.81; the total expenses were \$659,245.35, leaving a net revenue for those four months of \$95,781.46. Now I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. BRISTOW. Referring to the operation of the Panama Railroad Co. after the canal is completed, a great many who have given careful study to the transportation situation in Panama believe that it will be a profitable line after the canal is in operation, because there will be a great deal of small business which will have to be done over the railroad which can be done very much more cheaply in that way than by ships through the canal. The railroad probably will be run to its full capacity in handling trans-Isthmian freight.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator from Nebraska will permit me, I will ask the Senator from Kansas, who is well informed on this matter, if it is not in contemplation to abandon the steam railroad and substitute an electric railroad?

Mr. BRISTOW. Yes; because it is believed that it can be run very much more cheaply with electricity that comes from the waste waters of the Chagres River than by other power; and that that will be the proper way to operate it.

Mr. GALLINGER. I had an impression that that was in contemplation.

Mr. BRISTOW. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I should like to say that I think the Senator from New Hampshire was right when he said that the revenues from the operation of the railroad company from the work which it has had down there on the Isthmus would be materially decreased after the canal was in operation. I assented to that; but I did not mean to be understood as saying that there would be no further use for the railroad company. That has not anything to do, however, with the particular amendment which I am discussing; but in order to give some additional information to the Senator from New Hampshire I want to read an extract from the report of the president of the Panama Railroad Co., Col. Goethals, contained in the same report from which I have given these figures. He says:

Regarding the future policy of the company as related to the opening of the Panama Canal to commerce, the board of directors, after mature consideration of the topic in conference with the Secretary of War, the company's principal shareholder, decided to continue to operate the railroad and steamship line as at present, except for such modification of existing practices as may be expedient from time to time to meet changed conditions.

Mr. President, in conclusion, I want to say a word about the effect, in my judgment, that would be produced if this amendment were adopted and enacted into law. The ships provided for would not be a drop in the bucket so far as the number of ships that would be necessary to carry on the trade between all the points of North and South America. It is not my idea or my intention, nor do I believe that anybody desires, that steps should be taken to try to get a monopoly of this trade or any part of it by the building of not less than 15 nor more than 20

vessels. If that number is not adequate, it can easily be changed; as experience develops what the necessities are, we can easily give authority to the President to build additional ships if necessary. The idea is that if the ships were built and put upon the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans to ply between the ports of North and South America through the Panama Canal, it would be a barometer of rates and there would be no danger with that many ships owned by the Government of the United States—for that is what it would mean if they were owned by the Panama Railroad Co.—there would be no danger anywhere in North or South America of a combination of shipowners by which unreasonable and exorbitant rates could be exacted or demanded from commerce. So that, in my judgment, the great benefit that would come would be the stability and the guaranty to commerce that it would be free; that there would be real genuine competition; and that the charges would be in accordance with the services rendered. Therefore, Mr. President, it seems to me that not only would this amendment assist directly to control the price of coal that would be mined in Alaska, but it would go further and be a complete barometer of rates between all the ports of North and South America.

I promised the Senator from Montana, I believe, that I would give a list of the ships.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, before the Senator from Nebraska leaves that point—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHEPPARD in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not know whether he has noticed the fact—and if he has not, I think it would be a powerful supplement to his argument—that we are paying now from seven to ten dollars a ton for coal that is used by our battleships on the Pacific coast, which mainly, of course, comes around the Horn in merchant ships. These merchant ships are mainly owned by citizens of foreign countries and sail under foreign flags. I should like to know why it is not just as legitimate for the Government to build a merchant ship and use it in carrying coal to its own battleships as it is to own battleships and sail them or steam them around the Horn?

Mr. NORRIS. To my mind, there is no answer to the Senator's argument. It seems to me that it is just as reasonable to do the one as the other.

Mr. CUMMINS. The ships that are proposed by the Senator from Nebraska are necessary as a supplement to our Navy, and they ought to be built; they ought to have been built long ago.

Mr. GALLINGER. Well, Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. GALLINGER. On that point it is variously estimated that we are paying foreign ships to-day for carrying our commerce to and fro across the Atlantic Ocean and the Pacific Ocean between two and three hundred million dollars a year. Would the Senator, for the purpose of reducing the cost to the American exporter or the American passenger, be in favor of the Government building a fleet of ships to ply across the Atlantic and across the Pacific Oceans in competition with private corporations?

Mr. NORRIS. In answer to the Senator, let me say that, in the first place, I would not do it for the purpose of helping people to go across. I would not be in favor of that kind of a proposition now, even to carry freight. There is a different condition existing that has developed. We have, however, just about completed the Panama Canal. We wish to get our share of the trade of South America. We are not going to get it unless we do something of this kind. Other ships, flying a foreign flag, are going to use that canal more than we are. We have already a corporation engaged profitably in the operation of ships, in connection with which no one, so far as I know, has uttered a word of criticism as to its management, as to its honesty, or as to the ability with which it is managed. Nothing of that kind has been charged. This is simply to give a greater usefulness to that corporation, and enable it to bring the merchants of the United States into contact with the merchants and the business men of South America. Incidentally, it does what the Senator from Iowa has so well suggested; it enables us to use these ships, besides, in case of emergency and in case of war.

Of course, we all hope that necessity will not come, and that these ships may continue forever, or at least as long as they last, to carry on the more peaceful operations of trade between the ports of North and South America.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will venture to suggest—and I will not interrupt the Senator again—that in case of war the handful of ships that is going to be provided through the Senator's

amendment will not accomplish a very useful purpose. We will need a great many more ships than those as auxiliaries to our warships if we ever get into war with a first-rate power.

Mr. NORRIS. Probably we will; and perhaps when we start out and build the number of ships provided here and get them on the waters we will find that we ought to double the number, and that they are doing good work and increasing our trade, and that by adding some more we will get more trade. That may occur; I do not know. In my judgment, however, it is no argument for the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire to say that this amendment should not be adopted because it does not provide enough ships. I take it from what he has said that he is going to vote against the amendment, and yet he is criticizing it because there are not enough ships provided here.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the amendment should be agreed to, I want it to be as perfect as possible. I shall vote against it, in whatever form it is put, if it provides for Government ownership either of railroads or of steamships; but I am going to try as best I can, before the vote is taken on the amendment, to improve it. The Senator will not object to that, I am sure.

Mr. NORRIS. I will not; certainly. I shall be glad to have the Senator's assistance in that respect.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator.
Mr. BRANDEGEE. I will not interrupt the Senator if he desires to proceed without interruption.

Mr. NORRIS. I have no objection to an interruption. I had about concluded my remarks.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Not having heard the first part of the Senator's remarks, I wish to ask the Senator whether he contemplates that the vessels provided for in his amendment shall enter upon general carrying trade?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.
Mr. BRANDEGEE. Anything that offers?

Mr. NORRIS. Anything that is offered. As the Senator did not hear me, I will briefly state to him that the idea is that if they are constructed they shall be leased by the Government to the Panama Railroad Co.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Yes; I understand; and operated through that company.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.
Mr. BRANDEGEE. Of course, however—that is, I will not say a subterfuge, but a mere agent of the Government in the operation, as are the existing steamships owned by that company.

Mr. NORRIS. Certainly.
Mr. BRANDEGEE. I think the proposition made by the Senator from Nebraska raises a very important issue. If the Government is to build ships and engage in general commerce in competition with shipping lines owned by private capital, it seems to me that before we enter on that policy it would be well to consider carefully where it would probably lead us. It may be desirable to do it; I do not know; but I am free to confess that at first blush and without having given it any particular consideration it seems to me it is likely to lead us into the field and to point a precedent for the Government engaging in various enterprises in competition with its own citizens.

Whether that is desirable or not is another question. I agree that we are already doing that and have been for some years, especially in relation to our Army and Navy equipment. We furnish factories to make armor plate, and we build our ships in Government yards to some extent. All of those activities are in competition with private concerns. But if we are to build ships to bring coal from Alaska to furnish the Navy in part, it seems to me with equal reason we might build railroads from oil fields to bring oil to furnish our ships. I believe oil is coming to be more and more used as a vessel fuel, and that Great Britain especially operates its warships largely with oil fuel.

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator will permit me right there, I concede that that might be true, and in a proper case I would be perfectly willing to do it; but I do not know of any oil fields that are so out of reach of transportation that already exists that there would be any particular reason why it should be done.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. No; nor I, and I am not familiar with either the oil situation or the coal situation. As I say, we might be justified, for all I know, in engaging in both operations.

Of course, it has been said that the coal of the country is practically monopolized. It has been said that the oil of the country, also, is practically monopolized, and that therefore it

would be justifiable for the Government to establish competition of its own in relation to these matters.

I am merely drawing attention to the general principle of the Government entering into furnishing supplies for its own legitimate activities, and then, incidentally, in order to use its equipment in full, filling up with general merchandise in competition with privately owned vessels.

Mr. NORRIS. I think the distinction the Senator draws is very clear. While we are not interested at present, at least, in any of the particular lines that he suggests, so far as I am concerned I would not hesitate in any case if I thought it were necessary, and the most practical way to break up an unreasonable combination by which extortionate rates were charged for transportation, to have the Government engage in it if it could. In this particular case, however, we are in the main, at least, if this amendment should be agreed to and enacted into law, engaging in a field where private parties are not now engaged. We are trying to develop, by means of this amendment, our commerce between the United States and all the countries on the Western Hemisphere south of us. The greatest good, in my judgment, that would come from it would be that development, and the effect that the Government owning enough ships to have an effect upon the transportation business would have in equalizing the rates and keeping them fair and reasonable.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I understand the Senator, and I am not saying what I say at all in a spirit of antagonism, or even of criticism.

Mr. NORRIS. I understand that.
Mr. BRANDEGEE. I say it simply to understand it clearly,

as it strikes me that if commerce in South America with the private citizens of other countries is to be competed for by the United States Government we are entering upon a vast field. If we are not only to compete with foreign citizens for the trade of foreign countries, but are to compete with our own citizens for that trade, it strikes me it would be calculated to discourage individual enterprise if it is known that the United States Government, with its treasury, is to operate in any industry in competition with a private individual. The business does not need to be conducted successfully. Any indebtedness that is incurred can be paid out of the Treasury of the United States.

As to other questions suggested by the Senator, that wherever a combination in a product which is needed by the Government is so strong as to maintain, as he says, extortionate prices, that condition furnishes an excuse for the Government to go into the same business, as I view it, perhaps without warrant of the Constitution, to engage as a merchant or a competitive business man for the purpose of suppressing combinations which are illegal, it seems to me that is a questionable policy. The thing for the Government to do, if a combination is illegal, is to suppress it by the law which prohibits it, and not to enter upon competition with it. Furthermore—and with one brief observation I shall have concluded—if every one of the particular instances which occur now and then, as illustrated by the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska, is to be followed by the Government going into competition with private citizens and private capital, I fear before long we shall be in the full exercise of socialism by this Government, lacking merely the name to describe properly the activities upon which our Government will have been almost unconsciously embarked.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield just for a moment, in line with a part of what the Senator from Connecticut was talking about?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Certainly.
Mr. WILLIAMS. Suppose you build a railroad up there which belongs to the Government. There are now 466 miles of railway there. The railways there now pay a tax of \$100 per annum per mile. I take it that the Government railroad would not pay that tax, or does the Senator from Nebraska think it would?

Mr. NORRIS. No; and I should like to say to the Senator in that connection that he is talking about something that I have not discussed. I have not discussed the railroad proposition. What I have said related entirely to ships.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] was talking about bringing this Government-managed affair into unfair competition with a privately owned enterprise.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. He was talking about steamship lines.
Mr. WILLIAMS. I know; but the same reasoning applies to railroads. If a railroad that paid no tax to the Government came into competition in any degree with one that paid a tax of \$100 per mile, it would be only a question of time when the one that paid the tax of \$100 a mile would have to quit running, it strikes me.

Mr. NORRIS. The \$100 a mile—while that has nothing to do with what I am discussing, and I should prefer that it had not been brought into the discussion—I will say to the Senator, as I understand, is the tax. It pays that in lieu of any tax. The Senator certainly would not advocate exempting the railroad from the payment of any tax.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But the Government-owned line would pay no tax of any sort.

Mr. NORRIS. Unless there was a law providing for it, which could be easily provided. I take it that if we entered upon the acquisition of the railroads of this country we probably would provide, not for a direct tax, perhaps, as the railroads are taxed now by most of the States, but for the payment of some percentage of the income, or something of that kind, in proportion to the mileage, to the different States through which the line would operate in lieu of a tax.

I think, myself, that if the Government went into the railroad business up in Alaska, and built a line parallel to an existing line, and made the rate, as it could, so low as to ruin the other line, below the cost of operation, it would be an unjust and unreasonable thing to do; and I would not by any means advocate such a procedure.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator will pardon me, the Government-owned road would not have to reduce the rate below the cost of operation. It could keep enough to pay interest upon what it had cost, and a slight sinking fund; and yet if the other line had to pay the ordinary taxes of the locality and, in Alaska, this \$100 per mile per annum, it would not be long before it would have to go out of business.

Mr. NORRIS. While there is not anything in this bill in regard to the tax or anything that shall be paid to the local authorities if the Government operates the road—

Mr. WILLIAMS. There is something in this bill, though, about a railroad to be owned by the Government, which necessarily would pay no tax if we passed this bill.

Mr. NORRIS. I was just going to say that. I say, in this particular bill there is not anything that requires the payment by the Government of any tax to Alaska; but the reasons given why we should build this road in Alaska—and in my judgment they are sufficient, although that is a question upon which honest men may disagree—are because the peculiar conditions that exist there make it necessary for the development of Alaska.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand that; but what I am trying to impress upon the Senator is that if this bill does pass, it ought to pass with an amendment exempting the railroads now existing there from this tax of \$100 per mile, so as to enable them to live with Government competition.

Mr. NORRIS. Personally, I do not know whether the \$100 tax is fair or not; but the railroads certainly ought not to be relieved from taxation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. By the way, I think that in a new and growing community like Alaska, where the main thing is to develop its resources, the railroads ought not to be taxed.

Mr. NORRIS. I want to say just a word in reply to what the Senator from Connecticut said about the Government entering upon different activities.

The proposition before us that I am discussing is not that the Government is going to go into the manufacturing business. If the amendment is agreed to, it is going into a business principally for the reason that there is not anyone now, as far as America is concerned at least, in the business, and we want to develop it. The proposition of going into manufacturing things that the Government uses, and thereby coming into competition with private parties that manufacture the same things, is justified, in my judgment, if, in the opinion of the Government officials, we are not getting a square deal. I myself have taken a great deal of pleasure in reading the announcement that the Secretary of the Navy was in favor of building a Government armor-plate factory, because we have been held up by armor-plate factories in the past. Although it would come into competition with private persons engaged in that business, it is justified on two grounds—one, that the Government has a right to make articles needed for its own use; and second, build factories so that in case of emergency it will not be dependent upon private parties for armor plate. It is shown by the Secretary of the Navy and those who have investigated the matter that the Government has been charged exorbitant and unreasonable prices by those private parties.

Now, I want to close my remarks.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Before the Senator closes, if he will allow me to interpolate one suggestion there, of course the Government has a right to do anything it thinks necessary for the well-being of this country and its people if it will amend its Constitution so as to authorize it so to do. We are, however, not only gradually entering upon the twilight zone and getting

into the penumbra of doubtful authority, but we are pretty well into it already, without ever having amended our Constitution; and we are doing a good many things for which nobody can cite any specific authority in the Constitution. It puzzles smarter men than even Philadelphia lawyers are alleged to be to find warrant or implied authority for many of the Government's activities at the present time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Raising horses, for example.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. All sorts of things—educating farmers, inspecting all sorts of things, giving information about all sorts of things, and collecting statistics about all sorts of things. It is an endless task, it appears to me, and every Congress is filled with propositions to plow farther into that unplowed field.

What I meant to say was that if we want to do these semi-socialistic things we should amend the Constitution so as to give us authority to do them. When I say "socialistic" I do not use that word as a term of reproach, but as defining a kind of government and a policy that does not yet exist in this country. There may be many desirable things about socialism, but as applied to a country of this size the fact that somebody believes in the system advocated by the Socialists does not prove that the country will be better off with it.

What I am afraid of is that if propositions like that contained in this bill, and those corollary thereto suggested by the Senator from Nebraska, become the fixed policy of this Government even as to Alaska—because we must bear in mind that they are not tried; they are simply experiments now, only on paper—if they should be tried and should be successful as applied to Alaska, what will we have in Alaska?

We will have, as it seems to me, a crown colony, run and exploited by the United States Government, with all the transportation owned and operated by the United States Government, both rail and water. Say what one has a mind to say; if the Government owns a railroad in Alaska and the steamboats running from there to Pacific coast points, and perhaps through the Panama Canal and to both coasts of South America, carrying the commerce, exports and imports, to and from Alaska and the rest of the world on this continent, at least, there is no man alive now, and there never will be, and no combination of them, that will ever have the audacity or the effrontery to enter into competition with the resources of 100,000,000 people managed by politicians, for that is the way Government ownership and operation is going to be managed.

When I say "politicians" I do not mean to reflect on anybody. Politics is a respectable calling. It is the science of government. The only way the Government can operate anything is by employing men to do it, and this is a Government of parties. One party beats the other party and takes possession of the Government, and mans and equips the agencies of government with its adherents. If we pass laws to provide that those operatives shall be permanent, and shall be maintained during good behavior, and of efficiency and demonstrated capacity, the minute a party that has been out of power long enough to get hungry enough gets in, I will not say by one pretext or another, but by one theory of policy, irrespective of what might have been their theory when they made the platform upon which they arrived at their destination, we see that suddenly the expert and qualified operatives who have had the experience and who have the capacity are suddenly stricken with inefficiency, and those who have never had any experience in the matter are the most efficient, and they get the jobs.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I wish to ask the Senator if he sees any large movement of that sort going on now?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I have not seen any large movement, but I have seen a good many alleged attempts and a great deal of literature upon the subject, and I have seen two bills passed in Congress by the votes of the party of the Senator from Mississippi which have done that to a certain extent.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I make the inquiry because I have been anxiously awaiting the rising of the sun of patronage, and it has not risen yet.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I have not the slightest idea that enough will be released to satisfy the appetite. Do not let the Senator from Mississippi misunderstand me. I think there will be wailing and howling in his State and in his neighborhood long after they have gotten all they can.

Mr. NORRIS. I am very thankful to the Senator for yielding the floor to me. [Laughter.] I will proceed now, and I will reciprocate when occasion arises.

Mr. President, I hope I shall not be interrupted again. I should like to conclude. Every time an interruption comes it seems to me it necessitates something of a reply; but before I undertake to reply I want to do what I started to do when I closed about an hour ago. [Laughter.]

In answer to the request of one of the Senators, I want to give a list of the steamships that were and are operated by the Panama Railroad Co. There are six, as I gather from this report, only two of which are owned by the corporation. Four of them, having a gross tonnage of from nearly 7,000 tons to nearly 10,000 tons, are chartered steamers. Two steamers, one of nearly 4,000 tons and one of nearly 3,000 tons, are owned by the corporation, the Panama Railroad Co.

In conclusion I want to say just a word, while it has not anything to do with the question I am discussing, in regard to some of the suggestions made by the able Senator from Connecticut. He says: "Suppose we build this railroad in Alaska and it turns out to be a success." Well, that would be a calamity. Suppose we do build it, and it turns out to be successful.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. The Senator need not worry about that.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator evidently is not worrying about it, but he is nevertheless somewhat fearful that it might be.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Oh, no; if the Senator will pardon me, I never said anything of the kind, if I was in my right mind.

Mr. NORRIS. I can not answer for that, but I think I know what the Senator said.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I did not say anything about success. I said if the Government operated the road and the steamship line nobody would be audacious enough to attempt to compete with them.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; the Senator said that, but I think the Senator will find he said "Suppose we build this railroad in Alaska and it turns out to be a success," or, "turns out successful," or words to that effect.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Oh, no. I did say, however, that if it turned out to have a deficit it would have to be paid for out of the Treasury.

Mr. NORRIS. Nobody has denied that.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I did not anticipate its success, in my wildest imagination.

Mr. NORRIS. I am not claiming, either, that it would be a financial success, at least for several years. Perhaps, it will be. I hope so. I think we are warranted in developing that great country, however, and opening up these coal fields, even though we know in advance that the railroad is not going to be a financial success.

But the Senator is also in error, I think, when he fears that if this bill as proposed to be amended should pass, particularly the amendment of which I am speaking, there would be danger of partisan political control of the corporation that would operate the ships. The proposition is to lease these ships to the Panama Railroad Co., a corporation that has been in operation ever since the beginning of the digging of the Panama Canal, and I have not heard, and I do not believe any Senator here has heard, of a single instance in all those years in the operation of that corporation that politics has controlled the appointment of any official or the operation or transactions of the corporation. A corporation owned by the Government with that kind of record, the efficiency of which has never been questioned, can, I think, be trusted to operate these ships in the development of a trade that we are all anxious to develop, and a trade that is now in control of European officials.

If it be unconstitutional, the remedy of the Senator from Connecticut will still exist after the bill is passed. I think it is conceded that the bill, even with the amendment that I have proposed, is constitutional. So I do not believe that that enters into the proposition. It is, in my judgment, a different proposition from entering a field that is now already supplied with commercial facilities. It is entering a great field of transportation that we have been trying for years and years to develop and in which we have made no headway. Private parties have not been able to do it, have not done it, and are not doing it. When private capital does undertake it, especially where there are but a few ships engaged in the trade, and gets a monopoly of the trade, then exorbitant rates are charged, the people must pay unreasonable rates, and business does not expand or develop. I do not believe that the Government would undertake to destroy any other transportation company if it went into the business, but it would prevent monopoly by making fair rates. When the trade with South America develops, if it ever does, there will spring up in various Atlantic and Pacific ports ships that will engage in this trade owned and operated by private parties. This, in my judgment, will develop a trade that we have been for years trying to develop, and will induce private parties to go into the business.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

Mr. NORRIS. I hope the Senator will let me conclude. I am about through.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will.

Mr. NORRIS. Although I will yield for a moment to the Senator, if he desires.

Mr. GALLINGER. I was about to suggest to the Senator that his hope in that respect is chimerical, for the reason that we can never operate ships to South America or to any other foreign country in competition with Germany, France, and England, with their subsidized lines of steamships, running them at so much less cost than we can run an American ship.

Mr. NORRIS. Now, let us put that argument right up against the argument of the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from Mississippi, who say, if we go into the business ourselves, private parties can not go into it because they can not compete with us while we are backed up by the Treasury of the United States. Now, the Senator from New Hampshire says that the Government of the United States can not make a success of it. If that be true, then it never will be developed by private parties who, according to the other two Senators, are handicapped away beyond the United States Government. If the Government of the United States could not develop the trade by the ships operated by the Panama Canal Co., then there would be no use for private individuals to undertake it. Hence there would be no objection to this bill on the ground that it would interfere with private parties operating similar lines.

Mr. GALLINGER. I do not think it will interfere much with private parties, but I believe it will be a losing venture on the part of the United States.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator, I take it, was anxious that we should provide by law for the proper kind of assistance to private ships that should operate between these same points, and that we should pay it out of the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes; for the transportation of the mails.

Mr. NORRIS. These vessels would transport the mail and probably at a less cost than we would have to pay to the subsidized ships that have been provided for in any ship subsidy bill that has ever yet been proposed.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will interrupt the Senator but a moment further. It is in line with my suggestion for amending the provision. The ocean mail act of 1891, under which we are paying a subvention—I do not call it a subsidy; it is a payment for transporting the mails, perhaps a little larger than the actual cost of transporting them—has several provisions in it that I think ought to be in this amendment; for instance, "that the vessels employed in the mail service under the provisions of this act shall be American-built steamships, owned and officered by American citizens, in conformity with the existing laws, or so owned and officered and registered according to law, and upon each departure from the United States the following proportion of the crew shall be citizens of the United States," and so forth. I will not read the necessary definition.

And further:

That all steamships of the first, second, and third classes employed as above and hereafter built shall be constructed with particular reference to prompt and economical conversion into auxiliary naval cruisers, and according to plans and specifications to be agreed upon by and between the owners and the Secretary of the Navy, and they shall be of sufficient strength and stability to carry and sustain the working and operation of at least four effective rifled cannon of a caliber of not less than 6 inches, and shall be of the highest rating known to maritime commerce.

Further, the speed of the vessels is provided for. One of these boats is to be a collier that can go only 8 or 10 knots an hour. It will be of no service in war.

Mr. NORRIS. It would be a good collier in war, would it not?

Mr. GALLINGER. It would be overtaken by a sailing vessel of some foreign country. You have to have speed in war; you have to have good ships. We would not think of building a war vessel of 12 knots an hour when England is building them of 22 knots an hour. Of course, they would be of no use to us.

Mr. NORRIS. England has a great many colliers that can not travel 22 knots an hour.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is very true; but the Senator is providing now for vessels, he says in his amendment, which can be converted into auxiliary naval vessels in time of war.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. GALLINGER. I wish the Senator would take the law which is now on the statute books and look it over, with a view of perhaps incorporating some of its provisions into his amendment. If the amendment is to be adopted, it ought to be made as perfect as possible.

Mr. NORRIS. Let me suggest to the Senator, I think most of those provisions are covered, provided we are willing to trust the President of the United States, because it proposes to give the authority to the President, and says that "said vessels

shall be constructed as near as may be so that they will be suitable for use in aid of the Navy of the United States as a merchant marine." My own idea is that if the President, the highest authority in the United States, were instructed to build these vessels with that provision in the law, he would see to it that all the necessary things, so far as they could, in a vessel to be used in general business, were incorporated into the plans and specifications of the ships.

Mr. GALLINGER. But the point I was trying to make, and very likely I stated it very awkwardly, is that the provisions relating to their being used as auxiliaries in time of war ought to be enlarged so that they would be of sufficient speed and be constructed according to specifications of the Navy Department so that these would be actually useful vessels. That is the point I was trying to make.

Mr. NORRIS. I can not conceive of the President, having authority to do that very thing under the bill, that would not do it. He has authority to do everything by this amendment suggested by the Senator. He is instructed to build them "as near as may be" so they will be suitable for a merchant marine. No one doubts, no one can doubt, that any President would under such a law see to it that all of these essentials were looked after.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, simply a word, replying to a remark of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS]. The Senator from New Hampshire says that these vessels could not compete, in his opinion, with foreign vessels which are subsidized. Of course everyone would agree that they could not compete with them and show the same kind of a balance sheet. They could not profitably compete with them.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is what I meant to say.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. There is no difference between the Senator from New Hampshire and myself. The Senator from Nebraska has attempted to make an argument out of it, as though it were a *reductio ad absurdum* statement. What I distinctly say is that of course the Government can compete as long as the Treasury will hold out to pay the deficit. It is simply another form to pay whatever is necessary to operate them. If the Senator from Nebraska thinks that that situation would be an inducement for a man of private capital to invest his fortune and put it in an enterprise with which he is being competed by all his fellow citizens combined in the form of the United States Government, I disagree with him about the probabilities; that is all.

It occurs to me that if this steamboat-operation proposition should be a success it will be a success because it gets the business. If it gets the business, it will be because somebody else does not get it. In other words, this Government line will either prevent other lines coming in competition or it will drive them out after they have begun to compete, or else the Government will be driven out; one of the two. They can not exist side by side. If the Government stands ready to take all the business that offers between Alaska and the Pacific coast and South America, it is bound to furnish facilities for doing it.

We start with the number of ships provided for by the Senator from Nebraska. If those are not enough to attend to the business, the next Congress will authorize more to be built, if that is the policy of the Government, and the Government is going to attend to this business. If it is the policy of the Government that that business ought to be attended to as other business is attended to and let private capital go in and operate, where it does it can make some money; and then the Government ought to keep out of that business. I do not think we can have both successfully. The Government is either going to succeed or fail in it. It will not fail as long as the people will stand the operation of the unprofitable business.

The Senator from Nebraska has also alluded to the fact that I said there would be danger of political manipulation about the operation of these boats. Of course I do not think there will be any particular trouble about the manning and equipment of the boats, but what I mean to say is that they are to be run as every other Government activity is run, by human beings here in Washington at the heads of the departments, and with changes in political control, changes in the personnel of the operative heads of those boats will make a great change in the business.

The fact that the Government owned and operated the Panama Railroad in Panama should furnish no precedent for this new embarkation in this Alaska scheme. The Government put on most of the steamboats that the Panama Railroad is operating to build the Panama Canal and to carry the material and the people who went there necessitated by that operation and not with the slightest intention of competing with its own merchants or sailors or citizens in the steamship business.

I do not think there is any reason for the Government now extending its operation in steamboat and railroad properties any more than in any other of the activities of life. I think those things had far better be left with all their troubles to private initiative, private capital. If great provinces like Alaska—and if Alaska, I do not know why not the Philippine Islands—are to be financed and exploited by the United States Government, I fear we are encumbering ourselves unwisely.

I do not know why the Government is under any obligation to develop the Territory of Alaska. There it is, a country such as it is, with its limitations, its climate, its difficulties, and with certain wealth to be achieved. It is to be developed. I do not know why it is necessary because the development is slow or the conditions are hard that the Government should rush in and insist upon developing it immediately. If it does not offer sufficient attraction for the people who subjugated the rigors and the difficulties of this country, which was a primeval wilderness, conquering the great American desert—if the Territory of Alaska does not offer opportunities and inducements enough for people who rose superior to the obstacles here in the United States to enter it and develop it, I see no reason why it should not lie idle. Whenever the commodities that Alaska offers become of sufficient value and the people need them badly enough, I have no doubt private capital will be found to go in and develop them and put them upon the market.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President—

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WALSH. Are we to understand from the Senator from Connecticut that he disapproves the policy which prompted the construction of the Cumberland Road by Government appropriation?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I do not know. I do not recollect the facts about the Cumberland Road, to tell the truth.

Mr. WALSH. Does the Senator desire us to understand that he disagrees with the policy that prompted the loan of \$55,000,000 for the construction of the Union Pacific and the Central Pacific roads?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I do not know. I think the Union Pacific was constructed largely as a war measure.

Mr. WALSH. And the Northern Pacific?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Oh, far be it from me to regret that any of the transcontinental roads were aided by the Government.

Mr. WALSH. I do not quite understand, then, how the Senator takes the position he does in regard to these great works of internal improvement. The Senator's acquaintance with history is accurate, we all know, and extensive. He knows the manner of the construction of works of internal improvement had been the subject of debate in the halls of Congress here for 20 years, and the policy which was adopted prevailed because it was urged that it was the duty of the General Government to give transportation facilities to the extended regions to the west of the Allegheny Mountains and west of the Mississippi River.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Certainly; the Government aided in the construction of those railroads.

Mr. WALSH. Then what difference in principal does the Senator find?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. The difference in principal I find is that, instead of aiding a company to go and build a road in Alaska, it is proposed to put the Government into the business as a proprietor.

Mr. WALSH. Then, if I understand the Senator aright, he would give his approval to some form of aid to private corporations to construct railroads in Alaska.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I do not know whether I would or not. I would want to examine the proposition very carefully, if there was one up, I will say to the Senator from Montana, to see first that it was necessary to get the Government tangled up with any at all, to see that the people of this country were suffering bad enough to even authorize Government aid in the operation of a railroad in Alaska; and I would want to know which railroad it was. I would rather not vote for a bill, if my recollection serves me, which states in substance, as this bill does, that the President of the United States is authorized and directed to build railroads from the Pacific coast of Alaska to the interior, by which language the two termini of the road are accurately described and located, and that he shall be authorized to employ anybody he chooses, at any price he chooses, and to use any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated from the Treasury for the purpose of paying them. I would rather vote for a little more particular proposition, even for the Government ownership and operation, if that was proven necessary.

Mr. WALSH. I should not have interrupted the Senator at all except that I understood him to lay down the proposition that he was opposed to taking any steps toward the development of Alaska and preferred to allow it to remain there until private enterprise had developed whatever resources may be there and open to development, and provide the transportation facilities which are requisite; in other words, that he was opposed to the policy of Government aid in the opening up of a new and undeveloped territory.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I think I can agree to a certain extent with the Senator's understanding of my views.

I would prefer, if left to myself, not to embark the Government in the operation of railroads and steamships in Alaska and from Alaska to other countries at the present time. I do not believe that the necessity exists for committing the Government to that proposition. I do not think the country is suffering bad enough at present to warrant it. However, if the country would abide by the result, I would almost be willing to see the Government try the experiment of operating this railroad in Alaska, because, then, it would deter people from advocating the ownership of all the railroads in this country by the Government.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I can very easily understand and appreciate the attitude and position of the Senator from Connecticut in his antagonism to Government ownership and Government construction or Government operation of a railroad anywhere, in Alaska or elsewhere, but I was somewhat astonished to hear the Senator from Connecticut—and that is why I rose—assert what seemed to me to be in the nature of a statement that he was opposed to making any effort on the part of the Government toward providing transportation facilities, and that he preferred allowing Alaska to remain as it is until private enterprise, unaided in any way by the Government, would develop its rich resources.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. The Senator from Montana has gone a good deal further in making an extreme statement than what I intended. I say I doubt if the situation at present necessitates the Government going into the building of railroads and steamships in Alaska. I would not say that the Government ought not to furnish any aid or encouragement to anybody or to any proposition to help develop Alaska. I think we have done a good deal, similar to what we have done in our forest reserves, in the way of making trails and roads, and we have done it also in the Philippines, and probably shall never get our money back; but I think there is a great deal of difference between aiding and guiding and helping financially to a certain extent in the development of a country like Alaska and the pitching of the Government in there as the operating proprietor and putting it in charge of all the transportation lines. Even if it would open up the Territory, I doubt whether it would be wise. The trouble about all these things is that we can not tell whether or not they are wise until we try them; and, if they are unwise, we have the whole thing on our hands and have to pay the deficit.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Mr. President, I intended to speak this afternoon upon the question now pending, but I understand the Senator from Oregon [Mr. LANE] would like to go on now, and as the hour is late I will give notice that at the conclusion of the address of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] to-morrow I shall ask the Senate to indulge me.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President, I shall not make a speech, but I would like to call the attention of Senators to some matters which I think will interest them in connection with the construction of a railway from the coast into the interior of Alaska.

I differ in opinion from the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE]. I think if the road were built to the best advantage, if it passed through a fertile country, first reaching the coal mines, and then over into the great Tanana Valley, that afterwards, if it were handled in an ordinarily businesslike manner, it would pay the Government, or that the Government, at least, would not lose money on the investment. I can understand how, if the Government made a mistake and built a piece of railway in connection with some privately owned railway which controlled the outlet to the sea, that it might, in acquiring the title to such railway and its lands, have to pay too much for the property and lose money by it, thus making a poor investment. I can understand, too, how, if it established a line through a particularly rough country, a country such as the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] was talking about the other day, where it had to go around or cross large glaciers, it would have difficulty in reaching the interior of Alaska except at an enormous expense.

It is the general impression among people who have been in Alaska, at least I have heard it from a number of them, that

the Copper River line—the Guggenheim line, as we term it—has gotten itself into difficulty with a glacier; and if the Government purchased that line I think it would have a troublesome and expensive piece of property upon its hands, for at the rate at which that glacier is now moving the bridge and the property in the vicinity of it will be crushed like an egg-shell within the next few years. Upon the other hand, if the Matanuska coal field can be reached by a cut-off from Prince William Sound, to which the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] called attention a few days ago, with a tunnel, or from Seward on up the valley of the Susitna River, it is not a difficult proposition. You strike within a few miles of the coast into a region where the country is very good; it is a bit too rainy in the summer to be pleasant, yet vegetation grows there to a size and of a perfection which you would hardly believe possible. The soil is rich; the climate is fairly mild. It has the disadvantage of having a very heavy snowfall, yet it has in connection with it, near by, gold mines and also coal fields, and thus offers inducements to people to build homes. That route would open up a fairly good country.

If the Matanuska coal fields contain the quality of coal which it is claimed they do, the Government would immediately tap an immensely valuable property. The coal is needed all along the coast; it is not only needed in the interior of Alaska, but it is needed all along up and down the Pacific coast. There would be plenty of freight for a fleet of steamers were they put upon the route if you could get the coal to the coast at not too great an expense. A railroad properly built would follow a water grade to the sea with no glaciers to contend with, I am informed.

If that road then proceeded up by the easiest grade through the Susitna Valley into the Tanana Valley, it would come into a valley which is several hundred miles long. The Tanana Valley, I presume, is 600 miles long, and in places from 100 to 150 miles wide. There are hundreds and thousands of acres of rich muck land there as lies out of doors. There are also hundreds of thousands of acres of waste land where there are sloughs, the same as in any other country; yet the Tanana Valley, as you go into it on the boats or as you go through it with your dog sleds and look it over, is as beautiful as this country; indeed, it is a prettier country than this.

The climate is not a bad one; it gets cold there, to be sure. In the winter the thermometer goes down sometimes as low as 50 degrees below zero, the same as it does in Minnesota; but you would not know it. Unless you saw a thermometer you would not know whether it was 10 below or 50 below, for it is that dry cold which does not chill you, as does the humidity of the Atlantic coast. The men in the Tanana Valley to-day who are working the windlasses in the mines on Cleary Creek and around Fairbanks and on the Chatanika and other streams all through that country are working in their shirt sleeves; they are not working with heavy clothing on, for the reason that if they should do so and bring on perspiration the climate is so dry and cold that it would frost them. They keep under that degree of body heat which brings on perspiration. The same precaution is necessary also in traveling with dogs.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator what treatment they give their ears when the thermometer is 50° below zero?

Mr. LANE. I will tell the Senator. When the thermometer is 46° below zero I have been out on the trail mushing with a dog team in Alaska and carried my ears along with me and brought them back here. [Laughter.] When you are running you must be careful that you do not get too warm. The cap which they wear in Alaska has nothing but a silk top to it. It has no fur on top; it would be too warm if it had, if you please—I think the Senator from New Hampshire might require fur on his—you pull the flap of your cap down over your ears, and when your ears get warm you lift it. You have the flaps off your ears about half the time. I will say to the Senator that humidity is lacking; there is a dryness in the air, and if the wind is not blowing one will have no trouble with his ears nor with his fingers or his feet. He must keep them loosely clad and use a reasonable amount of care. The people there enjoy the winter season, I think, a great deal more than they do the summer time.

It would astonish you to know that the flora of that country is of the greatest variety and the most beautiful I have ever seen. The country is one mass of the most beautiful flowers for miles upon miles and for hundreds of miles.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. That is so up as far as Grant Land.

Mr. LANE. That may be so; it is certainly true in the portions of Alaska to which I refer.

When they remove the moss from the soil, as one of the Senators explained the other day, the sun in the summer time thaws it out, say a foot the first year, and then down to two or three feet. Then, you have a muck soil, with the sun shining down upon it 21 hours a day out of the 24.

In the heat of the day you have, say, 90° and the ice two or three feet down melting slowly and furnishing subirrigation, makes it possible to raise there the finest vegetables I have ever seen in my life, and the largest. I have asked a number of Senators here in the last day or two if they had been over to see the exhibit of vegetables from Alaska in room 115 of the Senate Office Building and have not yet found one who had done so. I would like to have every Senator look at that exhibit, and then I would like to have them say, when they return, if in their respective States, whether in the Delta of the Mississippi or the Beaver Dam land in Oregon—and there lies no better land out of doors than that—they can raise better vegetables in their States. We can not do so in Oregon.

They do raise rye in Alaska. In all of northern Europe—you know it well—the Russian, the Finn, and the people who live in Siberia eat rye bread; they do not eat wheat-flour bread. Only a small minority of the people of this earth eat wheat flour. Two-thirds of the people of the earth, from the beginning of its history, have never tasted wheat flour. They use other grains; and anyone can live well and sustain life on bread made from rye flour. They raise barley in Alaska and they ripen oats. I have seen oats ripen there.

People will go in there to live and they will farm. You can not keep them out, for they can grow the grain for the bread they eat. The country has game in it; it has fish in it; it is a beautiful country to look at. The hills of the Tanana Valley are covered with spruce timber, sometimes from 100 to 150 feet high and as straight as a pole. They also have beautiful white birch and balsam, once in a while some tamarack, and willows, and behind almost every willow bush, or behind a great many of them, there is a great big snowshoe rabbit, which is good to eat. The rivers teem with salmon, king salmon, if you please, which are as good and fine a fish as the Columbia River chinook, which is considered the best salmon in the world. Then they have the grayling, and they have the whitefish, and you all know, particularly those from portions of the country where whitefish inhabit the streams, that there is no better fish in the world than the whitefish, as there is no fish richer than the salmon. So the people of Alaska have those sources of food supply.

They have, as I have said, a beautiful country to look at; and, in addition, there is always the lure of gold. Sometimes, when you sink your cellar, you discover gold. I have seen a man up there when digging a foundation for his house out on the benches, when he could not get a claim down in the creek bottom, which claims are staked first—I have seen a man in building his house strike a better gold mine than the best gold mine nearer the creek. There is always a chance that you will dig up a pocket full of gold; and that appeals to everyone. It is the most fascinating way in the world to make money. Everybody likes to see a man get it in that way. He does not take it from anyone; there is not any strife or fight for it. It requires, however, harder work physically than any other method in the world of acquiring money.

There is the great Tanana Valley, as I have said, stretching hundreds of miles, one of the largest valleys that I know of in America. That valley will fill up with a population; you can not prevent it; you will not be able to keep people out of there, whether you build this road or not. But the conditions now are not calculated to bring about settlement. To get there they must either go through the White Horse Pass and down the Yukon River for 2,000 miles, and then back up 300 miles on the Tanana River in order to reach the town of Fairbanks, and then scatter from there, or else they must go in through the Unimak Pass and through the Bering Sea to St. Michaels, then up the Yukon River a thousand miles upstream on that river, and then 300 miles bucking the current of the Tanana River to arrive at their destination.

When the miner arrives at St. Michaels Island with his freight from the outside perhaps he has a stock of groceries or something of that sort, which he needs for himself or his family for a year's supply, and perhaps he has a bit more which he would like to take in to make a profit on. Whatever he has is very carefully looked over by the agent of the only company which operates on the Yukon River. When I was there there were two companies, but now there is only one company, which has the boats to navigate the river. But before I reach that point I will say that the company has trading stations all up and down the river from near the headwaters of the Yukon

to its mouth, and if you have anything which they carry in stock up there and which might come in competition with them, they decline for one reason or another to take your freight along on that trip; you will have to wait for another boat or the next trip, and it is very expensive to hang around St. Michaels Island, and it is a very unpleasant place in which to stay. I do not apply any of my descriptions of interior Alaska to that island, for there even the willow does not grow more than an inch or two inches high. It is nothing but tundra and moss. They may not take the freight for you at all, but if they do condescend to take it the freight charge from St. Michaels to Fairbanks would be \$90 a ton. When you pay \$90 a ton for freight on a bacon and flour your freight comes rather high and makes your food cost you considerably. That is the condition that exists there. If you go farther up the Yukon you fare worse. In the meantime you have to pay the freight from Seattle to the mouth of the Yukon River or else through the White Horse Pass down over the White Horse Railway and then down the Yukon and back up the Tanana, where the transportation facilities are in the hands of the same gentleman or some particular friend of his. It is therefore very expensive for people to go in there to mine, and there is not much inducement for them to go in there and become farmers, if you please. They can not afford to ship farm products out of the country.

There are hundreds and hundreds of miles of that country and hundreds of thousands of acres where it is claimed—the Government does not make so large a claim—that anywhere from three to four hundred bushels of potatoes can be raised to the acre. The Government says they do actually raise 285 bushels—I think that was the quotation given here the other day—and that is a better average than we have in continental United States; it is better than the present average in my State; it is not, however, any better than it was 50 years ago, but we have partly exhausted our soil.

The soil in most of Alaska where they will undertake farming is inexhaustible.

The cut banks of the Yukon, where the breaking up of the ice has exposed the soil, show it to reach a depth of 50 or 60 feet. It is a seemingly rich soil that goes down no one knows how deep. I myself have been down in it 40, 50, and 60 feet to bed-rock in mining shafts.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator is very interestingly discussing this question. I have endeavored to acquaint myself as far as I could with the agricultural possibilities of Alaska. The Senator is telling us that it is a wonderfully fertile and productive country.

Mr. LANE. Oh, certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have been looking over the reports of Prof. Georgeson, representing the Agricultural Department in that great Territory, and what he says does not agree with what the Senator from Oregon is stating to us. He reports that the soil is not fertile, and that crops can not be raised without fertilizers. That, in a new country, is rather startling to me.

Mr. LANE. It would be to me also.

Mr. GALLINGER. Because virgin soil is usually rich and does not need fertilization.

Let me read just two lines from Prof. Georgeson. He says:

For this reason the soil soon becomes exhausted—

Mr. WILLIAMS. What part of Alaska is the professor talking about there?

Mr. GALLINGER. He is discussing the agricultural possibilities of Alaska, and I think he goes through pretty nearly all of the Territory.

Mr. LANE. That is what I was going to ask.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I want to know what part the professor refers to, because probably Alaska, like other countries, has some parts that are more fertile than others.

Mr. LANE. I will quite agree with him as to other portions of Alaska. There are parts of that country which will not raise much of anything. The Seward Peninsula never will be an agricultural country, and yet it has much gold in it. I am talking at this time of the Tanana Valley and the Susitna Valley. I am sure I am right about the Tanana Valley, for the reason that I have seen vegetables grown there. I have been in the country, and I have seen them. They do raise them.

I say that it is my opinion that owing to the fact that these people, whatever you may say, are forced to pay an enormous tribute to get their tools, their food, and their other supplies into the country, or to get anything out of it; if the Government was ever justified in building a railroad in a new country and helping to develop it, it is justified in this instance, if it builds

the railroad in the right way. In my opinion there should be some restrictions placed upon it.

I notice that some enterprising gentlemen have heavily shaded what seem to be the preferred lines. Those are the lines which are favored by the commission. I do not know of whom the commission was composed, and I do not understand just what the Government would be doing in building a road to the Matanuska coal field, and then striking off south and west of Mount McKinley to the Kuskokwim, because that is a very rough country, and I never heard anyone say that it had any agricultural possibilities. I have heard that there are going to be opened up in there some wonderfully rich gold-mining claims in the way of quartz ledges, the richest in Alaska. I was told that. I had that tip from a friend of mine who is well posted on that country.

Just what they are doing up there, unless they are hunting for that gold-laden quartz, I do not know. I would not like to see that done unless I knew more about it. I am only speaking of that which I know.

I would not like to see the Government build a railroad up the Copper River Valley. I have been down the Copper River Valley, from near the head of it to Prince William Sound, and there is not much good agricultural country in there. That is a pretty rough country. There is some fair agricultural land there, but it would not pay the Government or anyone else to bother with it. The railway that was built in there by the Guggenheims was striking for copper. They were striking out for the copper claims up there. That is all right if the Government is going into that sort of business.

I do not see, however, why Senators do not go over to that exhibit and look at it and see what Alaska raises. It is a wonderful country. It is the most attractive one to me that I ever saw. It is a country that puts vitality and vigor into the people who live there. It is even a health resort for tuberculosis. Tubercular cases do about as well there as they do down in New Mexico and Arizona. There is ozone in the air. Then there are the northern lights that come in the fall and winter, those great northern lights, the aurora borealis, that goes over the sky. When you stand out where you can imagine that if you took two more steps you would be right under the north star, and those lights begin to play, you would think the Creator of the universe was right up in that country "marking down the time" and flashing His streamers across the sky and giving instructions to His assistants elsewhere as to how to carry on the affairs of the other spheres. It is the most wonderfully majestic sight, and one that can not be adequately described.

It is a great country, but it has its disadvantages, too, and much of it is bad country. I do think, however, that it is worthy of this attempt that is being made to open it up, and I do not think any mistake can possibly be made if the Government uses ordinary intelligence.

I am not afraid of public ownership. We heard this sort of talk in the city where I live when we undertook to take over our system of waterworks. All the prophecies of evil that we have had here were made to us by those far wiser and those who had much more money than we had; but we have run the municipal water system now for many years, and for years and years we have made a profit from it of three or four or five or six hundred thousand dollars a year by the use of ordinary business methods.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, before the Senator takes his seat I should like to ask him a question. The Senator from Oregon has given us a beautiful description of the Alaskan country.

Mr. LANE. It is not all that way. I am talking of especially favored sections.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Senator has made it all beautiful by his description.

Mr. LANE. No; it is not all beautiful.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Senator has told us very interestingly about its possibilities. I should like the Senator to tell us something in relation to the coal possibilities up in Alaska—what coal you have, what you can use it for, what kind it is, how we are to get it, and all about it. That seems to me to be an important question here, because I understand the chief purpose of this immense expenditure of public money and this departure that we are about to make is to secure coal from Alaska for use in the Navy and for use in all of the pursuits along the Pacific coast and in the rest of the country where coal is necessary to produce steam. I should like to have the Senator tell us something about the coal of Alaska.

Mr. LANE. All right.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I should like to know if there is any Senator here who has ever seen an analysis of this coal and knows what its qualities are; how much fixed carbon there is in it, how much sulphur, how much ash, whether it will coke, whether it is a good steam coal, and what its qualities are.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. LANE. I yield; yes.

Mr. THOMAS. I simply wanted to say that that matter has been discussed here during the past few days at very great length by the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH], and I think the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER], so that the RECORD is full of information upon the subject.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Just one moment more.

Mr. LANE. Certainly.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I should like to have the Senator from Colorado point me to some statement, some figures, some specific facts, as to what are the qualities of this coal. It is perfectly easy for Senators to get up and declare that there is an immense quantity of coal in Alaska and that it is good for all purposes. It has been stated here without any qualification that it is a magnificent coal for the Navy. That has been disproven by the Navy itself. The Assistant Secretary of the Navy, after a complete test, not only on a battleship but at the testing grounds at Annapolis, has said that it is not fit for use by the Navy. Now, what can you use it for? That is what I want to know.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I think there is a very great difference of opinion as to what was the result of this analysis.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I should like to see the analysis. Where are the figures?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. As a matter of fact, the figures are in the reports, and many of them have been incorporated in the RECORD. I am afraid the Senator has not been here while the discussion was going on.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have not seen that, and I want to see it.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Let me suggest to the Senator that some years ago some coal was gotten out of the Bering River field by a coal miner who had a claim up there, and 30 tons of it was put on board the *Nebraska* and tested. On the test, as evidenced by the report of the lieutenant in charge, it showed up better for naval use than Pocahontas coal. The recent analysis which was made of the coal from the Bering River field showed that it ranked at least 79 per cent, as compared with 100 per cent for the Pocahontas coal.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is a very great difference.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes; but if the Senator had heard the discussions here he would have found out that there are affidavits filed here which show that the men who went up there and got that coal put into the sacks gravel and everything else.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I understand that. It is very easy, of course, to get an affidavit; but here is an actual test made by the Government.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes; of coal that was brought out on a sledge under very adverse circumstances.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not know exactly what the circumstances were under which it was brought out, but they brought it out, and they have made an actual test on a battleship and have declared it to be unsuitable for that purpose. Then they sent it down to Annapolis, to the testing station, and they say it is unsuitable for the use of the Navy.

I do not know whether this coal will coke or not. I do not know whether it is merely a sort of lignite, or something of that sort. We want to know something about it before we embark on all this expenditure of money. Building railroads in the Senate on paper is very different from building them in Alaska on the ground.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, we have already appropriated \$150,000 to try to ascertain whether or not this is suitable coal for the Navy.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes; so I understand; and they have declared that it is not suitable.

I should like to have the Senator from Oregon, or some other Senator, tell me who is going to mine this coal. Everybody who has had any experience in coal mining knows that not 10 per cent of the coal mined in this country is mined on the main line of a railroad. Ninety per cent of it is mined on branch roads built out from the main line, some of them quite lengthy. When you have built all these railroads in Alaska, who is

going to mine the coal—the Government? Is the Government going into the coal-mining business? If so, it must open these mines at a very large expense. It is expensive to open coal mines. If you had a coal mine in Alaska with a capacity of 500 tons a day, it would take 100 miners' houses to accommodate the miners, and those houses must be substantially built in Alaska.

It will cost large sums to open the coal mines. Who is going to do it—the Government? If so, for what? That is the question—for what? To develop the resources of Alaska? That is desirable in a way, of course; but the main purpose is to reduce the price of coal to the ultimate consumers in a very small section of this country. That is the real purpose of it. Nobody will deny that. The Senator from Oregon will not deny that.

It seems to me that in view of all these things the Senate ought to be very particular about what it does in this particular case.

If we are ready to go into the Government ownership of railroads, this is a fine beginning. If we are ready for the Government to go into the business of mining coal, this is a good start.

If we are going to spend all this money to build some railroads in Alaska to open some mines to be worked by the Government for the purpose of reducing the cost of coal to somebody, why not let the Government mine coal in Pennsylvania, where it can reduce the cost, if it can be done at all, to a very large number of people?

I do not think the Government can do anything as cheaply as a private individual can do it. It can not build a railroad, it can not operate a railroad, it can not open and operate mines as cheaply as a private individual can do it. That is my experience, and I believe it is the experience of every Senator who does me the honor of listening to me.

I would be willing to have the Government guarantee the interest on bonds sufficient to build railroads in Alaska to the extent that the conditions justify. I would be willing to do that, just as we did in the development of this great western country of ours. Then I would open these coal mines on a lease system under proper regulations and restrictions. I would say to private capital, "Here are these lands. We will not sell them. We do not propose to part with our title in them, but we will lease them to you." More than half the coal produced in the United States is mined on the lease system and not by the actual owners of the land.

I hope the Senator from Oregon will pardon me. I shall be through in a minute.

Mr. LANE. All right.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I would say to private capital, "We will lease you these coal lands on a certain royalty under proper restrictions." The royalty might be 10 cents; it might be 8 cents; or if the coal is of a very high quality—I have heard it suggested that they have anthracite coal there—the royalty might be 25 or 30 cents, depending on the value of the coal.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator from Alabama will pardon me, if they would add just one other feature to that, they could for all time prevent monopolization.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Why, of course.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is this: After limiting the number of square feet that should be allowed to go to any one person, natural or artificial, if they would then declare the lease to be a personal license of privilege and then provide that in case the lessee attempted to re-lease it or to sell it the lease should ipso facto fall back to the Government, no corporation could ever gather together many grants and monopolize the production.

Mr. SMOOT. In answer to the Senator from Mississippi I want to say that I have introduced just such a lease bill, and it is now before the Committee on Public Lands. I expect a favorable report upon it from the Secretary of the Interior, and I shall ask the Senate to vote upon that lease bill at the earliest possible date.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am very glad to hear that the Senator has done so. That idea has always seemed to me thoroughly practical, and I have always been of the opinion that a government which has done what our Government has done from the beginning has made a mistake. There ought to be a limitation upon the amount to go to any one person, natural or artificial, and there should be a personal license, nontransferable. With a nontransferable license, a hundred of them can never get into one hand, and it will never become a monopoly.

Of course these lands are all absolutely the property of the Government at this time, and we can make just such regulations as the Government may think necessary to protect the Government, to protect the consumers of coal, and so on. There will be no trouble about that. I do not want to give

my approval—and I doubt if I do—to the idea that we are going to build railroads in Alaska; that whether they are needed for the development or not we must build the roads at an expense of forty or fifty million dollars for the purpose of some kind of development. I do not want to give my approval to a proposition that is going to authorize the Government, even if they go on and build these roads, to operate coal mines.

To repeat what I said, and then I am through. I am perfectly willing to vote—indeed, I would be glad to have an opportunity to vote—for a bill pledging the Government for the interest on a sufficient amount of bonds to build the necessary roads in Alaska, just as we did in building the Union Pacific; and we got it all back.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And in the Philippines we did the same thing.

Mr. BANKHEAD. In the Philippines we are doing it. I can not see any particular objection to that. But this is an entirely different proposition. I think we ought to be very cautious, and we ought to know more about it than we do, although we have had some very extensive and enlightened discussion on this question in the Senate in the last few days. But we have been building railroads here in the Senate. We are building them on paper. We are opening and developing mines here in the Senate on paper. I want to assure the Senate, from some personal experience, that it is a very different thing when you come to build railroads on the ground and through the mountains and tunnels and opening mines with slides and drifts and shafts, and building miners' houses and everything that pertains to the operation of a coal mine. Those are very different things from what we have had here in the Senate in the last few days.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President, I will take but a moment more. I wish to call attention to the fact that horses will winter out in the Tanana Valley and come out in the spring fat. They can not do that in any climate unless they have good grass. I have seen them there in midwinter as fat as butter. We can not do that in the Willamette Valley, Oreg., for the reason that it is a little too damp and the grass is not nutritious. Over in the eastern part of the State they can. I do not think they can do it in this climate, but I may be mistaken. I would not care to put one of mine out on grass in this part of the country in the winter.

I wish to say in reply to the question of the Senator that the cost of building railroads in Alaska is liable to be exaggerated. There are places where it is difficult, and then there are miles and miles and miles where the ground is as level as a floor. The little railroad which runs out from Fairbanks to Cleary Creek goes through a country where in many places there is good timber alongside the track suitable for ties, and they put the rails down on top of the moss. They did not in many places have to grade or shovel dirt. There are miles and miles where practically there will be no grading at all in the construction of a railway to the interior of Alaska. There will be more cost for the bridging of streams than for anything else.

In relation to the matter of leasing coal mines, if I had a coal mine or a gold mine I would not lease it to anybody. I have seen the leasing business carried on in mines, for I have lived in the vicinity of mines all my life. The man who is the lessee of a mine desires to get at the richest part of the mine, the pay streak, and to do as little timberwork as he can, and he "guts" the mine, as a rule, in order to do so.

Now, in relation to the Matanuska coal, I have heard from people who live there that it is very good coal; that some of it is almost as good as the anthracite of Pennsylvania. I do not know that that is true. Much of it, I presume, is like our soft coal on the Pacific coast. It is a good steaming coal, but whether it be good enough to drive torpedo boats at a high rate of speed I do not know. It will do on our coast steamers there. They use that character of coal all over the coast. It will make steam and plenty of it, and it will coke. I am assured of that on what seems to be good authority. However, I will say that if an honest investigation can prove the fact that the coal is not to be of any value to the Government or the people as a fuel, I would not vote to build one inch of railroad to it. But if it is, as I am told, a valuable coal, a good coal as coal goes, and some of it of superior quality—and there is plenty of it, as I am assured, enough to give tonnage to a railroad with a double track—I would, if it were in my power, build a road to it.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Before the Senator retires, from his familiarity with Alaska Territory, I should like to ask him where he thinks the railroad ought to be constructed?

Mr. LANE. I am not an engineer.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I understand; but the Senator has some familiarity with the country.

Mr. LANE. If I were going to that country to tap the richest country with the greatest agricultural possibilities and having the largest deposit of the best coal and good gold mines and at the same time get over into the interior of it, into the great Tanana Valley, I would start here [indicating], very near about Cooks Inlet, at the town of Seward, or near there, and cut across here [indicating] from Prince William Sound and go up the Susitna Valley and over the divide. You do not know it when you pass over the divide; it is so low.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. What would the mileage be?

Mr. LANE. That route, I am told, is not to exceed 300 or 350 miles clear on into the valley.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. In the opinion of the Senator, would that subserve the purpose?

Mr. LANE. That would tap the heart of Alaska. That is my personal opinion.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. In the Senator's judgment, it would not require more than about 300 miles of railroad?

Mr. LANE. I think that is all. It would not be far from that.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. So the claim that there is a necessity for authorizing a thousand miles is a little extravagant.

Mr. LANE. They could go as much farther as they liked to get in here [indicating].

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I understand.

Mr. LANE. I am talking about tapping the Tanana Valley near the center.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Three hundred miles would subserve every requirement for many years to come?

Mr. LANE. I do not know that. If you bring in a line of railroad, the people will rush in there and the products will have to come out. I am only stating that that is the heart of the proposition, as I understand it. In my opinion, that taps the heart of the Alaska country.

Mr. BACON. Will the Senator permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. LANE. Certainly.

Mr. BACON. Leaving out of consideration the question of the development of other resources of Alaska, and limiting the inquiry simply to the question of coal, if you had no other purpose now but to run a railroad to the coal fields, those fields that you say have good coal, how much railroad would it require from the seacoast?

Mr. LANE. If you went in through by Seward, something like 120 to 150 miles. Of course, you could cross from Prince William Sound in probably half the distance.

Mr. BACON. Seventy-five miles?

Mr. LANE. Yes.

Mr. BACON. Yet we are talking about building a thousand miles to get to the coal.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. That would be competitive, would it not? Private enterprise already has that country opened up?

Mr. LANE. No. You see, the trouble with railroads in Alaska is this: All quotations from there in recent years have shown that they do not make a profit. The supposition that they do is based, as I have heard the argument, on a false assumption. They begin at the seacoast, but they do not reach anywhere. They do not get on into a productive country. When you get up into the Bering district, off Katalla, the wind whistles off the glaciers 60 miles an hour at times, and it is as cold as ice, and it is a very hard place to make a landing.

Mr. BACON. I understand the Senator to say that 75 miles will reach the coal fields.

Mr. LANE. I am told so. It is something like that. It may be a hundred miles.

Mr. BACON. Therefore the other 925 miles are not for the purpose of reaching the coal fields.

Mr. LANE. But you will get up into the interior.

Mr. BACON. But the coal question can be developed with 75 miles?

Mr. LANE. That may be; but I will say that I did not rise for the purpose of saying anything which would obstruct the passage of the bill.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] requested me to ask, when this discussion was over, that Senate bill 48 be temporarily laid aside.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

Mr. KERN. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, January 22, 1914, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, January 21, 1914.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We bless Thee, eternal God our heavenly Father, for the spark of divinity which glows in the heart of man, which lifts him infinitely above the animal, makes him a living soul, a progressive being destined to live on forever. Impress us, we beseech Thee, O Lord, with the great responsibility Thou hast laid upon us as individuals and as a people, that we may think and think right, act and act right, keeping ever before us the highest ideals in intellectual, moral, and spiritual attainments, thus moving onward and upward, under the leadership of the Jesus of Nazareth, the world's great Exemplar. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

NAVAL HOLIDAY.

Mr. HENSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by inserting an article from Berlin on the naval holiday.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record by inserting an article from Berlin on a naval holiday. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that that is rather indefinite. What is it?

Mr. HENSLEY. It is a dispatch from Berlin which appeared in the press of this country, showing that Germany, instead of being opposed to a naval holiday, is anxious to join the great nations in a plan of this character, in order to relieve their people of the great burden of taxation which is due to the increase in armaments.

Mr. MANN. From some Berlin newspaper?

Mr. HENSLEY. Yes, sir; indicating the position taken by Germany upon the proposition of a naval holiday for one year. It is a short article.

Mr. MANN. I am making no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The article is as follows:

TIRE OF NAVY "BLUFF"—GERMANS GLAD THAT ENGLAND FAVORS BATTLESHIP "HOLIDAY"—SEE PEACE BETWEEN NATIONS—KAISER'S SEA FORCE TO-DAY AS STRONG AS GREAT BRITAIN'S WAS 10 YEARS AGO, BUT LIMIT IS ABOUT REACHED—WILLINGNESS IN EMPIRE TO FOLLOW WINSTON CHURCHILL'S PROPOSAL.

[Special cable to the Washington Post.]

BERLIN, January 17.

Nothing in the foreign political situation is more pleasing to the German people than the fact that the English-German tension, which at times last year seemed to threaten the peace of Europe, is lessening. It is not quite clear to the Germans whether this is a result of the Balkan drama or, what it is preferred to believe, because the English statesmen are gradually becoming convinced of Germany's sincere love of peace. But whatever the reason, there is rejoicing to see that England has discovered that there is absolutely no necessity for her to keep practically her whole naval fighting force concentrated in the North Sea.

SEES PEACE NAVY PROGRAM.

In a talk the writer had the other day with a prominent naval expert, Capt. L. Persius, a frequent writer on naval subjects in the Berliner Tageblatt, he expressed the firm conviction that the way is now open for an Anglo-German agreement restricting naval armaments, as repeatedly suggested by Mr. Winston Churchill. No one can deny the proposed naval budgets of both countries are so gigantic it is to be feared it will be found almost impossible to carry them out.

"About a decade ago," Capt. Persius said, "the British fleet consisted of 61 battleships, with an aggregate tonnage of about 800,000, while the navies of Russia, France, and the United States were about half as strong. Germany had at her disposal 25 battleships, with an aggregate tonnage of 270,000. Now the German Navy program provides for 61 battleships, and at this moment Germany actually possesses 33 first-class battleships of 537,000 tons and 13 battle cruisers and armored cruisers, with a tonnage of 186,000. That is to say, Germany's navy is to-day about as strong as was England's 10 years ago.

GERMANY FORGING AHEAD.

"If the present program is carried out and the ships antedating the dreadnought period are replaced by modern battleships, the tonnage of our 61 battleships will reach the enormous total of 1,500,000. The new English and American battleships will have a tonnage of from 28,000 to 30,000."

If Germany considers 61 battleships necessary for her defense, Capt. Persius went on to say, England will certainly need 100. The cost of construction of a modern battleship of 30,000 tons is about \$15,000,000, and it requires a crew of about 1,100. These figures show what enormous heights the naval budgets must reach in a near future. Will the nations really be able to bear this burden?

EUROPE LOOKING ON.

All the other powers fully realize this and let England and Germany fight out their "bluffing match" alone, fully aware that one of them will be forced to give up and that they will be the ones to profit thereby. France's program provides for only 28 battleships and Russia's naval

plans are equally moderate. Italy is satisfied to build one battleship a year. Austria intends to do the same and the United States wisely follows suit. It had been expected that Japan would quickly build a mighty navy after the war; but patriotic though the Japanese are, their papers have stated in no uncertain terms: "The people demand that their real interests be not sacrificed to the Moloch of militarism and marlinism." The cries of the Japanese jingoes have been entirely drowned in the storm of popular protests. Brazil has discovered that dreadnoughts are expensive toys and is now endeavoring to sell the ships she was too quick to buy, and Chile is following her example.

WHOLE WORLD AGREES.

Practically every power in the world has admitted that naval armaments have been excessive and that it is absolutely necessary to call a halt.

Remembering the words of Winston Churchill, on November 15 last, that with a little good will much might be accomplished, the whole German nation fervently wishes that the two Governments will show the necessary good will during the present year.

IMMIGRATION.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the immigration bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record on the immigration bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

RAILROADS IN ALASKA.

The SPEAKER. This is Calendar Wednesday and the unfinished business is the Alaskan railroad bill. The House automatically resolves itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. HARRISON in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 1739, of which the Clerk will read the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 1739) to authorize the President of the United States to locate, construct, and operate railroads in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HARRISON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 1739, the Alaskan railroad bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time for general debate on the Alaskan railroad bill be limited to five hours and a half on a side after the conclusion of the speech of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS], one half of that time to be controlled by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DAVENPORT] and the other half by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that after the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] concludes his speech there shall be five hours and a half of debate on each side of this question, one half to be controlled by himself and the other half by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DAVENPORT]. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, I suggest that some gentleman on this side of the House ought to have control of some of the time.

Mr. HOUSTON. We thought the matter of discussion could be taken care of by the advocates of the bill and the opponents without regard to partisan control.

Mr. MANN. I understand; but I do not know who wants to be heard on this side.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to call the attention of the gentleman from Tennessee to the fact that those who favor this legislation have up to this time had between four and five hours more—

Mr. DAVENPORT. They have had six hours.

Mr. MONDELL. Six hours more than those opposing the legislation. Now the gentleman from Tennessee proposes to have a division of the time without regard to what time has heretofore been consumed. I want to ask the gentleman if he thinks that is a fair division?

Mr. HOUSTON. The gentleman from Wyoming does not state the matter properly. We do not ask for such a division of the time. We propose, in order to compensate for additional time, that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] shall have time to conclude his speech before the limitation begins. After that is done, which will set us right, we propose to limit the time.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] has not suggested that he wants to take all day, and it will be necessary for him to take the entire day in order to average up the time. I think the gentleman from Oklahoma ought to have all the time he desires, but I do not think he desires four or six hours. Therefore I think it would be better

to go on with the debate, and at the conclusion of the debate to-day, perhaps, come to some arrangement in regard to it. But, in any event, whatever debate there is to be from this time forward—and it seems to me there ought to be two full days—ought to be divided so that at the end of the debate each side will have had an equal length of time.

Mr. MURDOCK. If there are enough against it to occupy that much time.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, we have agreed, the opponents of this measure and those who are in favor of it, in the committee on this division of time. We agreed to compensate the negative for the additional time we have had in favor of the bill by allowing the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] to complete his speech, and after that to fix the limitation of time. So far as the question raised by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is concerned, I do not think we will have any trouble about Republicans and Democrats alike getting a fair division of time.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman from Oklahoma expect to consume enough time to equalize the time in debate up to this time, which will be some five or six hours?

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I have not the floor, but I will say that I do not expect to use over an hour and a half; I hope less than two hours. This question is one of making reference to hearings that we can not get over as readily as we would like and that has consumed by former speakers and will by myself consume some more time than one would like. I am sure that I will be through within two hours.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, in view of the statement that the gentleman has made, it is very apparent that there will not have been an equal division of time after he has closed his speech. Therefore it seems to me better to go on to-day, alternating on each side. I suggest an arrangement such as will equalize debate at the end of two days between those in favor of the legislation and those who are opposed to it. That will leave two days for general debate.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, it is quite evident that the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HOUSTON] would occupy one more day besides this in general debate, and I think likely run over that.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, that is evidently correct, and in order that we may get through with this measure and not have such extensive time consumed, it is very important I think that we fix this limitation now. We had agreed on the limitation of time, after allowing the negative side on this question to present their case in as much time as the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] deems proper to consume. We have reached an agreement of that sort in committee, and I think that that will be fair to all.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to suggest to the gentleman that he put his request so that there shall be general debate on to-day and on the Wednesday following, and that the time be equally divided between those in favor of and those opposed to the bill, taking into consideration the time already used.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I am very anxious that we should get through with this matter in a reasonable time. We have reached an agreement that I think is fair, and I shall insist upon that proposition.

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Speaker, after discussing the matter with the chairman of the committee, I said to him that I would be willing to agree to that. However, I do say that I believe the time should have been equally divided, notwithstanding I told the gentleman a moment ago that if the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] were permitted first to finish his remarks, I would agree to five hours and a half on a side. Yet those favoring the bill have had six hours and something more than those opposing it, and I feel that this bill is of such importance to the people of the United States that all time necessary for Members of this House to discuss it should be given.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVENPORT. Certainly.

Mr. FERRIS. It is true, and I think all understand it, that those in favor of the bill have used about six and a half hours more than those who are opposed to the bill.

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. FERRIS. But I think there is quite a well-defined reason for that. The gentleman from Alaska [Mr. WICKERSHAM] is the Delegate from that Territory, and in a colloquy between myself and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HOUSTON] on Wednesday last, it was pretty well explained and accepted by the House that the gentleman from Alaska should have more time than the rest of us. I am rather in hopes that the suggestion of the chairman will be agreed to. It is undoubtedly in-

cumbent upon the chairman to try and get the legislation through some time, and we have had already a good deal of general debate. And if the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] should feel that he could agree, even if we have had more time, I hope he will agree to that and let us go ahead.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HOUSTON] asks unanimous consent that, after the conclusion of the speech of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS], there shall be 11 hours of general debate, one half to be controlled by himself and the other half by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DAVENPORT].

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] has been recognized in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for one hour. That is all he can get except by unanimous consent or an order of the House.

The SPEAKER. That is true.

Mr. MANN. If any further time was used by the gentleman, would that come out of the 11 hours?

The SPEAKER. No.

Mr. MANN. It would unless there was some agreement to the contrary.

The SPEAKER. Of course, if the rule is strictly construed, nobody can speak more than an hour without unanimous consent.

Mr. FERRIS. I understood the gentleman from Tennessee to include in his motion that I have time to conclude.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee included in his motion that at the expiration of the speech of the gentleman from Oklahoma—

Mr. MANN. Why not modify the request and make it seven hours and a half to those opposed to the bill, which will give the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] two hours, and five hours and a half to those who favor the bill?

Mr. HOUSTON. I am perfectly willing to do that; I am willing to put my request in those terms.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Tennessee this: Under this proceeding, when we began this discussion of the bill those of us who wanted to speak went to the Speaker's desk and put our names in for time. Among those who put their names in was Mr. FALCONER, of Washington, Mr. BRYAN, and myself. I have had, I think, 10 or 15 minutes' time. Mr. FALCONER and Mr. BRYAN are still waiting for time. Are they to have a portion of this time?

Mr. HOUSTON. Certainly, they are to have a portion of the time as limited. They are to have a portion of the 11 hours, if my request is agreed to.

Mr. MURDOCK. Under this proceeding, I will say to the gentleman from Tennessee, we put our names in and it is within the control of the Chair to recognize whom he pleases.

Mr. HOUSTON. I think there will be no trouble under that. Those gentlemen will be given time.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is all I desire to know—whether they will be given time or not.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object unless some of us who are opposed to the bill have an opportunity to be heard upon it.

Mr. MONDELL. Let me suggest to the gentleman from Tennessee—

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object unless some of us who are opposed to the bill have an opportunity to be heard upon it.

Mr. HOUSTON. There are seven hours and a half proposed to be given to those who are opposed to the bill.

Mr. MADDEN. I notice that under the procedure hastily agreed to heretofore those in favor of the bill could get time, whereas those opposed are left no time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the gentleman will permit, I suggest to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] it is entirely within the power of the chairman of the committee to move to close debate.

Mr. MADDEN. I understand that.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. And then it will be equally divided.

Mr. MADDEN. I understand that.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. And this grants two and a half hours more to the opponents of the bill than to those in favor of the bill.

Mr. MADDEN. But those in favor of the bill have had two-thirds of the time already.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. But they are going to be compensated. It seems to me it is an exceedingly fair proposition for those opposed to the bill.

Mr. MONDELL. How can the gentleman undertake to say it is fair when they have already used six hours more than those opposed to the bill?

Mr. DAVENPORT. In answer to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] I desire to say to him that a number of gentlemen on that side have submitted to me requests for time and have been granted time, and that the time, if we should fix it as suggested now, has all been taken.

Mr. MADDEN. Then I object.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I object if it is all taken, for I want to make a speech against the bill.

Mr. SLAYDEN. So do I.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

Mr. MANN. We had better let debate run for the day.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that general debate on this bill be closed in 11½ hours.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman just agreed to 13 hours.

Mr. HOUSTON. Not 13.

Mr. MANN. Five hours and a half on a side, and 2 hours extra to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS], which makes 13 hours.

Mr. HOUSTON. That is right. Mr. Speaker, I move that general debate be closed in 13 hours, and that the time be controlled by the gentleman from Oklahoma—

Mr. MANN. You can not do that.

Mr. HOUSTON. I make my motion to close debate in 13 hours.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HOUSTON] makes the motion to close general debate in 13 hours.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Speaker, that is the same request to which objection has just been made.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. DIES and Mr. FERRIS demanded a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 85, noes 39.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] makes the point of no quorum. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and fifty-five gentlemen are present; not a quorum. On the last vote the yeas were 35 and the noes 30. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll. Those in favor of limiting general debate to 13 hours will, as their names are called, answer "yea," and those opposed will answer "nay."

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 283, nays 66, answering "present" 5, not voting 79, as follows:

YEAS—283.

Abercrombie	Chandler, N. Y.	Floyd, Ark.	Hulings
Adair	Church	Fordney	Hull
Adamson	Clancy	Foster	Humphreys, Miss.
Allen	Clark, Fla.	Fowler	Igoe
Anderson	Claypool	Francis	Jacoway
Anthony	Clayton	Frear	Johnson, Ky.
Austin	Cline	Gard	Johnson, S. C.
Bailey	Coady	Garner	Kahn
Baker	Collier	Garrett, Tenn.	Keating
Baltz	Connolly, Iowa	Garrett, Tex.	Keister
Barkley	Conry	Gerry	Kelley, Mich.
Bartholdt	Cooper	Gillmore	Kennedy, Conn.
Bartlett	Cox	Gittins	Kennedy, Iowa
Bathrick	Cramton	Glass	Kennedy, R. I.
Beakes	Crosser	Godwin, N. C.	Kent
Bell, Ga.	Cullop	Goldfogle	Kettner
Blackmon	Curry	Good	Key, Ohio
Booher	Dale	Gordon	Kindel
Borchers	Davis	Gorman	Kinkaid, Nebr.
Borland	Decker	Goulden	Kinkead, N. J.
Bowdle	Deitrick	Graham, Ill.	Kirkpatrick
Brodbeck	Dent	Gray	Kitchin
Brown, N. Y.	Dershem	Green, Iowa	Knowland, J. R.
Brown, W. Va.	Dickinson	Greene, Mass.	Konop
Browne, Wis.	Difenderfer	Greene, Vt.	Kreider
Bruckner	Doolling	Gudger	Lafferty
Brumbaugh	Doolittle	Guernsey	Langley
Buchanan, Ill.	Doremus	Hamilton, Mich.	Lazaro
Buchanan, Tex.	Doughton	Hamlin	Lee, Ga.
Bulkley	Dunn	Hammond	Lenroot
Burgess	Dupré	Hardwick	Leshner
Burke, Wis.	Dyer	Hart	Lewis, Md.
Burnett	Eagan	Haugen	Lewis, Pa.
Butler	Edwards	Hayden	Lieb
Byrnes, S. C.	Elder	Heflin	Lindberg
Byrns, Tenn.	Esch	Helm	Lindquist
Calder	Estopinal	Helmer	Linthicum
Campbell	Evans	Helvering	Lobeck
Candler, Miss.	Fairchild	Hensley	Logue
Cantrill	Falson	Hill	Loneragan
Cantor	Falconer	Hinebaugh	McClellan
Caraway	Fergusson	Holland	McDermott
Carew	Ferris	Houston	McGillcuddy
Carr	Fields	Howard	McGuire, Okla.
Carter	Fitzgerald	Hughes, Ga.	McKellar
Casey	Flood, Va.	Hughes, W. Va.	McKenzie

McLaughlin	Padgett	Seldomridge	Tavener
Maguire, Nebr.	Paige, Mass.	Seils	Taylor, Ala.
Maher	Palmer	Shackelford	Taylor, Colo.
Mannahan	Park	Sherley	Taylor, N. Y.
Mann	Parker	Sherwood	Ten Eyck
Mapes	Patten, N. Y.	Shreve	Thacher
Metz	Payne	Sims	Thomas
Miller	Peters, Mass.	Sloan	Thompson, Okla.
Mitchell	Peterson	Smith, Minn.	Towner
Montague	Phelan	Smith, Saml. W.	Townsend
Moon	Platt	Sparkman	Treadway
Moore	Plumley	Stafford	Tribble
Morgan, La.	Post	Stanley	Tuttle
Morin	Pou	Stedman	Underwood
Morrison	Powers	Steenerson	Walker
Moss, Ind.	Rainey	Stephens, Nebr.	Walsh
Mott	Raker	Stephens, Tex.	Watkins
Murray, Mass.	Reed	Stevens, N. H.	Watson
Neeley, Kans.	Reilly, Conn.	Stone	Whaley
Nelson	Reilly, Wis.	Stout	Williams
O'Brien	Rogers	Stringer	Wilson, Fla.
O'Hair	Rouse	Summers	Wilson, N. Y.
Oldfield	Rubey	Sutherland	Winslow
O'Leary	Russell	Taggart	Young, N. Dak.
O'Shaunessy	Sabath	Talcott, N. Y.	

NAYS—66.

Aiken	Fess	Lloyd	Slayden
Ashbrook	Finley	MacDonald	Small
Barnhart	French	Madden	Smith, Tex.
Barton	Gardner	Mondell	Stephens, Cal.
Bell, Cal.	Gillett	Morgan, Okla.	Stephens, Miss.
Britten	Gregg	Murdock	Stevens, Minn.
Brockson	Harrison	Nolan, J. I.	Switzer
Bryan	Hawley	Norton	Taylor, Ark.
Callaway	Hay	Page, N. C.	Thomson, Ill.
Copley	Hayes	Quin	Vaughan
Danforth	Henry	Rauch	Walters
Dies	Howell	Rayburn	Wingo
Dillon	Humphrey, Wash.	Roberts, Mass.	Witherspoon
Dixon	Johnson, Utah	Rupley	Woodruff
Donohoe	Johnson, Wash.	Scott	Young, Tex.
Donovan	La Follette	Sinnott	
Farr	Lee, Pa.	Sisson	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—5.

Browning	Edmonds	Hinds	Talbot, Md.
Davenport			

NOT VOTING—79.

Ainey	Gallagher	Loft	Saunders
Alexander	George	McAndrews	Scully
Ansberry	Goeke	McCoy	Sharp
Aswell	Goodwin, Ark.	Mahan	Slemp
Avis	Graham, Pa.	Martin	Smith, Idaho
Barchfeld	Griest	Merritt	Smith, J. M. C.
Beall, Tex.	Griffin	Moss, W. Va.	Smith, Md.
Bremner	Hamill	Murray, Okla.	Smith, N. Y.
Broussard	Hamilton, N. Y.	Neely, W. Va.	Temple
Burke, Pa.	Helgesen	Oglesby	Underhill
Burke, S. Dak.	Hobson	Patton, Pa.	Vare
Carlin	Hoxworth	Peters, Me.	Volstead
Cary	Jones	Porter	Wallin
Connelly, Kans.	Kelly, Pa.	Prouty	Weaver
Covington	Kiess, Pa.	Ragsdale	Webb
Crisp	Korbly	Richardson	Whitacre
Curley	Langham	Riordan	White
Driscoll	L'Engle	Roberts, Nev.	Willis
Eagle	Lever	Rothermel	Woods
FitzHenry	Levy	Rucker	

So the motion to limit general debate was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

For the session:

Mr. SCULLY with Mr. BROWNING.

Mr. METZ with Mr. WALLIN.

Until further notice:

Mr. UNDERHILL with Mr. PROUTY.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland with Mr. SMITH of Idaho.

Mr. SHARP with Mr. PORTER.

Mr. RUCKER with Mr. WOODS.

Mr. ROTHERMEL with Mr. PATTON of Pennsylvania.

Mr. NEELY of West Virginia with Mr. PETERS of Maine.

Mr. WHITE with Mr. WILLIS.

Mr. MCCOY with Mr. VARE.

Mr. LOFT with Mr. J. M. C. SMITH.

Mr. LEVY with Mr. MOSS of West Virginia.

Mr. LEVER with Mr. MARTIN.

Mr. KORBLY with Mr. GRIEST.

Mr. GRIFFIN with Mr. LANGHAM.

Mr. GOEKE with Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania.

Mr. GEORGE with Mr. HELGESEN.

Mr. GALLAGHER with Mr. CARY.

Mr. COVINGTON with Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania.

Mr. CARLIN with Mr. BURKE of South Dakota.

Mr. BEALL of Texas with Mr. AINEY.

Mr. ANSBERRY with Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas with Mr. AVIS.

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland with Mr. MERRITT.

Mr. CRISP with Mr. HINDS (transferable).

Mr. CLANCY with Mr. HAMILTON of New York.

Mr. WEBB with Mr. VOLSTEAD.

Mr. FITZHENRY with Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada.

Mr. ASWELL with Mr. SLEMP.

Mr. HOBSON with Mr. BARCHFELD.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. A quorum is present, and the Doorkeeper will open the doors. The House automatically resolves itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I desire now to submit a request for unanimous consent. It is the proposition we agreed to. The proposition is that 7½ hours of the 13 hours be allotted to those opposing the bill and 5½ hours to those in favor of it, the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DAVENPORT] and myself, respectively.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HOUSTON] asks unanimous consent that the 13 hours allowed for general debate be divided, 7½ hours to be used by the opponents of the bill and 5½ hours by the proponents of it, the 5½ hours to be controlled by himself and the 7½ hours to be controlled by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DAVENPORT]. Is there objection?

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] objects. The House automatically resolves itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 1739) to authorize the President of the United States to locate, construct, and operate railroads in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes, and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] will take the chair.

The House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 1739, with Mr. HARRISON in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 1739, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 1739) to authorize the President of the United States to locate, construct, and operate railroads in Alaska, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] is recognized.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to conclude my remarks in not to exceed two hours.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] asks unanimous consent to be permitted to conclude his remarks in not to exceed two hours.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, does that mean that the gentleman is to consume 2 hours out of the 13?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks it would be 2 hours out of the 13.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to object, but I would like to know something about the allotment of this time. I am as much interested in this legislation as anyone in the House, not even excepting the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. WICKERSHAM], the Delegate. The other day he had all the time to talk that he wished, and I am glad that he did, and I consented to it; but under this arrangement the Members from the State of Washington, it seems to me, are not going to have an opportunity to talk upon this question. I think that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] ought to have all the time that is desired, but at the same time, if we are going to be limited to 13 hours, I think we ought to have some understanding about it. I want to have a little time myself.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the Chair, who unofficially has knowledge of what has already taken place in the House and who now has charge of the time, will undoubtedly recognize gentlemen in opposition to the bill for seven and one-half hours and gentlemen in favor of the bill for five and one-half hours, so that the granting of this time would not interfere with the rights of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that the 2 hours would come out of the 13—

Mr. MANN. Certainly—

The CHAIRMAN. And in recognizing the various Members he will take those two hours into consideration.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object for just a moment, I want to call attention to the situation we are in just now. Here is a bill of vital importance, and five Members from the State of Washington, and five and one-half hours of debate are allowed, and 15 or 20 gentlemen wanting time; and yet, in the face of that fact, without attempting to make any arrangement or adjustment of the time, the chairman of the committee asks that this debate be

limited. I want to call the attention of the House to the injustice of that proposition. I am not going to object. I have never made an objection in this House since I have been here— for 10 years.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, in view of the tremendous importance of this measure and the great number of gentlemen who are anxious to be heard upon it, I am constrained to object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is made. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] is recognized for one hour.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I had hoped to dwell historically on Alaska for a few moments, but my time being limited, I will not be permitted to do that. In place of that I wish to thank the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. WICKERSHAM], the Delegate, who gave us a great deal of historical data on last Wednesday about his people and about his Territory.

I concede to any Member of Congress here the right to say as many nice things about his people as he cares to say, and as many hopeful things about the future of his country as he cares to, but living in the West myself, and knowing something of what chambers of commerce and people living in a new State or Territory are apt to say and think and hope for the future, I shall neither be amazed at what he said nor deceived by it.

There are nine railroads or parts of railroads in Alaska, ranging from 5 to 195 miles in length, part of them narrow gauge, part of them standard gauge, with a total trackage of 466 miles, all "busted" and "broke" except three, and trying to sell out.

RAILWAY COMMISSION.

The last Congress authorized the President to appoint a commission to go to Alaska to examine the railroad situation. President Taft appointed on that commission Maj. Jay J. Morrow, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, chairman; Alfred H. Brooks, geologist in charge of Division of Alaskan Mineral Resources, Geological Survey, vice chairman; Civil Engineer Leonard M. Cox, United States Navy; and Colin M. Ingersoll, consulting railroad engineer, New York City. They were directed to report to Congress at the succeeding session their findings. Their work necessarily had to be done with great haste, and as their report on numerous occasions indicates, they based it on facts, figures, and data collected from railroads and other parties on the ground rather than by personal contact, surveys, and investigations. They made an estimate of cost on 16 different lines of railroads, specifically stating that in each of the estimates made no allowance was made for organization and promotion expenses.

I will here insert the commission's estimates and their remarks on construction.

CONSTRUCTION.

The commission has made a careful study of conditions in Alaska as regards wages, cost of materials, and freight rates. It had at its disposal the results of preliminary surveys of only a portion of the roads considered. Such surveys were lacking on many of the routes, though considerable data bearing on costs of construction were available.

The commission has prepared estimates of cost of construction of all roads under consideration. These estimates are submitted herewith in the order in which the various roads have been described. It will be observed that the cost of the line from Chitina to Fairbanks has been estimated in considerable detail. It is regretted that the other lines could not be treated in the same manner, but this was impossible on account of lack of data, and in these cases the commission was compelled to assume a cost of construction per mile comparable to that experienced in country of similar character traversed by existing lines or estimated for in the Chitina-Fairbanks line, over which the commission actually traveled.

The commission had opportunity to obtain construction results from a number of existing railroads and also to discuss costs with engineers who have had Alaskan or Canadian experience; and it was on information such as this that it based its unit prices for the various classes of excavation, clearing, grubbing, trestles and bridges, masonry work, etc. For equipment the commission assumed the number of locomotives and cars which it believed sufficient to care for the traffic immediately in sight. In all of the following estimates no allowance has been made for organization and promotion expenses.

Estimate No. 1—Haines-Fairbanks route.—This line involves the construction of 638 miles of line, starting at the town of Haines, running in a northwesterly direction through 287 miles of Canadian territory and terminating at Fairbanks.

Cost of construction of this line is estimated at.....	\$21,284,700
Engineering and superintendence, 5 per cent.....	1,064,235
Terminal ground and land damages.....	20,000
Telephone.....	159,500
Contingencies, 10 per cent.....	2,252,844
Interest, 6 per cent on cost during one-half period of construction.....	2,230,315
Rolling stock plus overhead charges.....	1,173,920

Total.....	28,185,514
In round numbers.....	28,186,000
Average cost per mile of track.....	44,300

There was no profile of this line available, and the above estimate is based almost entirely upon information furnished by the engineer who conducted the exploratory reconnaissance. One member of the commission, having traveled over approximately the same route, was sufficiently familiar with the character of the country traversed to form a general idea of the cost of railroad construction.

Estimate No. 2—Chitina-Fairbanks route.

	Quantity.	Unit price.	Total cost.
1. Right of way.....			
2. Clearing..... acres.....	3,758	\$100.00	\$378,000.00
3. Earth..... cubic yards.....	2,190,535	.40	876,214.00
4. Frozen earth or gravel..... do.....	1,937,605	.75	1,453,205.00
5. Loose rock..... do.....	89,100	1.00	89,100.00
6. Solid rock..... do.....	398,925	1.60	638,280.00
7. Culverts..... miles.....	313	500.00	156,500.00
8. Pile and framed trestles.....			977,250.00
9. Bridges (steel and masonry).....			464,000.00
10. Tunnels..... feet.....	945	75.00	70,880.00
11. Ties.....	901,440	.50	450,720.00
12. Rails (75-pound)..... tons.....	36,930	65.00	2,400,450.00
13. Rail sidings, laid..... feet.....	110,180	2.84	312,900.00
14. Switch timbers and ties.....			20,000.00
15. Spikes..... lbs.....	2,253,600	.05	112,680.00
16. Splice bars..... do.....	4,031,440	.05	201,570.00
17. Track bolts..... do.....	532,100	.07	37,240.00
18. Track laying..... miles.....	313	600.00	187,800.00
19. Ballasting..... do.....	300	1,000.00	303,450.00
20. Turnout and switch furnishings.....			30,000.00
21. Water stations.....	16	4,400.00	70,400.00
22. Depots.....	45	2,500.00	112,500.00
23. Snow fences..... feet.....	93,200	.34	31,690.00
24. Snow sheds..... do.....	15,845	50.00	792,000.00
25. Intermediate yards.....	3	40,000.00	120,000.00
26. Fairbanks yard, track, buildings, etc.....			260,000.00
Cost of construction.....			10,547,339.00
27. Engineering and superintendence, 5 per cent.....			527,367.00
28. Terminal ground and land damages.....			20,000.00
29. Telephone.....			78,250.00
30. Contingencies, 10 per cent.....			1,117,296.00
31. Interest, 6 per cent on cost during half period of construction.....			1,106,122.00
32. Rolling stock plus overhead charges.....			575,000.00
Grand total.....			13,971,374.00
In round numbers.....			13,971,000.00
Average cost per mile of track.....			44,600.00

Estimate No. 3—Valdez-Fairbanks route.—This line involves the construction of 101 miles of road from Valdez to the northward, where it joins the route already estimated for the Cordova-Fairbanks route, from which point to the terminus, 279 miles, the construction cost per mile is taken from estimate No. 2.

Cost of construction of 101 miles.....	\$4,684,046
Engineering and superintendence, 5 per cent.....	234,202
Telephone.....	25,250
Contingencies, 10 per cent.....	494,350
Interest on cost, one-half period of construction.....	489,406
Rolling stock plus overhead charges.....	174,225

Grand total, 101 miles.....	6,101,479
279 miles, at \$44,600.....	12,443,400

Total, Valdez to Fairbanks.....	18,544,879
In round numbers.....	18,545,000
Average cost per mile of track.....	48,800

Estimate No. 4—Seward-Fairbanks route (from Kern Creek to Fairbanks).—This line involves the construction of 391 miles of line, extending from Kern Creek, the terminus of the Alaska Northern Railroad, in a northerly direction to Fairbanks. The use of the existing Alaskan Northern tracks, which run from Seward to Kern Creek, is contemplated.

Cost of construction of 391 miles.....	\$13,382,054
Engineering and superintendence, 5 per cent.....	669,103
Terminal land damages.....	20,000
Telephone.....	97,750
Contingencies, 10 per cent.....	1,416,891
Interest on cost, one-half period of construction.....	1,402,722
Rolling stock plus overhead charges.....	719,440

Total.....	17,707,960
In round numbers.....	17,708,000
Average cost per mile of track.....	45,300

Estimate No. 5—Seward-Iditarod line.—This line involves 344 miles of new road, the first 115 miles from Kern Creek to Willow Creek is coincident with the Seward-Fairbanks route. From Willow Creek it runs in a northwesterly direction 229 miles to the village of McGrath on the Kuskokwim River.

Cost of the first 115 miles (estimate No. 4; this includes all overhead charges).....	\$5,209,500
Cost of construction of the remaining 229 miles.....	9,746,000
Engineering and superintendence, 5 per cent.....	487,300
Telephone.....	57,250
Contingencies, 10 per cent.....	1,029,055
Interest on cost, one-half period of construction.....	1,018,764
Rolling stock plus overhead charges.....	421,360

Total.....	17,969,229
In round numbers.....	17,970,000
Average cost per mile of track.....	52,300

Estimate No. 6—Iliamna-Kuskokwim route.—This line involves about 400 miles of road, starting at Iliamna Bay, running in a northwesterly direction, and terminating at or near Piamute on the Yukon River.

Cost of construction of this road is estimated at.....	\$17,440,000
Engineering and superintendence, 5 per cent.....	872,000
Telephone.....	100,000
Contingencies, 10 per cent.....	1,841,300
Interest, 6 per cent on cost, during one-half period of construction.....	1,209,198
Rolling stock plus overhead charges.....	736,000

Total.....	22,198,498
In round numbers.....	22,199,000
Average cost per mile of track.....	55,400

Estimate No. 7—Valdez-Marshall Pass—Copper River line.—This line involves 54 miles of new road. It starts at Valdez and from that town to Marshall Pass the line is coincident with the Valdez-Fairbanks route. At mile 27 this line runs through Marshall Pass, thence in an easterly direction, connecting with the Copper River & Northwestern Railroad at about mile 87 of that route.

Cost of construction of the first 27 miles	\$1,507,190
Cost of construction of the remaining 27 miles	1,205,000
Total cost of construction	2,532,190
Engineering and superintendence, 5 per cent	126,610
Telephone	13,500
Contingencies, 10 per cent	267,230
Interest, 6 per cent on cost during one-half period of construction	88,186
Rolling stock, plus overhead charges	93,150
Total	3,120,866
In round numbers	3,121,000
Average cost per mile of track	57,800

Estimate No. 8—Branch from Bering River coal field to Cordova via Katalla.—This line is 93 miles long, 55 miles of which is a proposed extension. This new line connects with the Copper River & Northwestern Railroad at mile 38, and runs in a southerly direction to the town of Katalla, thence in a northeasterly direction to the Bering River coal fields.

Cost of construction of this new line is estimated at	\$2,099,500
Engineering and superintendence, 5 per cent	104,975
Telephone	13,750
Contingencies, 10 per cent	221,823
Interest on cost, one-half period of construction	73,201
Rolling stock plus overhead charges	187,000
Total	2,700,249
In round numbers	2,700,000
Average cost per mile of track	49,000

Estimate No. 9—Branch from Bering River coal field to Cordova via Lake Charlotte.—The total length of this line is 76 miles, 38 miles of which will be new road. This new line connects with the Copper River & Northwestern Railroad at mile 38, and runs in an easterly direction via Lake Charlotte to the Bering River coal fields.

Total cost of construction of this new line	\$1,583,334
Engineering and superintendence, 5 per cent	79,187
Telephone	9,500
Contingencies, 10 per cent	167,200
Interest, 6 per cent on cost, during one-half period of construction	55,176
Rolling stock plus overhead charges	159,600
Total	2,053,977
In round numbers	2,054,000
Average cost per mile of track	54,000

Estimate No. 10—Katalla-Bering River coal field line.—This line involves 31 miles of road, starting at the town of Katalla and terminating in the Bering River coal fields.

Cost of construction of this line	\$1,180,699
Engineering and superintendence, 5 per cent	59,035
Telephone	7,750
Contingencies, 10 per cent	124,748
Interest, 6 per cent, on cost during one-half period of construction	41,168
Rolling stock plus overhead charges	288,190
Total	1,701,590

In round numbers 1,702,000
Cost of terminal facilities 2,500,000

Grand total 4,202,000
Average cost per mile of track, exclusive of terminal 55,000

Estimate No. 11—Controller Bay-Bering River coal field line.—This line involves 25 miles of road, starting at Controller Bay and running in a northeasterly direction to the Bering River coal field.

Cost of construction of this line	\$952,313
Engineering and superintendence, 5 per cent	47,616
Telephone	6,250
Contingencies, 10 per cent	100,618
Interest, 6 per cent, on cost during one-half period of construction	33,204
Rolling stock plus overhead charges	287,500
Total	1,427,501

In round numbers 1,430,000
Cost of terminal facilities 2,500,000

Grand total 3,930,000
Average cost per mile of track, exclusive of terminal 57,000

Estimate No. 12—Chitina-Matanuska coal field line.—This line leaves the Copper River & Northwestern Railroad at mile 132 at the town of Chitina; for 55 miles the proposed new line is coincident with the Chitina-Fairbanks route. Leaving that route the line runs in a northwesterly direction for 108 miles to the Matanuska coal fields.

Total cost of first 55 miles	\$1,853,335
Cost of construction of remaining 108 miles	4,860,000
Engineering and superintendence, 5 per cent	335,667
Telephone	40,750
Contingencies, 10 per cent	708,975
Interest, 6 per cent, on cost during one-half period of construction	233,962
Rolling stock plus overhead charges	400,980
Total	8,433,669
In round numbers	8,434,000
Average cost per mile of track	51,700

Estimate No. 13—Kern Creek-Matanuska coal-field line.—This line involves 187 miles of new road, starting at Kern Creek, the terminus of the existing tracks of the Alaska Northern Railroad, and terminating in the Matanuska coal fields, From Kern Creek to Matanuska

Junction, 77 miles, the new line is coincident with the proposed Seward-Fairbanks route. The remaining distance of 38 miles runs in an easterly direction to the Matanuska coal fields.

Cost of construction of new work, extending from Kern Creek to the Matanuska Junction, of 77 miles	\$2,640,353
Cost of construction of remaining portion of line, extending from Matanuska Junction to the coal fields	1,223,116
Engineering and superintendence, 5 per cent	103,174
Telephone	28,750
Contingencies, 10 per cent	408,539
Interest, 6 per cent, on cost during one-half period of construction	184,818
Rolling stock plus overhead charges	316,250
Total	4,945,000
Average cost per mile of track	43,000

Estimate No. 14—Skolai Pass-White River Branch line.—This route involves the construction of 129 miles of new line starting from McCarthy, near Kennicott, on the Copper River & Northwestern Railroad, and running in an easterly direction through Skolai Pass, connecting with the Haines-Fairbanks route near the junction of the White and Donjek Rivers.

Cost of construction is estimated at	\$6,750,000
Engineering and superintendence, 5 per cent	337,500
Telephone	32,250
Contingencies, 10 per cent	711,975
Interest, 6 per cent, on cost during one-half period of construction	234,952
Rolling stock plus overhead charges	222,525
Total	8,289,202
In round numbers	8,289,000
Average cost per mile of track	64,000

Estimate No. 15—Fairbanks-Yukon extension.—This route involves 115 miles of new line starting at the town of Fairbanks and runs in a northwesterly direction to the Yukon River.

Cost of construction	\$3,775,000
Engineering and superintendence, 5 per cent	188,750
Telephone	28,750
Contingencies, 10 per cent	399,250
Interest, 6 per cent, on cost during one-half period of construction	131,753
Rolling stock plus overhead charges	198,375
Total	4,721,878
In round numbers	4,722,000
Average cost per mile of track	41,000

Estimate No. 16—Valdez-Matanuska coal-field line.—From Valdez to Mile 55, on the Chitina-Fairbanks route. This estimate is the same as the like portion of the Valdez-Fairbanks route. The remaining 108 miles to the Matanuska coal fields is the same as the like portions of the Matanuska-Chitina line.

Cost of construction	\$10,255,204
Engineering and superintendence, 5 per cent	512,700
Telephone	57,500
Contingencies, 10 per cent	1,082,546
Interest, 6 per cent on cost during one-half period of construction	357,240
Rolling stock plus overhead charges	396,750
Total	12,662,000
Average cost per mile of track	55,000

No construction work should be begun until adequate preliminary surveys had been run. Topographic surveys should be made over a wide belt of the country traversed, in order that no opportunity may be lost to secure the best possible location. They could be completed in one year, and the commission is of the opinion that the railroads can be built and ready for the operation of trains within three years after the completion of the surveys and after decision as to definite location.

There have been presented to Congress measures for Government construction of railroads in Alaska which contemplate the use of railroad and construction equipment of the Panama Canal Commission. It is possible that economy would attend the use of this material, but this would depend upon the amount which it would bring if offered for sale in the open market at Panama. The commission does not feel that it would be justified in considering the use of this equipment in its estimates of cost, but invites attention to a memorandum furnished by the Secretary of the Interior containing a list of such equipment as is now or will later become available. This memorandum is made a part of the appendix of the report.

In the above estimates, while the time of construction for the trunk roads was assumed at three years, it was considered that the shorter branches and the coal roads could be constructed in one year; interest items were computed accordingly.

Attention is invited to the fact that in each of the foregoing estimates it is assumed that money used in construction bears interest at the rate of 6 per cent; should it prove feasible to obtain these funds at a lower rate of interest an appreciable reduction in first cost would result.

The commission recommends the construction of five lines of railroad, as follows:

(1) Chitina to Fairbanks, 313 miles; estimated cost, \$13,971,000.

It will be observed that this extends the Guggenheim line from Chitina on up to Fairbanks, and it was admitted in all the hearings, both before the House and Senate committees and by the Railway Commission itself, that that part of the line running from Chitina to Fairbanks would not be profitable, due to the fact that there was not sufficient tonnage to warrant the construction of a line up through that barren, treeless country.

(2) Branch from Bering River coal field to Cordova via Lake Charlotte, 38 miles; estimated cost, \$2,054,000.

(3) From Kern Creek to the Susitna Valley, distance 115 miles; estimated cost, \$5,209,000.

(4) Matanuska coal field branch, distance 38 miles; estimated cost, \$1,618,000.

(5) Susitna Valley to the Kuskokwim River, distance 229 miles; estimated cost, \$12,760,000.

Their estimates of cost for the 16 lines of railroad estimated upon range from \$41,000 to \$64,000 per mile. If all of those lines were constructed concerning which they made a partial or full report, it would require more than \$600,000,000 from the Treasury to construct those lines. But relying upon one of the leading railroad presidents who appeared before the committee in advocacy of this bill, he said it would require 10,000 miles of railroad to develop Alaska. Let us strike a balance of the average cost per mile of \$48,000, and they estimate that to be the average price. To construct 10,000 miles of railroad, at \$48,000 per mile, would take \$480,000,000 out of the Treasury. I ask this House, who have promised the people economy and sane, careful, patient, well-defined government, what does all this mean? I ask you what political platform, aside from the Socialist and the Progressive platforms, ever promised, prior to their election, any such propaganda as that?

This bill appropriates \$1,000,000 outright. It authorizes a bond issue of \$35,000,000 outright, and authorizes the President to do anything and everything he desires to do with that first \$36,000,000. There is a veiled suggestion coming from somewhere behind the scenes that from this \$36,000,000 they are going to build three lines of railroad, but no part of the bill, from first to last, limits it to any particular line or any particular feature of construction, and no part of the bill limits the number of miles to be constructed, or offers a word of restraint as to the purchase of these seven defunct, "busted" railroads that are now seeking to sell out. Any attempt to parallel them would be opposed on every hand, so what will probably happen is an unloading of those defunct, worthless roads on the Government, which will blast us and plague us.

The Alaskan Territorial Legislature have expressed themselves on this proposition, and in a letter directed to the Secretary of the Interior on April 13, 1913, signed by the president of the senate and six senators, have expressed the gravest doubt about the advisability of the construction of the railroad by the Federal Government.

I will insert this letter in the RECORD at this point:

ALASKA TERRITORIAL LEGISLATURE,
SENATE CHAMBER,
Juneau, Alaska, April 13, 1913.

TO THE SECRETARY OF INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: We are informed that it is a general opinion prevalent at Washington that the people of Alaska are unanimously in favor of a Federal Government owned, constructed, and operated railroad in Alaska.

The majority of the people, in our opinion, are opposed to the principle of Government ownership.

It is true, however, that in order to prevent the depopulation of Alaska we are in favor of any plan or system that will result in the immediate construction of trunk-line railroads in Alaska, as an imperative necessity to the development of our vast mineral resources and extensive coal fields.

We consider "transportation" the key to the present situation in Alaska.

Yours, respectfully,

L. V. RAY,
President of the Senate.
ELWOOD BRUNER,
Senator Second Division.
B. F. MILLARD,
Senator Third Division.
CONRAD FREDDING,
Senator Second Division.
H. T. TRIPP,
Senator First Division.
J. M. TANNER,
Senator First Division.
HENRY RODEN,
Senator Fourth Division.

Hon. FRANKLIN K. LANE,
Washington, D. C.

I can scarcely think this Congress, irrespective of party and irrespective of any program mapped out in the minds of those here, can realize what all this means. Ten thousand miles of railroad, it is stated in the Senate hearings, will be required to develop Alaska. Ten thousand miles of railroad, at \$48,000 a mile, calls for an appropriation of \$480,000,000. Is there anyone who thinks that by the building of the three lines of railroad referred to the clamor from the Seattle Chamber of Commerce and the various chambers of commerce in Alaska will be stopped? Are the eyes of anybody so blinded to the truth as to believe that this \$36,000,000 which we are now proposing to appropriate will be the end? Not at all. It will merely whet and sharpen the appetite of every other chamber of commerce, of every other town-site booster, of every promoter up there to come down and claim their part.

What is the history of appropriations in this House? Look at them. Look at the Army and Navy. Look at the rural-route appropriations, which started in a few years ago with \$30,000 or \$40,000 and now amount to \$45,000,000.

Tom Reed and his entire Congress were swept off the map because they appropriated a billion dollars in a single Congress of two years. We are appropriating more than a billion dollars

every session of Congress, and we are asking to be retained from an economical standpoint and on a platform of economy.

I do not blame my good friend the gentleman from Kansas, VIC MURDOCK, and his Progressive Party for advocating this scheme. But I should like to have a Republican or a Democrat step up here and say that he advocated the Government ownership of railroads in any platform that he ever ran on, at any time, at any place, or anywhere. The Bull Moose Party are so few in number and so far from power and responsibility they can advocate anything. They were organized to destroy the regular Republican Party. That is done. Their mission is ended.

Mr. BRYAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. For a question.

Mr. BRYAN. Will not the gentleman admit that Mr. Bryan, Secretary of State, openly advocated Government ownership of railroads?

Mr. FERRIS. Not at all. I have attended the last four or five national conventions, and nowhere, except in the platform of the Socialists or the Progressives, has there been any plank on the Government ownership of railroads. The courageous Secretary of State has had much to do with the making of each one of these platforms, and if he desired Government ownership in them it would undoubtedly have been inserted.

Mr. BARTLETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes.

Mr. BARTLETT. I know that the gentleman is familiar with what I am about to ask him.

Mr. FERRIS. I do not know about that.

Mr. BARTLETT. One suggestion that has been made here, and as an argument why we should build this railroad to develop Alaska, is to compare it with what we have done in the matter of railroads in the Philippines. Is it not a fact that the Government of the United States has not at any time guaranteed any bonds of any railroad in the Philippines, but that the Philippine Government alone is responsible for them?

Mr. FERRIS. I think that is true. I have not given that close attention recently, but this is undoubtedly our first attempt in anything of this kind.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. If the gentleman from Oklahoma will allow me, that is absolutely true. Congress permitted the Philippine Government to guarantee the bonds, but the United States did not guarantee them.

Mr. BARTLETT. I do not want to take up the gentleman's time.

Mr. FERRIS. I endeavored to get some additional time, but I did not get it.

Mr. BARTLETT. That was one of the reasons and one of the arguments given by the advocates here, that we were doing this thing in the Philippines, and I want it to appear in the RECORD, and I knew that the gentleman from Oklahoma was familiar with the matter.

Mr. FERRIS. The Government is not doing it in the Philippines, neither are they doing it anywhere else. They have heretofore granted to railroads a large amount of land, which is a blot on the Nation's history, and no man can defend it. All through this debate that has been offered as a precedent as to why we ought to do this, but instead of being a precedent in favor of it it is a hideous, ghastly, blighting precedent against it, and we ought not to need anything more to make us realize it.

The proponents of this legislation offer as a precedent for this bill that the Federal Government has heretofore granted 159,125,734 acres of the public domain to the railroads of the country to encourage them in railroad building. I pause to call attention to the cold but stolid fact that this acreage, at \$10 an acre, would bring an amount of \$1,591,257,340 of the people's money; I pause to again call attention to the somber fact that this was the granting away of homes of 40 acres each to 3,988,143 homeless American families; I pause again to ask if such a precedent is sufficiently encouraging to warrant us in supporting the Alaskan railway bill. So far as I am concerned, I am opposed to any more land grants, and I think the records will show that the land grants of this country, by which the railroads were enabled to sell at extortionate prices and on harsh terms to bona fide home builders the lands received gratis from the Federal Government, is a blot upon our history and would serve only as a condemnation rather than as a precedent to proceed further upon the same line.

My good friend from Alaska [Mr. WICKERSHAM], who is able, bright, and brilliant, made a noble fight for his people, and I am glad that he did; but he took occasion to whack my colleague and myself and my State over the fact. This morning I secured from the General Land Office a letter which I have here, saying that there was not a single acre of land granted in aid of railroads throughout my entire State. I shall not take the

time to read the letter, for our State is not on trial. We are not asking the Federal Government to appropriate \$36,000,000 in aid of any railroad project.

It is doubtless important to this Congress to know exactly what is proposed to be done here. It might also be interesting to know just who wants the Federal Government to build this line from Chitina to Fairbanks. We are fortunate in having so good an authority as ex-Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Fisher, to quote from, wherein on page 141 of the Senate hearings he illuminates quite well, though possibly unintentionally, the real situation in Alaska. The exact colloquy is as follows:

Senator WALSH. Mr. Secretary, does not that condition, with the immense wealth of agriculture and mineral deposits, in that neighborhood offer the most inviting kind of a field for the construction of a railroad by private enterprise?

Mr. FISHER. No; it does not, for this reason, Senator: The difficulty is that the people that are asked to build this railroad will say:

"Alaska is a long way off and we are not satisfied with the return on our investment in Alaska that we would be satisfied with in Indiana, Iowa, or Montana. We want a great deal more if we are going to put our money in up there. We do not see where we are going to get it. It may be that in the course of time there will be traffic developed which will justify it, but it is a long wait, and we do not know; we will proceed tentatively. We will develop up to the Matanuska field, then we will stop, and we will wait to see what happens."

The result is nothing happens except in the most casual fashion. As I said before, it is a vicious circle. You never get any place. You have got to get your transportation in advance of development, and the financial interests that have been concerned so far have no disposition to do it. I have talked with the representatives of the people interested in the Copper River Railroad. They talked very sensibly about it. They say, "We do not care to extend from Chitina over to Fairbanks, because it would not pay." Why have they built that railroad? They have built it because they were interested in the Bonanza copper field up at Kennicott, and they figured there was enough copper ore up there to justify putting in the road that far. They came up to Chitina and came up the Chitina River to Kennicott and built the road. It cost them, so they say, approximately \$20,000,000. You say, "Build it from here" [indicating]. They say, "That is an awful way off, and we do not see the justification for it at all. We do not care to do it." I have asked them, "Do you care to give any assurance at all?" "No; we do not want to do that; we have had our dose in Alaska. Our present investment is not particularly encouraging, and we do not care for more."

What they would like to do would be to have the Government build a road from Chitina over to Fairbanks.

Senator WALSH. That is quite obvious.

Mr. FISHER. That is one reason why I have advocated the Government taking over this road from Seward, this 72 miles, and extending this other road. I have not much use for this feeder system, the Government building the feeders and the privately owned trunk line getting the advantage of them.

Senator WALSH. If you were endeavoring now to interest us as the directors of a private road to construct beyond the coal fields and into the Tanana Valley, what inducements would you hold out to us as the directors of a private road to construct?

Mr. FISHER. If you were a private road, all I could do to you would be to describe as eloquently as I was able the probable future development of the country.

Senator WALSH. That is what I want to know.

Mr. FISHER. I should like to do that. I think the railroad commission has done it as well as men could who wished to be careful about what they said, and have a solid foundation for every statement. They have said what they think can be done. They have said that if private capital builds that extension from Chitina over to there [indicating], and pays what private capital would have to pay for its money, or would expect to get as a return on its investment, that there is not enough freight visible at the present time to pay the carrying charges, let alone a profit over and above what might be called a proper bond interest for private capital under conditions like that. But they say that if the Government builds it the difference in the rate of interest that the Government would have to pay on its money and what private capital would expect to pay on its makes all the difference between success and failure.

Now, let us see what the situation is. Here are the Guggenheim people, who have built their road from Cordova up to Chitina. From there to Fairbanks the record in the Senate before the Territories Committee shows that it is a wild, barren, worthless, glacial country, and that nothing will grow there and that nothing does grow there. The glaciers have come down from the mountains from time immemorial, and there are huge cakes of ice there 200 feet below the surface, which have each season been buried deeper and deeper as the last glacial formations would come down upon them; so that it is a bleak country of no value. The Government, if it builds that extension, will do one of two things—either buy out the Guggenheim line and be in the attitude of buying out alleged crooks instead of prosecuting them, or building a Federal Government line up there, up through a barren waste, so that the Guggenheims will get the profits and the Federal Government will get the experience. I ask you which one of the horns of this dilemma do you choose? Here comes Secretary Fisher, who says that the Guggenheims refuse to build any farther up there; that they have had enough of Alaska. They told Senator NELSON in the Senate that they wanted to sell the lines. Here is Mr. Ballaine, who owns the Seward town site and was the promoter of the now "busted" railroad 70 miles long. He is here, too, and before the committee seeking to get the railroad taken over. Without becoming personal, there is a lady in my hotel who owns stock which she was induced to buy in a railroad to be built across

Bering Strait from Alaska into Russia, under the sea, beginning nowhere and ending nowhere. Is the Government, of which we are the chosen agents, to be duped, scuttled, and cheated? Are we to allow our Government to be the unsuspecting one?

This new theme of buying out alleged crooks, criminals, and monopolists rather than prosecuting them is a propaganda wonderfully and terribly made. I should prefer, had I my way, that we make use of our clear-headed administration, our well-trained and well-equipped Department of Justice, and see to it that every species of monopoly is crushed out of Alaska; that every monopolist is prosecuted and imprisoned, so that the humblest man in all America may be given an opportunity to lease a piece of coal land and carry on his industry under fair treatment and not admit that we have to buy out the Guggenheim and other defunct Alaskan railroads or to build railroads that will accommodate them in order to ward off the monopoly and oppression of which they stand charged.

These schemers and promoters from up there are going over the country selling wild blue sky stock to people, and they have come down into this House and into this Government with their moving picture shows, and pictures, and chambers of commerce, and they are about to blind the eyes of the clear-headed men in the House. I will offer some remedies before I get through of how you can open Alaska, and do it without any noise or whoop hooray, and without any breaking of precedents, and without any going back on our party platform or anything else.

Again I quote from Secretary Fisher in the hearings from the Senate. I quote now from a portion which comes after a colloquy between him and Senator WALSH. He says:

I want to say, Mr. Senator, that you would not be interested in it at all as private parties unless you were quite optimistic about the future development and willing to go through a lean period in order to obtain a sufficient return upon your capital. You would figure a loss if you figured the carrying charges upon your investment.

Gentlemen, after all, the Federal Government wants to do its full duty. I want to do my full duty and you want to do your full duty, but at the same time you are Representatives of the people and of the Government, and you should not launch your Government into something that your ex-Secretary of the Interior tells you is not feasible, and you should not put the Federal Government in the attitude of going through a lean period that no private person would be interested in. Appropriations have grown beyond all reason and defense, and some time, somewhere, somebody ought to take unto themselves the painful task of having the Federal Government use a little common sense and head off appropriations that can not be defended from any economic source whatever.

Mr. Chairman, one word about the coal fields. There are but two known coal fields in Alaska that anybody will assert have a merchantable value sufficient to bear shipping expenses to the States. They have a lot of lignite coal up in and around Fairbanks and in the interior of Alaska, but everyone knows that lignite coal will not bear shipping across Alaska, a distance of 400 or 500 miles and then a 1,500-mile water haul to Seattle. The two fields are the Matanuska and the Bering coal fields. Where are they? They are right on the coast, not right on the edge of the water, but one is 25 miles back from the water and the other is about 130 miles back. The construction of 25 miles of railroad will give us water transportation to the Bering field and a distance of 110 miles added on to the Ballaine defunct road, that is now "busted," and which is now on the market on amicable terms by the lamb speculators who want to let loose. I ask my own party, who are charged with responsibility here and who are on trial, what more would you want to do than to build those two extensions if you wanted to build anything? Why appropriate \$36,000,000 to build up through a country that has nothing to invite either private or public capital to construct? I again revert to some of ex-Secretary Fisher's statements. He is not of my party and he is not an official of this day, but I have been a member of the Committee on Indian Affairs and of the Committee on the Public Lands, and I grew quite well acquainted with him. He was before both of those committees many times. I say for him in his absence, and I would say to him anywhere, he is one of the clearest-headed men in this country. Here is what he says:

Alaskan coal is of great value, but its extent and character have been much exaggerated. There are great quantities of lignite and low-grade bituminous coal in several parts of the Territory, but there are only two fields of accessible high-grade coal known in Alaska.

Of course, Secretary Fisher then did not know that the Secretary of the Navy had tested this coal and finds that it is not feasible for naval purposes. I will present those letters in a few minutes. He continues:

Their location is shown on the accompanying map, page 1—which we do not have here. The better known of these two fields is the Bering River field, which is near Controller Bay, and in which the

Cunningham claims were located. It is the field about which the Alaskan controversy has been fiercest and most bitter. The Matanuska field is larger and may prove to be the more important. Both of these fields contain anthracite and high-grade bituminous coals. The question is how they shall be opened so as to promote development and protect the public interests. Before answering that question it is necessary to consider the general conditions that now exist and the real end that we wish to attain. Alaskan coal can be opened so as to enable a larger or smaller number of individuals or groups of individuals to make money out of its development, bringing with this development considerable incidental benefit to the community as a whole through the expenditure of money and the employment of men; or it can be opened on terms which will offer to the operator a sufficient profit to furnish an adequate incentive for his investment and his efforts, but which will result in placing the coal upon the market at the cheapest price consistent with this incentive, conferring upon the community the manifold advantages of cheap fuel and of the development of the many forms of industrial enterprise that cheap fuel renders possible.

That states the case more beautifully than I can state it, and, if I can have the time, I am going to state how this can be done without the construction by the Government of any road. Again, it will be observed that 500 tons of that coal has within the last month been examined, been burned, been used on the steamship cruiser *Maryland* in the test, and in addition to that a test has been made down here at Annapolis, where that coal has been washed and screened and given all possible advantages of the test. Let me read what the Secretary of the Navy says in a letter addressed to my colleague [Mr. DAVENPORT]:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, December 15, 1913.

HON. JAMES S. DAVENPORT,
*Committee on the Territories,
House of Representatives, United States.*

MY DEAR MR. DAVENPORT: The report of the coal investigations in the Bering River fields has not yet been completed. At the present time the progress is as follows: The conditions in the Bering River field have been observed and a large sample of coal mined. It has been estimated that the field contains an adequate supply. The sample of run-of-mine coal contained a much larger percentage of ash than former investigations of the field indicated, and possibly on account of this large ash content and the clinking of the coal the test by the U. S. S. *Maryland* proved that run-of-mine Bering River coal is unsuitable for naval use. A portion of the coal was screened and washed at the naval engineering experiment station, Annapolis, Md., and an evaporative test will be made on December 17 and 18 to show whether the washed and screened coal from the Bering River field is suitable for naval use.

The department regrets that your letter was not received in time to forward you this information at the hour requested by you.

Sincerely, yours,

JOSEPHUS DANIELS.

Now, let me read what they say after they made a test at Annapolis:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, December 27, 1913.

HON. JAMES S. DAVENPORT, M. C.,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. DAVENPORT: The preliminary report of the tests of Bering River washed and screened coal at the engineering experiment station, Annapolis, Md., notes that under similar conditions Bering River coal produced only about 75 per cent of the power gotten with Pocahontas.

The department therefore notes with regret that the Bering River coal sample has thus far proved unsuitable for naval use.

Sincerely, yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
Acting Secretary of the Navy.

I ask with what bland complacency those gentlemen in favor of this bill can go along claiming this is the place to establish a naval base. I ask what becomes of the argument that was the sole moving cause that undoubtedly interested the President and the Secretary of the Interior. Though not endeavoring to quote them here or without any brief for them, the fact was it was a place from which they could ship naval coal, and I want to call attention to the fact that Josephus Daniels, Secretary of the Navy, in the report so recent that he can not be mistaken about it, says it is not naval coal, and he regrets very much that it is not suitable. But that is not all.

Mr. LENROOT. Now, the gentleman wants to be fair—

Mr. FERRIS. I do.

Mr. LENROOT. That applies only to the Bering field coal.

Mr. FERRIS. Oh, absolutely; but the Bering field has been considered better than the other.

Mr. LENROOT. Quite the contrary.

Mr. FERRIS. I do not want to enter into an argument with the gentleman; I can not do so in the time I have; but I have plenty of reports to show the two fields are on a parity, and many assert the Bering is the better.

Mr. BOOHER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. I will.

Mr. BOOHER. From what field was the coal obtained that was tested at Bremerton?

Mr. FERRIS. I am not acquainted with the Bremerton tests. Is that one of these?

Mr. BOOHER. That is from the Matanuska field, and held to be the best naval coal in the country.

Mr. FERRIS. I am not familiar with that test; but I am referring to the test which was held at Annapolis, which says they used 500 tons, and it is not feasible coal. It was examined at Annapolis as recently as December 18-19, 1913, and this other letter relative to the Annapolis test is of date of December 27, and it shows it did not bear the test.

Mr. BOOHER. I thought the Matanuska coal was decided by test to be the best coal.

Mr. FERRIS. I am not acquainted with any such report, and it must be of a more ancient origin than this.

Mr. MANN. Is the gentleman aware the Secretary of the Navy has recently reported that the Navy Department ought to entirely abandon the use of coal?

Mr. FERRIS. I am, and I am going to read a letter here in relation to it. Might I not have more time? I am going to hurry through. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to conclude, which will only run a little over my time.

Mr. MANN. How much time would the gentleman desire over the hour?

Mr. FERRIS. I would like to have authority to finish within the two hours, if I can, and I will try to finish within an hour and a half.

Mr. MANN. I will again ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have an hour's extra time if he needs it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma have an hour's additional time. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. [Applause.]

Mr. BATHRICK. I would like to say gentlemen appearing in connection with the hearings before the Naval Committee stated that this coal could be used in time of peace and was among the best used.

Mr. FERRIS. I will say in response to the gentleman I do not know what happened before the committee; you can get anything you want before a committee, but here we have a statement from the head of the department that the Secretary of the Navy says, in two letters dated in December, 1913, both of them, that the coal is poor, inferior, and not suitable for naval use. That settles it, as far as I am concerned. I am not interested in what was said by some enthusiast before a commercial club or before a committee or anywhere else, but what the Secretary of the Navy says is what interests me and he has stated in writing his views. Now, if the gentleman will let me proceed, I will do so.

Again, as has been suggested by the gentleman from Illinois, and he merely anticipated what I was going to say, because I have the letter here, all future battleships are to be built to burn crude oil, and not coal. Not only that, but most all of the battleships now burn oil. To be sure that I make no mistake, let me present a letter on this oil-burner question of the Secretary of the Navy, as follows:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, December 15, 1913.

HON. SCOTT FERRIS,
House of Representatives, United States.

MY DEAR MR. FERRIS: The tests of Bering River coal will not be completed until December 18. In general, it may be said that an adequate quantity of Bering River coal exists in that field; that the sample mined contained a much larger ash content than analyses would indicate; that the U. S. S. *Maryland's* tests showed that run-of-mine Bering River coal is not suitable for naval use; and that the tests at the engineering experiment station at Annapolis are being conducted to ascertain whether washed and screened coal from this field is suitable for naval use.

The Navy has definitely abandoned the use of coal in future fighting-ship design, and all destroyers, submarines, and battleships are being designed for oil burning. There are now built and building 4 battleships, 41 destroyers, 30 submarines, 1 monitor, 3 tank ships, 1 submarine tender, and several tugs and small vessels, all of which are to use oil fuel. Eight battleships burn both coal and oil, and 1 transport and a supply ship will be fitted to burn either oil or coal.

Sincerely, yours,

JOSEPHUS DANIELS.

What has become of these bland gentlemen who say that nowhere can such a naval base be found as that contemplated in Alaska? Here we find the Secretary of the Navy telling us, first, that the coal is not good and feasible for naval use, and, second, we find the use of coal in fighting battleships has been totally abandoned. With what consistency can men come here and say that we must appropriate money lavishly, and, I fear, almost idiotically, for a purpose that is so wanting in feasibility and sense and so nonfeasible from every possible viewpoint?

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. I will.

Mr. SHERLEY. Is it the gentleman's contention that the Navy will have no need for coal in the future?

Mr. FERRIS. Not that. They will use some coal, I assume. There is no question about that.

Mr. SHERLEY. The reason for my question is that they are making provision for a very great supply of coal at Panama, and I was wondering, in view of what the gentleman says, why they are doing it.

Mr. FERRIS. To make sure that we be not mistaken about that, if the gentleman from Kentucky will give me his attention—

Mr. SHERLEY. Certainly.

Mr. FERRIS. I have in my hand a letter of December 16, 1913, from the head of the Navy Department, which says the Navy has abandoned the use of coal in future battleship designs.

Mr. SHERLEY. I am not questioning the gentleman's statement. But I was struck immediately on hearing it how it appeared to be in conflict with the policy they are pursuing in connection with the use of coal in Panama.

Mr. FERRIS. I did not know that was true. But, gentlemen, if we do not have coal in Alaska that is suitable for the Navy Department, and we are not constructing any ships to use it, what under high heaven can be the reason for entering Alaska with a Government railroad?

Mr. MANN. The gentleman has not referred to the annual report of the Secretary of the Navy. He goes into the subject matter more thoroughly there than in the letter which the gentleman has read.

Mr. FERRIS. That was made a year or two ago.

Mr. MANN. I refer to the annual report of the Secretary of the Navy submitted about the 1st of December. He says that every civilized nation that knows anything is trying to abandon coal in the Navy, and that we have the best chance of any of them to use oil.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I want to ask the gentleman if he does not admit that coal that is 75 per cent as good as the Pocahontas standard coal would not be available in the service of the Government on the Pacific Ocean, not only for some war ships, but for revenue cutters, colliers, cable ships, and so forth, and be plenty good enough?

Mr. FERRIS. I assume myself it would be certainly good for some purposes, but I do not know of any better authority to go to than our Secretary of the Navy, who has so recently had tested 500 tons of it—washed it and screened it, gave it every chance—at Annapolis, and has absolutely exploded that view from every standpoint.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. I will.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Can you give us any idea of the depth at which the coal tested was mined?

Mr. FERRIS. I can not. I have the letters before me. They seem to have gone to great pains about it. They have brought it here to our Naval School and have screened and washed it and given it the highest possible test.

Mr. BATHRICK. I will answer the question of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LA FOLLETTE].

Mr. FERRIS. I will not yield for a side colloquy. I want to make the speech myself. I say that, of course, with due courtesy to the gentleman. I know the gentleman does not want to try to take me off my feet.

Mr. GOULDEN. Will the gentleman yield for just this question? How many tons of coal were brought over to Annapolis and used in that test?

Mr. FERRIS. Five hundred tons, I think; although the letter does not disclose the amount.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. If the gentleman will permit, the amount sent east for actual test was but 50 tons, and only 500 tons were used on the coast for actual trials.

Mr. FERRIS. I accept the gentleman's statement, because I think he knows. Now, if there is any reason on earth for building a railroad, we will have to show the reason for hauling something out of Alaska or something into Alaska. That is a bold, but nevertheless practical, statement.

As stated before, that is a bald, frank statement, but I am going to deal presently with that very statement.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma yield to the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. FERRIS. I do.

Mr. SAUNDERS. We have evidence of recent tests showing the inefficiency of this coal. I wish to ask the gentleman whether there are any tests that have shown its efficiency for naval use?

Mr. FERRIS. I do not know of any having been had; otherwise they would have been presented here with glaring headlines.

Mr. SHERLEY. How about coal for the use of the Army? How much coal does the Army use in comparison with the Navy?

Mr. FERRIS. I can not make accurate answer to that, but, as I understand, we do not need much coal for the Army posts in Alaska. We have enough coal in the States, at the rate of 400,000,000 tons consumed last year, to last us 7,000 years. The Geological Survey assures us of this by their full and complete reports.

Mr. SHERLEY. Well, we have transports for the Army that use coal.

Mr. FERRIS. I can not answer the gentleman, but I believe that such coal as might be needed for the Army posts in the far West could be transported from Wyoming, where the Geological Survey report for 1908 shows there is enough coal to supply the people of this Republic, at the rate of 400,000,000 tons' consumption a year, for 1,000 years, and that as yet the surface has been but scratched. This, of course, includes Army posts and all sorts of consumption. I take it that we could use that Wyoming coal much more cheaply than by bringing the Alaskan coal down. It is close by—from two to four thousand miles—with railroads and normal conditions present.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. That is lignite coal in Wyoming, is it not?

Mr. FERRIS. I am not so sure about that. It is good coal. I have a report of the Geological Survey showing that they have enough coal in that State, with only a mere handful of people, comparatively, to last the people of this country 1,000 years, at the rate of 400,000,000 tons a year.

Mr. HELGESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes.

Mr. HELGESEN. Does the gentleman claim that the test he refers to is a fair test of the value of all the coal in Alaska?

Mr. FERRIS. In answer to the gentleman's question, I will say this, that we have from ex-Secretary Fisher and from all of my associates in opposition to this bill, and from all the hearings and reports that can be got, the general testimony to the effect that there are only two known coal fields in Alaska, the Bering field and the Matanuska, that would justify the expense of shipping coal from Alaska and then incurring the expense of a haul of 2,000 miles for its transportation by water. The books and reports are full of data showing that the Matanuska coal field is on individual property, and that the Bering coal field, according to the reports, is superior to the Matanuska, but the coal other than these two fields is all in the interior of Alaska, and nobody claims that that lignite coal is of any other than local value.

Mr. HELGESEN. Are there not reports on file showing that there are great quantities of it?

Mr. FERRIS. Secretary Fisher says there are enormous quantities of low-grade lignite around the Tanana and in that interior section of the country, but he states that it is of value only for local purposes.

Now I must proceed. We have, about 50 miles south of Fairbanks, and within 20 or 30 miles from the proposed road from Cordova or along the proposed route from Seward, the Nenana coal field. I do not know just how that is pronounced.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Ne-na-na.

Mr. FERRIS. Yes. The Nenana coal field is a coal field where there is an enormous amount of lignite coal. But that is in the interior, where they are holding out the olive branch to us and telling us that we must open it up. Now, everybody knows what lignite coal is. Everybody knows that lignite coal is only good coal for local purposes, and that it is not of sufficient value to warrant its transportation for a long distance. I will read from the hearings an extract of testimony by Dr. Alfred H. Brooks, of the Geological Survey, who was a member of the railway commission, and here, no doubt, is a reference to one of those chamber of commerce pictures. The colloquy between Mr. Wickersham and Dr. Brooks is as follows:

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Have you seen this picture over here [indicating]?

Mr. Brooks. I did not take that photograph. I am a little skeptical about the picture of a coal bed.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. How thick is that bed?

Mr. Brooks. I have measured coal about 20 feet in thickness in this field. That is about the workable limit of commercial mining, so I prefer to think there is no coal quite so thick as indicated by the picture, because I do not think it would be worth much. But whatever may be said about the thickness of any individual bed, there is an enormous amount of coal in the field. Our party made an estimate on the basis of the actual coal in sight—and our surveys were not detailed—of some 9,000,000,000 tons, which is more lignite coal than we estimated in all Alaska at the time we made the reports of the conservation commission. There is an abundant supply of coal there. So far as we know it is all lignite, a fair grade of lignite, and can be used to advantage in local industries.

I hope the House will get that point, because, gentlemen, we have got to produce something in the interior of Alaska; otherwise they do not need a railroad. Reading from the report:

So far as we know, it is all lignite, a fair grade of lignite, and it can be used to advantage in local industries.

Is not that what I told you a moment ago? Dr. Brooks is the best geologist and the highest authority, and both the proponents and opponents of this bill will so insist. What he says ought to have weight here. It is not guesses and horseback opinions, but words from some one who knows—words from a man who is not biased and has no schemes to promote.

Continuing, he says:

It should be used, because they need fuel at Fairbanks very badly, and will need it much worse before many years have passed, because the timber supply has been rapidly used up by the local needs of the community.

So we have Dr. Brooks explaining to us that the only coal they have in the interior of Alaska is lignite. The other two fields are down where they have water transportation. What earthly reason do they have for this proposed Government railroad? Do you suppose a ton of lignite coal could ever stand the freight charges out to the coast and then stand 1,500 or 3,000 miles of water shipment? Certainly not. This is not any speculative theory, but this is the theory of Dr. Brooks, of the Geological Survey, who has long been a resident of Alaska, and who was of such high standing that President Taft appointed him on this railroad commission. Both friends and foes of this legislation must recognize him.

I take it it may not be amiss to let the people know, first, how much coal is used annually in the whole United States. I have the figures here, 405,000,000 tons in round numbers. Fifteen million tons come from Alabama, 2,000,000 tons from Arkansas, while California and Alaska, both put together, only produce 11,000 tons. I do not say there is not coal in Alaska, but Alaska is so inaccessible, so far away, that it can not stand the shipment charges and never will be able to stand them. With coal enough in the States already located by the Geological Survey to last 7,000 years, we will never need it.

I will read a table from the Geological Survey giving some statistics on coal production, by States, which might be interesting:

Coal production of the United States, 1911, by States.
[Value per ton and price per ton per employee.]

States.	Tons.	Average per ton.	Tons per employees.
Alabama.....	15,021,332	\$1.27	662
Arkansas.....	2,106,789	1.61	372
California and Alaska.....	11,647	2.00
Colorado.....	10,157,383	1.45	710
Georgia and North Carolina.....	165,230	1.49
Idaho and Nevada.....	1,821	2.68
Illinois.....	53,679,118	1.11	701
Indiana.....	14,201,355	1.08	670
Iowa.....	7,331,648	1.73	442
Kansas.....	6,254,228	1.54	538
Kentucky.....	13,706,539	.99	628
Maryland.....	4,685,795	1.11	779
Michigan.....	1,476,074	1.89	444
Missouri.....	3,760,607	1.71	376
Montana.....	2,976,358	1.79	770
New Mexico.....	3,148,158	1.54	788
North Dakota.....	502,628	1.43
Ohio.....	30,759,986	1.03	688
Oklahoma.....	3,074,242	2.05	350
Oregon.....	46,661	2.32
Pennsylvania (bituminous).....	44,754,163	1.01	860
Tennessee.....	6,433,156	1.12	601
Texas.....	1,974,593	1.66
Utah.....	2,513,175	1.69	821
Virginia.....	6,864,667	.91	929
Washington.....	3,572,815	2.29	550
West Virginia.....	59,831,580	.90	896
Wyoming.....	6,744,864	1.56	851
Total.....	405,757,101

Now, the possible tonnage: We had the statement in glaring figures here about the products that come from Alaska. What are the facts? More than half the products that come from Alaska are furs and fish that do not need any railroad; that tonnage comes out of the water up there, and nature has supplied water transportation. Let me give you the exact figures. The total receipts of Alaska from 1868 to 1911 in mineral products, including coal, gypsum, marble, and tin, amounted to \$206,000,000, while the receipts for sea food and furs amount to \$222,000,000, making a total of \$428,000,000.

Is there anybody here who thinks we need a railroad into the interior of Alaska, through that cold, bleak, barren country, frozen 200 feet below the surface, in order to haul the furs and fish brought out of Alaskan waters down to Seattle? Ships

will carry them without any railroad. No one would use a railroad for that purpose if they had one. The rest of the products are mostly precious metals with large intrinsic value but devoid of tonnage. Railroads must have tonnage if they succeed.

Mr. HARDY. Do those figures include the fish output?

Mr. FERRIS. Those figures include the fisheries and furs.

Now, the real truth about it is that the mineral products of Alaska are beginning to fail, and I will present figures here to show it. There is a marked decrease in the Alaska production of minerals. The Geological Survey puts out an advance statement, which has later been embodied in their annual report, which shows the following facts. These are not speculative statements; these are not the statements of chambers of commerce; but these are the official statements of your own Geological Survey. This is not charged with town-site schemes or with railroad schemes, but comes from your own Geological Survey:

The total mineral output in Alaska in 1912 was \$22,000,000. The total output in 1913 was \$18,000,000, a dropping off of \$4,000,000 in a single year. The total gold output in Alaska for 1912 was \$17,000,000, and for 1913, \$15,000,000, dropping down \$2,000,000. Copper and other minerals dropped down in proportion.

Now, I want to devote a little time to agriculture and its possibilities in Alaska.

Mr. HARDY. Before the gentleman leaves that subject, is it not likely that if freight rates and conditions of access continue to be as hopeless in that section as they are to-day, finally the mining industry will have to be abandoned?

Mr. FERRIS. I do not think so. I will offer the gentleman a remedy a little later that I think the gentleman will accept.

Mr. HARDY. It would seem to be natural that people cease to endeavor to develop that country if the difficulties of getting to it should continue as they are now.

Mr. FERRIS. I have no criticism at all of that question. It is a very proper question, and I will try to answer it.

Alaska has been very much abused by the handling of its public domain, its land laws, and coal laws, and I have a plan that I think the conservation people of this House will accept, and I believe the anticconservationists will accept, and I believe Alaska may have the door swung wide open for such resources as she has and give her population a chance to grow. I will present that plan a little later. The man who comes into this House or who goes elsewhere and tears down, but has nothing to put in its place, is a mere destroyer; but the man who comes here and has something to advocate, is at least trying to do his duty and is entitled to your consideration. [Applause.]

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. Certainly.

Mr. LENROOT. I want to ask the gentleman if he thinks this plan will result in the building of railroads for private enterprise?

Mr. FERRIS. I think it would; and I will produce for the gentleman's edification the words of ex-Secretary Fisher, and I know that he is an ardent admirer of the ex-Secretary, as I am myself. The ex-Secretary says that it will, and I have no doubt of it.

Mr. LENROOT. The reason that I asked the gentleman the question is that up to this point the gentleman is making the point that there is nothing in Alaska to build railroads for, so I was curious to know what his opinion would be.

Mr. FERRIS. We will let the House pass on that after I get through. Now, it has been presented to this House by the chamber of commerce pictures and chamber of commerce resolutions and these booster sheets that have crept into the House from one source and another—I do not know where—that the interior of Alaska was a garden and as fertile as the Nile; that it would grow wheat, corn, and potatoes and everything on earth that you want to grow; and that the things would grow like a weed in a fertile soil.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. For a question.

Mr. HARDY. Does the gentleman recall the effort by the Northern Alaska Railroad Co. to get an extension of its franchise and how vigorously the ex-Secretary wanted the committee to guard against any kind of a privilege that might be deemed of value in case the Government should want to take over the railroad?

Mr. FERRIS. So far as I know that is true; but I do not know the situation the gentleman refers to.

Mr. HARDY. Did it not appear that the road seemed to be so hampered by present restrictions that capital was loth to go into it?

Mr. FERRIS. That is true, and the gentleman is anticipating my remedy; a remedy which the gentlemen may accept or not as they see fit.

Now, as to agriculture. In the first place, I want to say that since 1897 Congress has appropriated for the installation of five agricultural bureaus in Alaska—one situated at Sitka, one at Fairbanks, one at Copper Center, one at Kodiak, and one at another place.

If I show you what these agricultural agents who have been there in charge since 1897 say about the agricultural outlook of that country, would not that be as good evidence as the moving-picture show that the chamber of commerce is presenting to us around the Capitol and about Washington? Would not the House be more apt to listen to men that they themselves employed and sent there to compile the facts than they would in looking at the moving pictures? Why, in my town to-day William F. Cody, "Buffalo Bill," is killing and scalping Indians and hanging them up by the toes, and they are burning down haystacks and covered prairie wagons, to show what beautiful moving pictures they can produce. They make good pictures, but, of course, are not based on facts at all. I think most of us know what the Seattle-Alaska Co. is doing here. Why, they are having moving pictures over in the Senate Office Building; they are running them in my hotel. In a little while we will have these people that are down in Oklahoma producing moving pictures showing Cody down there scalping and burning Indians, but nobody believes that it is so. It is beautiful to entertain the children, but I am going to give you some facts. Facts, not moving pictures, are what should guide this House when they are spending the people's money.

Much has been said by the town-site promoters and real-estate men and the proponents of this measure about the agricultural possibilities of the interior of Alaska. After the experience I have had in new Territories I am neither amazed nor deceived by them. I have lived in a new town, I have lived in a new Territory, I have lived in a new State where every man was an enthusiast and every man was willing to buy, boom, and promote to-day that which on the coming morrow he would sell to his unsuspecting brother, and so on, ad infinitum, until the general collapse came. [Laughter.]

However, this is a novel scheme to have the Federal Government carry on the boom, or more unusual still is the fact that it is the first time I ever found it to be true that the Federal Government itself is to be the unsuspecting one. This is the first time I ever heard of the Government being asked to hold the sack. Fortunately for this Congress and for the Federal Treasury we have valuable testimony from Prof. Charles V. Piper, of the Department of Agriculture, in the District of Columbia, a member of the Alaska Railway Commission, sent there by President Taft, in the Senate hearings, pages 548, 550, 552, and 556, showing what Alaska is from an agricultural viewpoint.

Listen to this man. Here is a member of the railroad commission, here is one of the men who had charge of the Alaskan agricultural stations:

Prof. PIPER. The development of the Copper River region anticipated at the time that the station was there established did not materialize.

When it comes to predicting the future agriculture of Alaska from these experimental results, backed up by the results of many farmers scattered over Alaska, one is confronted with a difficult problem. Before I touch on that I may state that most of the work done at these experiment stations has been done on small plots. The yield of oats has varied from 50 up to 125 bushels per acre, and of barley from 50 to 60 bushels. Yields of 50 to 60 bushels of barley were, I understand, secured last season at Fairbanks in pretty large sized fields. No wheat, so far as I know, has yet been grown in fields of any area, or at least where considerable fields have been planted the winterkilling has been so severe that the yields have been small.

There can be no question from these results that there is a possibility of the production of grains in the agricultural lands of Alaska. Just here I may say that the amount of tillable land in the interior of Alaska has been estimated by most of the men who have attempted to make an estimate at about 30,000 square miles. The total area of agricultural lands in Alaska has been estimated at 100,000 square miles, of which it is assumed that at least one-third is tillable, and that of that tillable land probably more than two-thirds is in the interior. So there is a very large area of land which if capable of raising profitable crops of grain would furnish a large amount of freight. As I said a moment ago I do not think there is any question as to the possibility of growing these grains, especially the oats, barley, and rye. In fact, I think there can be no doubt that sufficient of them will be grown for all local needs. As to whether quantities will be raised that could be exported, I am very far from being sanguine. There is, as I understand, in the interior of Alaska no large area of land on which a farmer can go and plow up as he could on our western prairies. I therefore do not see any chance for rapid development of that region in the matter of grain production such as is taking place in Alberta to-day, and which took place in our western prairie States.

Senator JONES. What is your estimate, Judge, of the cost of clearing land at Fairbanks?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. It does not cost much. Do you know, Mr. Joslin, what they figure on down there?

Mr. JOSLIN. The report of the farmer for the experiment station for 1911 showed \$200 an acre.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. That was up there in that heavy timber?

Mr. JOSLIN. Yes; up in that heavy timber.

Prof. PIPER. That was also about the cost at Kenai on lands covered with light timber.

Mr. BALLAINE. That is heavy timber—very heavy timber at Kenai.

Prof. PIPER. I would not call it very heavy.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I have had a little experience in clearing land up in the interior of Alaska, and if you can get a burn on the ground and kill those trees, the roots will lie on top of the frost, and in two or three years you can go along there and almost kick them out. It is very easy. Of course if you do it in one season it is a very expensive system.

Prof. PIPER. At any rate, whether you put it at \$100 an acre or \$50 an acre, you can still get good farm lands in the United States at \$50 an acre. However, I would not give too much weight to that, because the pioneer is attracted to public land that he can homestead even if it cost \$200 an acre to clear. The \$200 an acre for clearing it is based, I suppose, on wages to the ordinary laboring man of \$5 and \$6 a day, and if a farmer clears the land himself he saves that \$5 or \$6 a day. So that it is really the high cost of labor that makes the apparent high cost of clearing that land.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. I am quoting from testimony, but I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I have read the testimony which the gentleman has just quoted, that it cost \$200 an acre to clear this land, but it is my understanding that that clearing was done by the Government by hiring labor that worked eight hours a day and paying \$7.50 a day for it.

Mr. FERRIS. Then that is one somber example of what the Government would do if we sent the Government up there to build railroads. What a hideous example that would be! If it cost \$200 an acre for the Government to clear land in Alaska, land that is covered with moss a foot thick, what would it cost to build a railroad? We have more than 300,000,000 acres of public land in the United States merely waiting for the homesteader to go upon it with his family and to turn over the soil, build a house, dig a well, set out an orchard, and farm. You can buy land in Illinois within 40 miles of Chicago for \$150 an acre. Why go to Alaska, where the ground freezes 200 feet deep, where the thermometer goes down to 80° below zero, where they have eight months' darkness, and take up land that costs \$200 an acre to clear?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I want to ask the gentleman if he has also read the evidence from my distinguished friend, Mr. Boyce, who wrote the article that has been circulated? After admitting everything, he says that they made a profit of \$600 an acre on their potatoes.

Mr. FERRIS. He may have, but I will show you a little later where they grow a few potatoes on that muck soil by aid of fertilizers, where it freezes 200 feet deep, and that those potatoes were so watery that they are a drug on the market at 4 cents a pound in Fairbanks, while potatoes from Seattle and the States were selling at \$1 a pound. I do not wonder that the Seattle Chamber of Commerce is here with their moving pictures, wanting transportation facilities, so that they may be able to sell their potatoes at \$1 a pound to the poor benighted Alaskans.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Has the gentleman seen the pictures?

Mr. FERRIS. No; I have not been taken in as yet, though I may be run down with them.

Mr. Chairman, fearful that Prof. Piper may have made a mistake, that he may have placed a charge too high, I want to give you more recent authority as to what it costs to clear land in Alaska, this wonderful Alaska. Did any of you know of Seth Mann? I do not know whether he is kin to the gentleman from Illinois or not. In any event, he was appointed by President Taft to go up there with the Seattle Chamber of Commerce to look over Alaska and to report to him personally what the situation was, and anything he would say against it, after being in the hands of the Seattle Chamber of Commerce as long as he was, you would take for granted, would you not? Listen to what he says. On page 12 of his report this is what he says about clearing the land:

The trees are small and valueless, except for fuel. They are easily uprooted, and when the clearing is completed the covering of moss and tundra—

I do not know what that is, but it must be something awful—about a foot in thickness must be removed and the soil exposed to the summer sun. The initial expense in preparing the ground is in many places considerable, reaching as high as \$125 per acre.

Prof. Piper says it would take from \$50 to \$200 an acre, and Mr. Mann says that it would take \$125 an acre. Mr. Mann has just got back from there, and he rushed that report to every desk, a beautifully blue bound report. He says that it would cost \$125 an acre to clear it, so some of these fellows must be

telling the truth, and this man Mann all of the time under the influence of the Seattle Chamber of Commerce. If he says \$125 an acre, we might double it and then be safe. Here is what Prof. Piper says again:

So far as railways into the interior are concerned, any great amount of agricultural freight in the future would have, in the main, to come from and on account of possible grain production; that is, the production of other things like dairy products, or even meats, would not yield any very great amount of freight.

The most interesting experiment stations, so far as this problem is concerned in Alaska, are those at Rampart, which has been conducted since about 1900; Fairbanks, where the experiment station has been in existence since 1907, I believe; and Copper Center, on the Copper River, where an experiment station was conducted from 1902 to 1906.

It will be observed that conditions were so unfavorable at this point that the Agricultural Department was compelled to abandon it after six years of futile effort.

They sometimes cut wheat green before it has time to head up, because it will not ripen. I will show you where on July 1, on August 8, on August 25, on September 5, there was a killing frost.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. At what place?

Mr. FERRIS. At one of the agricultural stations.

Again, here is what Prof. Piper says. He is still working for the Agricultural Department and these are his annual reports, which you gentlemen can get from the Agricultural Department:

In general, my impression of the whole interior country is that there will be successful homesteads wherever there is a local market for the produce. I am somewhat skeptical about there being in the near future any surplus produce, either of potatoes or potato products, or of cereals, which will be exported.

Now I will give a little more.

Prof. PIPER. I may state briefly, in conclusion, that my own viewpoint, and I think that is the viewpoint Prof. Chubbuck has taken—and I am sure it is the one Prof. Georgeson takes in all his reports—is conservative as to the future agricultural development of the interior of Alaska. I have no doubt that with the building of the railways there will be plenty of literature of the boom type published, but I think it would be something of a calamity to induce any large number of homesteaders to go there to-morrow with the idea that it could be developed rapidly, like much of our prairie country was in the West. In the development of a new agricultural region usually the first development is live stock and the second is grain raising—usually wheat raising. Now, in the development of the live-stock industry in Alaska somewhat different methods will have to be used to those which farmers have been familiar with in the States, and, in a way, they will have to feel their way along toward the most profitable methods.

In the matter of extensive grain culture, while that may be possible, I feel that the farmer himself will have many problems to solve before the ordinary man can be advised to go into grain farming. That is, in other words, I would fear that the greatest danger to the proper development of the interior of Alaska would be of holding out too rosy hopes of what can be done in the way of its agricultural development.

Observe the spectacle of asking one aspiring to own a home, leaving the more than 300,000,000 acres of Government land behind in a mild climate among good schools, good roads, near-by markets, where land can be had by merely residing upon it, to go to Alaska, where it costs from \$50 to \$200 per acre to clear it, where they have frost every month in the year, the thermometer 80° below zero, and the ground frozen 200 feet below the surface.

Now let me go a little further, and I desire to speak of weather conditions in Alaska, and I want to talk a little about that. These are the annual reports of the department I am quoting from they make in Alaska, the same as here, and they can be had by anyone applying, and they say the weather conditions in Alaska are both varied and uncertain, and the success or failure in agriculture is necessarily dependent upon them. The annual reports from the agricultural stations in Alaska usually commence with the condition of the weather, as shown by the excerpts from the agricultural experiment station reports for the years 1905, 1910, 1911, and 1912.

I shall first present for your consideration an excerpt from the annual report for the year 1912, at page 99:

The plans outlined in former reports have been followed during the past year. In experimental work it is disastrous to change plans. They should be so well considered beforehand that no change will be necessary. The fundamental lines should be broad and well defined. Additions may be made to them, but to substitute others is detrimental to the results. The fundamental basis for work in Alaska is to obtain answers to the question, "What will the country produce?" It follows as a corollary to ascertain how to produce it. The dominating motive in the experiments of the stations is to answer these questions truthfully. The soil, climate, and crops must be studied and animals bred, and subsequent work must be governed by the results obtained. Experiments have already proven that grain of certain sorts can be successfully grown in Alaska, that hardy vegetables of all sorts can be produced, that live stock can be kept here, and that therefore it is possible for the farmer to make his home here. The agricultural problems of the country are new. Nowhere else in the United States are similar climatic conditions encountered, and all methods must be adjusted to meet these conditions. Every step in advance is new and untried, and no one can predict with certainty what the results will be until the fact has been established by experiments. All agricultural work in Alaska is in a peculiar sense experimental, and since there is

great variation in the climate and soil throughout this great Territory, it became necessary to start experiments in several regions.

WORK AT SITKA STATION.

Sitka is the smallest of the four stations, measured by the area under culture. It is the headquarters station chiefly by virtue of its location. It is more accessible and in more direct communication with the Department of Agriculture than any of the others. Its work is representative of the possibilities in agricultural lines in the coast region of Alaska, and more particularly of southeastern Alaska. Whatever can be done at Sitka can also be done in most places throughout the coast region, and whatever can not be done at Sitka can not be done with any degree of success anywhere else in this region. The nature of the country and the climate together determine the nature of this work. The region is mountainous and heavily timbered. There is but little land available for culture, and as a rule it must first be cleared of timber. Farming on an extensive scale is therefore out of the question. The climate limits the work as to the crops that can be successfully grown. Grain growing is a failure not because the season is not long enough between frosts, but because the heavy rains which prevail during the fall make it almost impossible to save grain crops after they mature. Vegetables and small fruits, on the other hand, are at home in this region, and the work of the Sitka station is therefore naturally confined to these crops. Small areas given intensive culture will always be the rule in the coast region of Alaska; there is little chance for the use of machinery.

You will observe that in this instance at Sitka, which is in southeastern Alaska, they say farming on an extensive scale is clear out of the question. At Sitka the rains drown them out and up at the northern stations the frosts freeze them out. Vegetables do fairly well at Sitka.

At page 7 of the report of agricultural investigations in Alaska they report as follows:

WEATHER CONDITIONS.

In Alaska the weather is the controlling factor which determines the degree of success attainable in agriculture. During the season of 1905 the weather was favorable to agricultural operations in the coast region. The months of July and August were bright and warm, and the gardens throughout that region were quite successful. In the interior on the other hand, conditions were somewhat less favorable. The spring was late, raw, and overcast. Seeding was therefore late and early growth was slow. In July and early August the weather was favorable, but during the middle and latter part of August the weather was rainy and overcast, which retarded the ripening of the crops. Conditions were not uniform throughout the interior. In the Yukon and Tanana Valleys the settlers complained of too much rain and not enough sunshine. In the Copper River Valley there was not enough rain, and killing frosts began in the latter region as early as August 14. Light frosts occurred in the Yukon Valley on several days the latter part of August, but no killing frosts destructive to hardy plants occurred until September. Hence the grain crops matured at the Rampart station, although they were late, while only a small percentage matured in the Copper River Valley, because of an early killing frost.

You will observe from this report that frosts appear on August 14, long before the crops have time to mature; and, again, almost a total failure is recorded at the Rampart station, which has heretofore been referred to as the banner station of the Territory. It will also be observed that in the Copper River Valley and the Yukon Valley similar frosts occurred all through the season, which made agriculture impossible and extremely hazardous on anything like an extensive scale.

We are again fortunate to have before us the report of Mr. C. C. Georgeson, special agent in charge of the Alaskan work, and he, in his annual report for the year 1910, again commences his report with the conditions of the weather, as follows:

It seems trite to begin an annual report with remarks on the weather, and yet the weather is the most important factor in our operations. In these northern latitudes all vegetation is dominated by the weather. Low temperatures are not the only factors which make for success or failure. The percentage of cloudiness is almost of equal importance. Whenever the growing season is overcast, even if it is not exceptionally cold, vegetation languishes. The soil does not dry out and remains cold, and these conditions are further augmented for the worse when the rainfall is heavy. An exceptionally favorable season is one with a large percentage of sunshine, for sunny weather means warm weather.

I stated in an interrogatory a few days ago there were killing frosts in that country every month in the year, and I state it again, and I desire to present my authority for it, which is as follows:

There were killing frosts at Fairbanks station the past summer—

And that is the home of my genial friend the Delegate, whom we all like, and who everyone knows presented the chamber of commerce reports from the various sections of the Territory better than any other human being could do, and I am glad of the opportunity to pay this compliment to him. It says:

There were killing frosts at the Fairbanks station the past summer on July 31 and August 5, 9, 20, 29, and September 5. It is the first time that this station has had frost in July and as early as August 5 or 9. The summer in the Tanana Valley was cool and cloudy, and in the first part of the season the rainfall was light. These conditions were, of course, very unfavorable. It is to be noted, however, that the frosts which occurred prior to that of September 5 did not injure the grain, but they did injure the potatoes on low ground.

You will observe from the excerpt of the report of 1910, at page 36, there were killing frosts at the Fairbanks station during the preceding summer, on July 31; again on August 5, 9, 20, 29, and September 5. It will be observed that these killed

the potato crops and shows conclusively at what great hazard agriculture can be carried on, even at the objective point for which all these Government-owned railroads are headed.

Again, you will observe that this is the valley that is being held out to us as the valley that is to afford sufficient tonnage to warrant the construction of a railroad and to make Alaska famous as an agricultural country. With killing frosts occurring once in July, four times in August, and once on September 5, I can not think any sane homesteader would leave behind him 300,000,000 of acres of Government land awaiting the plow and be attracted to any great extent for agricultural purposes to Alaska.

Again, the report of 1911 starts off with the remark as to the condition of the weather, and on page 9 Prof. Georgeson blandly remarks as follows:

Weather conditions must always receive the first consideration in all Alaska agricultural work. Plenty of sunshine during the growing season and a well-distributed rainfall means success, whereas much cloudiness and heavy precipitation means more or less complete failure. The past season was favorable in some respects and in others not. The spring was unusually late and cold. This was true both of the coast region and the interior. It was not until the last of May that the soil was warm enough and dry enough to sow and plant, and not until the beginning of July did the various garden and field crops begin to grow with vigor.

Here it will be observed that it is not until the last of May that the soil is warm enough and dry enough to sow and plant, and not until the beginning of July did the various garden and field crops begin to grow with vigor. As we observed in the preceding paragraph, if you could not plant until the last of May, and if the plants would not come up until July, and the frosts began on July 31 and lasted without interruption all through August and early September, I ask the proponents of this bill who they can seduce from among homesteaders to go and take up land under such conditions in Alaska?

Now, my friends, when the crops will not come up until the end of July by reason of the cold, clammy, mucky soil, and you have chilling frosts in August, have frost from July to September, I ask you with what propriety can any homesteader, seeking a home, be induced to abandon 300,000,000 acres in this country, where we have good schools, good roads, railways, and every other convenience, and go there—I ask with what propriety this Government can be asked to build a Federal Government-owned railroad, bringing on such an enormous bond issue, in the beginning, in such a favorable administration as we have to carry out any such propaganda as that?

Mr. BRYAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. For a question only.

Mr. BRYAN. If I understand correctly the gentleman is going to submit a plan whereby private capital will go and do that very thing.

Mr. FERRIS. I will submit my plan if the gentleman will content himself in peace. I shall not allow him to pervert anything I am going to say. I will present the plan that I have referred to presently, which will bring improvements into Alaska, with her resources, as fast as she is entitled to, and what I think should be done whether the railroad is built or not.

Mr. BRYAN. And that will include the building of the railroad?

Mr. FERRIS. I did not yield to the gentleman for a statement to be injected into my remarks. I do not intend to be discourteous, but I did not yield to him to make the speech. The gentleman does not appear satisfied with what my position is, but I will state that myself, and so far as I may be wanting in that, of course, the House will accept or reject.

Now, I come to weather conditions, on page 46 of the 1911 report, and let us see what they say. It is in this country where we are going to abound in homes where they have increased 733 souls in 10 years, and, I understand, took the census in the middle of the summer so as to take in the people up there who came to look at the glaciers, in order to increase the number. I am going to read the agricultural report for 1911, by Prof. Georgeson, at page 46.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. With pleasure.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The gentleman stated that they took the last census in midsummer so that they could get the benefit of the additional population?

Mr. FERRIS. I was drawing, of course, somewhat on my imagination. When was it taken?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. It was just the opposite.

Mr. FERRIS. Well, let us give him 333 more souls and let it go at that. Even then the increase would be such a sad commentary that I know the gentleman would dodge when it was even referred to. I say that in good I-m-mor, of course.

Now, as to weather conditions. Did you ever hear a report concerning the weather being always started with, "How do

you do? How is the weather?" My friends, we greet each other on the street in that way, but what do you think of five annual reports from Alaska each one of which is opened with "How do you do? How is the weather?"

Let us give them a little favorable report for a while. We have been quite heavy on Alaska. In the 1911 annual report from the Alaskan representative of the Agricultural Department, at page 46, they say:

WEATHER CONDITIONS.

In comparing one season with another it is found that the weather behaves very peculiarly. Last season (1910) was quite favorable to growing crops during the early season, changing to the other extreme about midsummer, and it continued cold, with frequent showers and killing frosts through the remainder of the season, while this season was almost the opposite.

This season opened a little later than usual and continued cold and wet with little sunshine until June 1, when the weather suddenly turned warm and dry with an unusual amount of sunshine.

I thought we were going to be spared the reports of this country being afflicted with drought, but they seem to be afflicted with that.

Continuing, the report says:

These conditions prevailed until well into August, with the exception of two or three light frosts in the lowlands late in July and early in August. Cold, rainy weather set in late in August, which made it very difficult to finish curing and storing the hay crop. Several light frosts occurred in the lowlands during the last week in August, and on August 31 potatoes and other tender plants were killed all over the valley. The temperature fell to 28° F. at the station and as low as 20° F. at Fairbanks and on the lowlands.

Here it will be observed that Prof. Georgeson stated that they had frosts in the lowlands late in July and the early part of August. He says, as you have observed, that several light frosts occurred in the lowlands during the last week in August, and on August 31 potatoes and other tender plants were killed all over the valley; that the temperature fell to 28° F. at the station and as low as 20° F. at Fairbanks and on the lowlands.

How flattering it must be to this country which is going to furnish tonnage enough to cause us to go into the Federal Treasury in order to build a railroad! Only 163 homesteads in the entire country have been patented. Only two coal claims patented. Only one cemetery site to care for the perishing.

Again, at page 10 of the report for 1911, Prof. Georgeson advises us that in the interior there was a killing frost on August 31, enough to injure grain that had not matured by that date, in the following language:

In the interior there was a killing frost on August 31, enough to injure grain that had not matured by that date.

How much time have I left, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma). The present occupant of the chair was informed by the former Chairman when he took the chair that the gentleman had an hour.

Mr. FERRIS. Now, again, at page 10, we have another annual report. This is coming right on down, now. This is on page 10 of the report of 1912 by Prof. Georgeson. It says that agriculture is at all times at the mercy of the weather. It is again, you see: "How do you do, Mr. Weatherman? How is the weather?" Every annual report begins with that. I will quote from the report:

Agriculture is at all times at the mercy of the weather. This statement is trite, but it is so true that those who are not familiar with the conditions in Alaska fail to appreciate its force unless it is brought home to them with emphasis and frequent repetition. Rain and sunshine are the two factors which determine success. When sunshine is abundant during the growing season the farmers' efforts prosper; when rain and cloudy weather unduly dominate their efforts languish or fall completely. These elements are beyond control, and it is necessary to learn how to meet them. This adaptation constitutes no small part of the experimental work of the Alaska stations.

If the reports I have just read were not from the very highest authority and did not cover a series of years, they might not be of value to this House; but I confess and submit to you what higher authority could there be than a representative of the Agricultural Department there on the ground at Government expense to the department, whose sole purpose was to ascertain real conditions independent of real-estate men, independent of boomers, independent of promoters and those who would proclaim for their country more than calm and dispassionate eyes could behold? I can not fathom with what propriety home-seekers could be induced to launch out on agriculture under such conditions without any hope whatever of reward; I can not think but few, if any at all, will go there. The fact of the business is the country amidst all its boom days and mining excitement of the last 10 years has increased but 733 persons; only 163 homesteads have ever proceeded to patent; only 2 coal claims of less than 200 acres have ever proceeded to patent; only 7 town sites have proceeded to patent; 12 mission sites; 311 mineral claims; 7 trade and manufacturing sites; and 1 cemetery site.

Now, my friends, I have given you what Prof. Georgeson, Prof. Piper, and Prof. Chubbuck, the three representatives of the Agricultural Department in charge of the four stations in Alaska, have to say about the climate and agriculture. I want to talk to you a little about the soil. I do not really want to talk so much myself about it as I want to present what is said about it by our own Agricultural Department on whom all can rely.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FERRIS. I will.

Mr. MANN. Is the gentleman able to say from the report of the investigations of the experimental stations what crops have been raised?

Mr. FERRIS. They raised some little rye in patches, and some barley, and some potatoes. They do raise some things on a small scale. They really seem to raise more potatoes than anything else, but I will soon present a report to the effect that potatoes, owing to the fact that they were raised on the frozen mucky land, where the soil is acid, are watery, and they sell for only 4 cents a pound, and in many cases not at all, and that they had to import potatoes from Puget Sound to keep the Fairbanks people going. The man who is in charge of the agricultural bureau says that the Alaskan people around Fairbanks will have outside potatoes at any cost and at any price.

Mr. MANN. Have they raised anything at these experiment stations which they have sold?

Mr. FERRIS. I have the figures on that. We have expended up there \$298,000, and we have gotten back \$22,000. So we are about \$276,000 behind.

Mr. MANN. But they have been able to sell \$22,000 worth?

Mr. FERRIS. Since 1897. My figures are from 1897 up to the present. They use commercial fertilizer, hotbeds, and with great care they can raise some produce. Prof. Chubbuck, who is conceded to know more about Alaskan conditions than any other gentleman, has submitted a report contained in Bulletin 50, which is just off the press, in which he says:

Reference has been made to the water and frost holding characteristics of the moss growth. It is this that makes the moss an impediment to agricultural development in sections where tillage is feasible. It appears to decay very slowly, as is the case to a certain extent with all vegetable matter in localities where there are but brief periods of warm weather, so that a coat of moss varying in thickness from a few inches to a number of feet accumulates over much of the land surface.

You remember this moss is of the kind which costs from \$50 to \$200 to remove. It also keeps the land frozen the year around.

Continuing, the report says:

Even in those portions of Alaska where the winters are comparatively mild, but the summers cool and moist, the frost will be so near the surface under a coat of moss that at any time during the summer a cane may be thrust through the moss to the frost line. Under these wet and cold conditions and the slow decay of the vegetation the soil is quite acid, as is evidenced by much of the plant growth, the species being those that grow on land that is too sour for most farm crops. When the timber and other plant growth, including the moss, is removed from the land, thus giving the heat of the sun and the air a chance to penetrate the soil and dry out the moisture, the frost line goes lower each season until it ceases to be an injurious factor, and in the meantime the acidity of the soil grows less.

There is something about the long freezing, there is something about that foot or two feet of Arctic moss, that leaves the land sour, or alkali, as we know it in the West. I read further:

THE SOILS OF ALASKA.

Alaskan soils have their origin largely in material formed by glacial action. They are not very rich in available plant food as a rule. The vegetable matter that has accumulated on the surface is in such a partially decayed and acid condition that it is quite apt to be injurious to some cultivated plants.

Here it is manifest that this country is impossible from an agricultural standpoint for thousands of years yet to come. It is all a dream of things that are not true and can not, from your own agricultural reports, come true.

I stated a while ago that you can go down 200 feet below the surface and take out great blocks of blue ice. They even say you can go down 1,000 feet and find ice, but I am not warranted in saying that. Glaciers have come down since time immemorial and formed that gravelly, glacial, sour, acid, alkali, and worthless soil that will not grow anything.

So, my friends, what a frost does not kill, the acid and the alkali of the land kill. I read again:

This is quite pronounced even in the regions of mild temperatures and abundant rainfall, as in southeastern Alaska, where vegetation is luxuriant and the soil is apt to be quite peaty and mucky. In fact, extensive beds of peat exist in various portions of Alaska.

I understand, by way of digression for just a few moments, that the Alaska Chamber of Commerce has just arranged to pump the Japan current over into the Yukon River so as to warm the interior of the country instead of permitting its use to warm up the southern country. [Laughter.] No doubt ere long they will attempt to have the Federal Government to do

the pumping, but other sections would grow jealous, and it is possible that even this would not pacify the Alaska Chamber of Commerce. I read again:

Wherever there has been sufficient drainage and the vegetable matter has fully decayed there is a rich black loam of varying depths; but these areas are limited to small valleys, some of which are the dried-up beds of former shallow lakes. The alluvial deposits along the larger streams contain good soil, but there are many gravel beds that have only a thin covering of fertile soil. Much of the soil, particularly of the benches and low hills, is composed largely of material deposited by the melting of the ice sheet that formerly covered the land.

That is where we get the ice 200 feet below the surface.

Again, Prof. Chubbuck, in a painstaking, well-worded message, warns homesteaders against going up there. With one unbiased arm of the Government warning people not to go there, here we are asked to build that railroad to try to force people to go there. What a spectacle! Prof. Chubbuck deals with what difficulties would confront homesteaders who contemplate going to Alaska to take up homes, and I take it everyone must feel interested in this matter, because if Alaska is to be settled people must go there and make homes for themselves. Prof. Chubbuck says:

DIFFICULTIES THAT CONFRONT THE HOMESTEADER.

Over against the optimistic facts pertaining to this great northwestern portion of the North American Continent are others that should be remembered by those who contemplate going to Alaska for the purpose of home making, particularly farm-home making.

On the south coast, where the climate is mild, tillable land is scarce, because of the proximity of the mountains to the shore line; elsewhere in Alaska the winters are long and very cold and frost-proof buildings must be provided for shelter of family and stock.

The ground freezes to a great depth and there is but a short period during which this can thaw, and the surface is covered with an accumulation of undecayed moss and other vegetable material serving as a protection to the frost and a reservoir for moisture.

Mr. WEAVER. Will the gentleman tell us what he is reading from?

Mr. FERRIS. I am reading from page 27 of Prof. Chubbuck's report, which is known as Bulletin No. 50, which is available in the document room. He says further:

The frost line under natural conditions sinks but a few feet during a season, and the thawed layer is usually a morass of muck in all portions of Alaska where tillage is possible.

Now, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asked a few minutes ago about the kind of soil, and about potatoes, and so on. Here is Prof. Chubbuck, on page 27 of Bulletin No. 50, off the press within the last few days, saying that "the frost line under natural conditions sinks but a few feet during a season, and the thawed layer is usually a morass of muck in all portions of Alaska where tillage is possible."

That indictment of Alaskan soils by Prof. Chubbuck, representing an arm of your Agricultural Department, is more severe than anything any of us could think of. He declares it to be a condition that makes land travel almost out of the question during the summer until wagon roads shall have been built.

Now, I want to say that they have expended \$2,000,000 out of the Treasury on the wagon roads up there, and yet Mr. Ballaine, who is very largely the owner of one of those towns and chief booster of this proposed railroad, as appears in the hearings—

Mr. FALCONER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. Ballaine says that the \$2,000,000 is mostly squandered. I have a letter in my pocket written by the chairman of the wagon-road commission up there, and in it the writer says that everything Mr. Ballaine has said is untrue. I do not know which one of them is telling the truth, and I can vouch for neither one of them.

Now I will yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. FALCONER. I think the gentleman is fair and would not be inclined to make a misstatement if he knew it. The gentleman ought to know that Mr. Ballaine has no money in this Alaskan railroad and has had no money invested in it for years. He ought to know that the Alaska Northern Railroad is fighting this bill. The gentleman from Oklahoma and others on the committee know that the representatives of that company were against the bill and appeared before the committee and made known their attitude to that effect.

Mr. FERRIS. Now, let me ask you something, and we will see how we come out. There has been a good deal of this loose talk around here that everybody who is in favor of this bill is a patriot and that everybody who is opposed to it is not a patriot, and we will have that out before we get through. If it has come to pass that a Member of this House who is trying to save the Treasury from unwarranted appropriations and bond issues and trying to save the people from a big scheme has got to be assaulted and pelted from every side by pillagers

and plunderers, we will meet the issue squarely, and I will go to the bat on that proposition now. My service in this House is not so new that it needs any defense, and I will be guided by what I conceive to be my duty as long as I am here. [Applause.]

I will ask the gentleman how many town lots in Seward does Mr. Ballaine own?

Mr. FALCONER. I do not know.

Mr. FERRIS. He owns the whole town, does he not?

Mr. FALCONER. No; he does not.

Mr. FERRIS. He is the town-site promoter, the one who opened up that town, did he not?

Mr. FALCONER. I think the gentleman knows that Mr. Ballaine does not own any interest in the railroad.

Mr. FERRIS. I do not know anything of the kind. He has been around here urging everybody, trying to get this scheme through, and I do not know anything of the kind which the gentleman states. Senator NELSON states that Ballaine and his associates sold stock to some of Senator NELSON's constituents. I find people around here who are holding some of the stock of these defunct railroads in Alaska, which they are now trying to unload onto the Federal Government, amid a blare of trumpets and a lot of false, incredible, unreasonable, and damnable charges. [Applause.] I will not be driven by any such abnormal influence. I do not have to be. Now, what question does the gentleman want to ask?

Mr. FALCONER. The interests of the several men interested in the railroads in Alaska are fully set out in the hearings. Mr. Ballaine stated definitely his interest in Alaska and made a very frank explanation of it.

Mr. FERRIS. I can not yield to the gentleman for the purpose of allowing him to make a speech. If the gentleman asserts that Mr. Ballaine does not own anything and he wants to say that, that is all right, and I do not want to argue it with him. I say that Mr. Ballaine is a town-site promoter who has been for five or six months hanging around this Capitol lobbying, trying to get this bill through. I do not know his interest. I do know that he was the town-site promoter who opened the town site of Seward and that he owns a lot of it yet, and he is here trying to get this bill through. It is fair to Mr. Ballaine to say that he asserts in the hearings that he does not now own any stock in the Alaska Northern Railway.

Mr. TOWNER. The gentleman did not say that Mr. Ballaine owned any of the railroads. I think he was strictly within the facts—

Mr. FERRIS. I did not say that, although I do not know what the facts are. I do not know that he does. I do know that he was the original promoter of it and that his crowd were peddling out this stock and unloading it onto a lot of unsuspecting persons, and now he is down here trying to make the Federal Government play the part of an unsuspecting purchaser; and whatever the consequences may be, I will not subscribe to the proposition to have the Federal Government be an unsuspecting investor in this matter.

Mr. TOWNER. I shall be glad to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. FERRIS. I shall be glad to answer it if I can. There are a lot of things about Alaska that I do not know.

Mr. TOWNER. Does the gentleman know about the ownership of the Alaska Northern Railroad?

Mr. FERRIS. I think Mr. Ballaine does assert that he sold his interest. Senator NELSON makes the assertion that they peddled stock among his farmers, and so forth.

Mr. TOWNER. I do not care anything about Mr. Ballaine now. I want to ask you if you know anything about the present ownership of the Alaska Northern Railroad.

Mr. FERRIS. I have not gone into that far enough to give the gentleman the best information. I take it he wants the best information, and I can not give it to him. This is a matter upon which I will not make a statement unless I have the facts.

Mr. LENROOT. I should like to ask the gentleman if Mr. Jenness was not one of the trustees of this Alaska Northern Railroad, and if he did not appear before the Committee in opposition to this bill?

Mr. FERRIS. I do not know. I have neither seen him nor his testimony. The gentleman may be right about it. I neither affirm nor deny.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. In a moment. I was, in a measure, unfortunate in the matter of not being present at most of the hearings. I was tossed on to the Committee on the Territories at the last minute. The Speaker very kindly appointed me a member of the Mulhall investigating committee, and I missed most of the hearings before the Committee on the Territories; so whatever my errors and mistakes may be they are owing to a lack of

information and are not intentional. I have read enough to make me exceedingly skeptical of these Alaskan railway schemes.

Mr. HARDY. Having been on the Committee on the Territories when a good deal of this matter was inquired into, and having been off that committee during this session, I wanted to ask the gentleman if it was not a fact that before that committee the question was not simply one of buying these railroads, but whether the Government ought to open up Alaska by some Government-owned road built either from Seward or Cordova or Valdez, or anywhere where the Government saw proper, without buying any of these roads, or by buying an existing road, as might be deemed best, and is there anything in this bill that requires the buying of these roads? On the contrary, does not this bill give the President the full right to ignore the existing roads?

Mr. FERRIS. It is not compulsory, although it gives him full authority to buy one or all of them.

Mr. HARDY. Exactly. He is not bound to buy either of these roads. Did your committee investigate the question whether we might not more cheaply build from a central station like Valdez?

Mr. FERRIS. There was much testimony, which I can not go over now, some of it credible, some incredible. I think the bill contemplates building three lines.

Mr. HARDY. The committee, when I was a member of it, were discussing whether the road was desirable and whether they should build it or buy it. This bill determines the first of these questions in the affirmative and leaves the second for the President to decide.

Mr. FERRIS. I have nothing but the highest praise for the chairman and every member of the committee. I know that they are honest, painstaking, patriotic men, trying to do their duty, and I would not if I could and I could not if I would make any Member of the House believe differently. Each man on that committee is following his own patriotic instincts, as he ought to do, and that is all that I have to say about that.

Let me proceed. I was reading from Prof. Chubbuck, Bulletin No. 50, page 27:

This condition makes land travel almost out of the question during the summer until wagon roads shall have been built, and these must be largely of the corduroy type. Meantime the farm home must generally be located close to navigable water.

The swampy character of much of the surface of Alaska makes it a great breeding ground for mosquitoes and gnats, which are almost intolerable pests to both man and beast. It also makes drainage a prerequisite in order to remove the surplus water so that the land can be worked, raise the temperature of the surface soil, lower the frost line, facilitate the decay of the accumulated organic matter, and bring about chemical changes which will transform the soil from a very acid condition to one much less so. Nature requires much time for this last process.

Where the vegetable accumulations are largely moss, this must be destroyed, either by burning or by carting it from the land, for if plowed under it decays very slowly and seems to have an injurious effect on most crop plants.

The timber growth, which occurs on practically all the land suitable for tillage, must, of course, be cleared from the land.

All this work—building houses and barns, drainage, clearing land of moss and timber—is very slowly accomplished in the short outdoor working season if done single handed by the homesteader, and costly, almost prohibitively so, if hired labor is used, because of the high wages and living expenses.

It will be observed that this comment of Prof. Chubbuck's is every word a warning to homesteaders to keep away from Alaska, showing with what disaster homesteading in Alaska is fraught, and admonishes them to not be misled by reports that are impossible, farcical, and even monstrous.

Prof. Chubbuck says that we must not only first build the railroads, but then we must build wagon roads. We have built \$2,000,000 worth of wagon roads as an extension of the Guggenheim line from Chitina up to Fairbanks. It may have been a proper expenditure to do that. I do not want to leave any imputation anywhere, but Chitina is the end of the line and they spent \$2,000,000 building wagon roads from Chitina to Fairbanks. Mr. Chubbuck says that we must build more wagon roads or settlers can not go there. When will this clamor for appropriations end and where is the House drifting? First, we build the railroads and, second, wagon roads, with five agricultural stations established there to prove that there is nothing but morass, muck, and sour, acid soil that will not grow anything.

Now, as to the soil. Did you know, my friends, that in Alaska, due to the long freezing and due to the sour, mucky nature of the soil, they have to use fertilizer on the land to grow anything? What do you think of using commercial fertilizer on virgin soil the first year that it is cleared and plowed up? In old worn-out soil, in old depleted run-down soil they have to use fertilizer. I call your attention to the somber fact that they have to use fertilizer in Alaska to start with. Let me present my authority. I am reading from page 13 of the annual report from the keeper of those experiment stations.

FERTILIZERS IMPROVE THE YIELD.

It is further to be noted that the soil is not naturally rich. Where fertilizers were applied there was an increase in the yield of straw, which in some cases amounted to double the weight obtained on unfertilized plots. Alaska soils are as a rule not fertile, except on alluvial deposits near the mouths of the rivers or elsewhere where silt has accumulated. There is but a small amount of vegetable mold in the soil. In the coast region, where the rainfall is abundant, vegetation is luxuriant nearly everywhere, but in the interior, where the rainfall is scant, the native vegetation is not abundant. Consequently, but little humus is accumulated. Owing in part, also, to the same cause, disintegration of the rocky material is not so complete as it is in more southern latitudes; that is, the soil, as a rule, contains a large percentage of gravel. These conditions combine to make the addition of fertilizers very desirable. The fertilizer used the past season was fish guano, an Alaskan product manufactured at Killisnoo.

Here it will be observed that the soil is poor and inferior and in the main of no substantial value for agricultural purposes. I submit that millions of acres of land within our own country, in fact, almost within the shadow of the Capitol, in Maryland and Virginia, could, with a sufficient amount of fertilizer, be made productive and, of course, valuable; but in a country where the climatic conditions are so extremely hazardous and the soil itself is lacking in fertility, and where the plants do not come up until July and are cut off by the frosts in August, pray tell me what is there that recommends such a country to a home builder and a home seeker, and pray tell me with what propriety can this Congress be induced to issue bonds, breaking all precedents, bankrupting the Treasury, abandoning economy, starting in on a project that is of more than doubtful propriety, when the very reports of the Agriculture Department itself tell us on every hand that the country is of little or no merit from an agricultural viewpoint.

Now, another report here, presented on page 33—and I hope the House will hear me, because upon this will hinge the result as to whether we build these railroads:

Alaska soils are not rich. Frequently statements from travelers and other observers are seen to the effect that the soil must be exceedingly rich in plant food, to judge from the height of the grasses and the luxuriance of some of the vegetation, but such a conclusion is not warranted. Grasses will sometimes grow rank on an almost barren gravelly soil, because they have plenty of moisture and they are adapted to the climate and to the conditions. The virgin soil in the interior is everywhere frozen to an unknown depth or to bedrock. In this state of refrigeration there can be no activity of the organisms which aid in the formation of mold and the manufacture of plant food from the organic matter, and what plant food the soil may hold is in a large degree insoluble, and therefore not available for plants except by a long and slow process of weathering. For this reason the soil soon becomes exhausted, and fertilizers are necessary. This is particularly demonstrated by the results of the Fairbanks station the past season, which will be referred to later.

What do you think of that? The interior of the soil is frozen everywhere to an unknown depth or to bedrock. This is no chamber of commerce report; this is no moving-picture report, but this is your own agricultural report.

Here it will be observed that many persons casually passing through Alaska are deceived at the fertility of the soil by reason of the growth of certain grasses thereon, but you will observe that the man familiar with the soil states that the growth of such grasses does not indicate a rich soil, but, on the contrary, is often found growing on barren, gravelly soil, being produced merely on account of the moisture contained therein. Again, you will observe that the irrigable soil in Alaska is frozen to bedrock, and it seems to me where he so well explains the soil to be in such a state of refrigeration that there can be no activity of the organic matter that the soil is doubly wanting under such conditions. He goes on and explains so well and so carefully how soon the soil becomes exhausted, and that fertilizers become necessary. He calls attention to the fact that this is more particularly demonstrated at the town of Fairbanks in the famous valley where this region is to afford ample tonnage, and at the very objective point of this railroad itself.

I now come to maintenance of fertility. It will be seen that they have not only a frost which comes with every month, and they have not only this other condition, this Alaskan moss, which takes from \$50 to \$250 an acre to clear, but they have other trouble. The soil is so barren that the annual report says they can not crop it every year, but they have to crop it every other year. I want to read now from the maintenance of fertility report, at page 38, for the year 1910:

MAINTENANCE OF FERTILITY.

As already stated, generally speaking, Alaskan soils hold but a limited supply of available plant food. They soon become exhausted, and the problem is how to increase this limited store of plant food. There are two ways: One is to raise a crop on the land only every other year and summer fallow the intervening years; that is to say, give nature time to act upon the soil and gradually change the plant food in the soil from its insoluble to a soluble form.

Here you will observe that the man acquainted with agriculture and with soils, who was a representative of the Government and who has no selfish interest to serve, says that the Alaskan soils hold nothing but a limited supply of available plant food,

explaining how soon under the conditions they become exhausted, and that there is no way to increase the limited store of plant food. He suggests the raising of crops on the land only every other year, but this is both expensive and unsatisfactory to any prospective home seeker, and all of this in the valley and at the point which is the objective point of the proposed railroads to be constructed at Government expense, that has heretofore proved unattractive to capital from any source or from any place.

Why, my friends, if it costs from \$50 to \$200 an acre to clear the land in the beginning, if you have to use fish guano to fertilize it the first year it is plowed, if you have to crop it every other year because you can not crop it every year, I ask you, What is there to attract an ordinary home builder? Will the home builder leave 300,000,000 acres of land behind him in the States, beckoning him to come with his family and reside upon it, and go to such a place as that? But even worse yet. Will this House adopt this moving-picture, chamber-of-commerce propaganda and build a railroad, unheard of in the history of this country, that begins nowhere and ends nowhere, with nothing to haul after you get there?

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. I will.

Mr. TOWNER. The gentleman speaks about there being 300,000,000 acres of land in this country available for farm use. Will the gentleman be kind enough to tell us where that is located?

Mr. FERRIS. I will. In Arizona, New Mexico, California, Wyoming, Utah, Idaho, Nevada, Montana, California, Oregon, Washington, and a number of the Southern States there are small areas yet subject to homestead.

Mr. TOWNER. Is the gentleman not giving now the total unoccupied land in the United States?

Mr. FERRIS. No; I am giving the land that is subject to entry. There are great areas in forest reserves that are not included at all in this statement. These figures are fresh from the tract books of the General Land Office and can be corroborated.

Mr. TOWNER. I was under the impression that if there were any public land that was really useful for farm purposes it was being occupied about as rapidly as the people could get to it, and that the Government when it could get a little reservation away from the Indians and could turn it over to the people was having difficulty in satisfying the clamor of those who were wanting a chance to get hold of the land.

Mr. FERRIS. That would undoubtedly seem to be true to those who had not looked into the matter, but on the contrary, independent of Indian reserves, independent of forest reserves and mineral reserves, there yet awaits a little more than 300,000,000 acres—I could give you the exact figures from the Interior Department—subject to homestead entry, that the gentleman from Iowa and other gentlemen here who have not exhausted their homestead rights can go and take to-morrow if they will but present themselves to the appropriate land offices.

Mr. TOWNER. The question is not whether we have a right to do that or whether the people have a right to do it, but whether it is worth anything after it is taken.

Mr. FERRIS. Of course the gentleman knows that that is a speculative question. I may say to the gentleman that much of these 300,000,000 acres is good land and will be taken up and will make good homes on which people will live, and they will do it by dry-farming methods—intensive cultivation, irrigation, and so forth, which has become a science. I wish I could have time to speak of that at length. They are entering it every day.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. As a matter of fact, there are millions of acres of the richest agricultural land in the world in the Southern States that can be purchased anywhere from \$15 to \$25 an acre, are there not?

Mr. FERRIS. I would not try to answer as an expert on that, but I understand that is true; and there are some lands open to entry in the Southern States. Arkansas has areas of public land, Alabama has, and Mississippi has small areas of public land—not much, but some.

Mr. FOWLER. Does the gentleman include in his estimate the 75,000,000 acres of swamp lands the richest lands in the world?

Mr. FERRIS. Well, if it is public land, I do, yes; because I take in all the land subject to homestead entry. There are a great many millions of acres in forest reserves and in military reserves and in other reserves that I have not referred to at all.

Mr. BOOHER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes; for a question.

Mr. BOOHER. I will ask the gentleman if he knows where the Government owns any swamp lands anywhere? Did not the Government give all the swamp lands in the country for school purposes?

Mr. FERRIS. I think not. There are many lands in the State of Arkansas now, such as are known as "sunk" lands.

Mr. BOOHER. That is not Government land.

Mr. FERRIS. Yes; the gentleman could file, and I, if I had not exhausted my homestead rights, could file. I have been a homesteader myself within the last dozen years.

Mr. BOOHER. Does the gentleman know any other swamp lands which have not been given by the Government for school purposes?

Mr. FERRIS. I could not give the gentleman an answer off-hand, because there may be such lands. How much time have I left, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has about 16 minutes left.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to suggest to the gentleman not to allow his time to be taken up by outside matters in connection with his Alaska talk.

Mr. FERRIS. Yes; I will proceed as rapidly as I can. I have only a few minutes—

Mr. HARDY. I would like to have the gentleman's plan, as I am interested in his plan.

Mr. FERRIS. I am going to get to that.

Mr. STAFFORD. How much more time would the gentleman need to present his plan fully?

Mr. FERRIS. I do not know; I will journey on as fast as I can.

Mr. STAFFORD. We would like to have a full presentation of the gentleman's views, because the House is deeply interested in the gentleman's presentation.

Mr. TOWNER. I think that ought to be done. The gentleman has given the matter such careful consideration, and ought to have as much time as the Delegate from Alaska.

Mr. FERRIS. I do not ask that much. I am not entitled to it.

Mr. HELM. Will the gentleman yield for just a question?

Mr. FERRIS. I will.

Mr. HELM. What does the gentleman think was the original purpose of the Government in buying Alaska?

Mr. FERRIS. Well, I do not know; probably fish and furs; that is my candid belief. Now, if the gentleman will pardon me—

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask in view of the statement of the gentleman that he be granted unanimous consent for an additional half hour.

Mr. FERRIS. If I need it.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman needs it.

Mr. DAVENPORT. That means it is not to come out of the time fixed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma may proceed for 30 minutes additional to the time already allotted. Is there objection?

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, I will not object if it is to be taken out of the ordinary time, but if it is to give the negative side this addition of time, unless the affirmative is going to have an addition also there will be opposition.

Mr. HARDWICK. The affirmative side on this question has had a great deal more time than the negative side—three or four hours more.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that there are about 25 persons desiring time, and only 11 hours left in which to divide that time.

Mr. BRYAN. I understand this extension will not be taken out of the 13 hours?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not so understand the request.

Mr. HARDWICK. The request was that this be in addition to the time the House had granted by unanimous consent, not to exceed 30 minutes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I understand we can not in the Committee of the Whole change the time originally set for general debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state the time was fixed by the House.

Mr. SISSON. But in the event there is no objection here there would be no violation of the rule.

I will state for the benefit of the chairman—and he may have kept up with that better than I have—that I have no disposition to lengthen this debate; but those in favor of the bill have consumed three or four times as much time, with the exception of this speech this morning, and if you look at the Record you will find that is true; and the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. WICKERSHAM] was given unlimited time to debate

this question, and in fairness I believe the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] ought to have unlimited time. I have not any brief to speak for or against the gentleman from Oklahoma having time. I have no disposition to do otherwise than to give both sides a fair opportunity to present this thing to the country, and if no point of order is made, this matter may proceed by unanimous consent.

Mr. LENROOT. I suggest to the gentleman that unanimous consent can not extend it beyond the 13 hours, and that any gentleman at the expiration of the 13 hours might raise the point of order that the time had expired.

Mr. SISSON. I understood that they had an agreement in the House that if the gentleman did not conclude in an hour and a half or in two hours if he needed additional time it should not be taken out of the 13 hours.

Mr. STAFFORD. That was not the understanding.

Mr. SISSON. I was mistaken, then, about the agreement.

Mr. HOUSTON. I will say to the gentleman we tried to make an arrangement and agreement by which we could have an equal division of time at least satisfactory to the opponents of the bill and agreed upon by those in favor of it. It was perfectly satisfactory to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] and to the other gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DAVENPORT], who, it was suggested, should have charge of the time. Now, then, the House, by its solemn action, fixes the time at 13 hours. I have no disposition to cut it off at all with a point of order, but we must get through some time. I do not think we should extend the time at which the House has fixed it.

Mr. DAVENPORT. I suggest that the gentleman proceed until the two hours of his time is exhausted, and then I will dispose of it by a motion—

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that we may have an additional time of half an hour, making it at the suggestion of the gentleman now occupying the floor. I think it a reasonable request. I do not wish the gentleman to be pressed to conclude his remarks in a limited time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] asks unanimous consent that he may proceed for 30 minutes in addition to the time already allowed. Is there objection?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. If the committee can do this without taking it out of the 13 hours, I hope it will.

Mr. DAVENPORT. If nobody objects to it, it will go that way.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. SAUNDERS. This is additional now to the 13 hours?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not understand it that way.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I understood that to be the motion.

Mr. STAFFORD. I know, but that will be contrary to the rules of the House.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Technically speaking, that is true; but if we all agree to it we can do it. We will make the motion specifically that he shall have the time, not to be taken out of the 13 hours.

Mr. LENROOT. Reserving the right to object, I have no objection in this particular case, but that would be a precedent for other gentlemen extending time beyond that point.

Mr. SAUNDERS. If anybody else makes that motion, I will take occasion to object to it myself.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. If the gentleman is going to take that attitude, I do not think it is going to help matters.

Mr. SAUNDERS. As I understand, we want to make an exception in the case of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS]. If I understand the situation, that is what we want to do.

Mr. LENROOT. May I suggest to let the motion of the gentleman prevail, and then at the end of the 13 hours make a motion to extend the time further?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Well, I do not know. We can do it now, but we can not know who will be in the House at the end of 13 hours.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, if the Chair will permit, the suggestion made by the gentleman is that at the end of 13 hours it can be arranged. If the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] shall consume 30 or 40 minutes more than the time allotted, I think there would be no objection in the House to extending the time at the end of the 13 hours by just the amount by which the gentleman from Oklahoma exceeds the allotted time, because the gentlemen in charge of the bill on both sides are anxious that that be done.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] accept the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS]?

Mr. STAFFORD. I have no desire to object to it.

Mr. LENROOT. I will be constrained to object to the proposition of the gentleman from Virginia.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] be permitted to proceed for 30 minutes in addition to the time already allotted to him. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I hope the Chair will avoid taking this out of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, now let us examine at page 49 in the report of 1912 from the man in charge of these agricultural stations in Alaska and ascertain what the six years' experience they have had there have led him to say about the soil and the treatment of it. His exact words are as follows:

SOIL TREATMENT.

The soil in a cold climate requires somewhat different treatment from that where the ground does not freeze. Here the ground is frozen nearly seven months of the year, and chemical action is therefore very much retarded. Plant food does not become available rapidly enough to crop the land every year. A system of cropping most of the land every other year has been inaugurated, especially for the hay and grain crops. This system admits of summer plowing when more or less green stuff can be turned under, and it also relieves the spring rush of preparing the soil for seed. The soil should be plowed deeply in July or August and left rough so that the air can act upon it. For good results the spring cultivation should be very thorough before seeding. If time will permit, it is highly beneficial to replot the land in the spring, as it helps to warm the soil, and it seems the more the soil is stirred in the spring the better the crops which follow. Care should be taken not to plow too much litter under, as it tends to cut off the capillary action of the moisture, and the rainfall is usually very light during the months of May and June. Without proper tillage the soil is apt to become too dry, and the crops will suffer from lack of moisture. It should be remembered that most of the snow water runs off before the soil is sufficiently thawed to absorb it, and it becomes necessary to conserve the moisture as much as possible.

Here you will observe he says they have been forced to abandon the proposition of cropping the land every year; that the soil is frozen seven months and there is not enough chemical action to keep plant life alive. He further explains that so much of the year the soil is frozen so hard and so deep that the water runs off into the sea and does not water the crop. He even cautions the farmer not to plow too much litter under, as it tends to cut off the capillary action of the moisture, and the rainfall is very light during the months of May and June. I had truly hoped that we might be spared this one comment, for I had at least assumed that they would not be drought-stricken on top of all the other series of calamities that the agricultural bureau in that Territory have to put up with, but it seems with their barren soil, with their arctic climate, with their midsummer frosts, and their necessity to fertilize, which is always expensive, and usually prohibitive, on top of this we find them afflicted with droughts that can not be overcome or checked, due to the fact that the frozen ground can not absorb the water, which rushes off madly to the sea.

No, my friends; farming in Alaska under such conditions as these can not become a reality. As one who has gone through the frontier days and frontier conditions incident to the opening and development of a new country, in the light of these facts this country is without hope and without possibilities so far as a poor man's country is concerned, and surely, if the Federal Government is to develop it at Government expense, it should be for the benefit of the poor man and for him alone. I can not fathom that the Federal Government would ever get so beside themselves as to think this is an agricultural country or induce its citizens to go there to suffer, freeze, and starve in the bleak and barren hills of Alaska.

CROPS.

This Congress is asked to issue \$35,000,000 in bonds and appropriate \$1,600,000 outright in cash for the purpose of constructing a railroad in Alaska which is to derive its tonnage from agriculture, because there is not sufficient coal of value to transport from within the interior, and because of what precious metals there are in Alaska no tonnage of any significance is connected with them; hence, we must rely upon the agricultural tonnage if we are to meet with any success in constructing this railroad.

Much has been said, Mr. Chairman, about potatoes being the leading crop up there. It is an important crop. It is the vegetable upon which the poor live almost everywhere, and it is an important crop. Let me explain to you why Alaska is not suitable for the production of potatoes. I read not my own words, but I read from the annual report for 1911, page 7, on potatoes. Here is what is said there:

POTATOES.

The potato is by long odds the most important vegetable grown in Alaska. It constitutes a very important item in the people's diet. Everybody uses it; everybody knows how to grow it; and with proper

care it can be grown all over the Territory. But in spite of this, several thousand tons are imported into Alaska every year. About a thousand tons are shipped into the Fairbanks region alone each summer from the Puget Sound district. It is maintained that "outside" potatoes are drier and mealer than those grown in Alaska, and they therefore bring a higher price in the market than do native-grown potatoes.

Here it will be observed that, though much has been claimed for Alaska as a potato country and much has been said of excessive freight charges, still the report says several thousand tons of potatoes are imported into Alaska every year and that about 1,000 tons are shipped into the Fairbanks region alone from the States. He also gives us the reason why this is true. The Alaska potato is watery, unpalatable, and is only eaten when the outside potato can not be had at any price. I think none of the proponents of this bill, laboring under the impressions they are of all the real-estate boomers and other pressures combined, will try to contradict this statement or attempt to combat it.

Now, my friends, that extract quite well corroborated what I said, but in the event it should not be so considered, let me read a little further. I read from page 50 of the annual report of 1912 of the men in charge of one of the arms of the Agricultural Department. This is a report which can be had by every gentleman here. This is said there:

Garden stuff commands a good price, but the supply usually exceeds the demand. Native potatoes are slow sale this season at 4 cents per pound. The Alaska potato market is peculiar. The Fairbanks market especially demands, first, an outside, or imported, potato regardless of price, kind, or quality; therefore, the merchants in their endeavor to please their customers do not like to handle the native potatoes, and will not, as a rule, when it is possible to have the outside stock.

Here you will observe that the Alaskan merchants will not even handle the potatoes and they are a slow sale at 4 cents a pound. He says the Fairbanks people demand outside potatoes regardless of the price, kind, and quality. I ask the proponents of this bill what kind of potatoes do they raise in Alaska and where does all this bland complaisance hail from with reference to their agricultural possibilities in Alaska?

Now let us look at the premises for a moment and follow it for a moment. First, it says that potatoes are the leading crop, and then it says the Alaska people will not use them. It says they can not sell them. At other places in the report the Agricultural Department representatives say they can not sell them, and assert that they are a drug on the market.

The statement is made that a thousand tons of potatoes were shipped into Fairbanks alone from Puget Sound in one season. Now, if that is so, I believe it would be cheaper to bring those people out of Alaska entirely and give them a home in one of these several million acres of unoccupied public land. Why, we could board them at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel more cheaply than keeping them in Alaska.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. My question is prompted by a desire for information rather than by mere curiosity. If they can not eat or sell the potatoes, what do they use them for?

Mr. FERRIS. Oh, I guess they can mix them up with guano and put them back on the soil and fertilize the soil and raise more potatoes of the same kind. [Laughter.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, I will answer that question.

Mr. FERRIS. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. It is an actual fact that potatoes are shipped from Alaska to Seattle, the very place from which are shipped the potatoes that were sold at Fairbanks.

Mr. FERRIS. Where does the gentleman get that information? When was that?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. That was within the last year or two.

Mr. FERRIS. I do not know where the gentleman gets a report of that kind.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I get it from the Federal statistics.

Mr. FERRIS. I have in my hands, Mr. Chairman, the report of 1911 and the report of 1912, which show that to this wonderful country a thousand tons of potatoes were sent to the gentleman's home town in Fairbanks from the States. One of two things must be true—they are either without home potatoes or those they have are worthless, or they would not ship in such a quantity as that.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes.

Mr. BRYAN. Has the gentleman ever bought an article marked "Made in Germany"?

Mr. FERRIS. Oh, the gentleman would not desire me to digress to answer that.

Mr. BRYAN. That is on the same principle.

Mr. HELM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes.

Mr. HELM. Is it not a fact that there was collected in customs duties at the ports of the United States \$60,000 or \$75,000 on potatoes imported into United States ports in the year before last?

Mr. FERRIS. I do not think so. I am sure that can not be. They do not even eat the Alaskan potatoes themselves, only when a potato famine is on. But I will say that since the date of the purchase of Alaska for \$7,200,000 the imports from Alaska have been a mere bagatelle and negligible in comparison with the expense of that Territory. If it takes from 1867 down to this good day to pay back \$7,000,000 on the money we have spent for Alaska, I would like to know how long it will take for the imports from Alaska to pay for this \$400,000,000 railroad—which it will eventually amount to if the scheme is entered into at all—that you propose to build up there. That is a proposition that you gentlemen can take home with you and think of until you are tired. We have spent \$35,000,000 on Alaska, and only \$17,000,000 has as yet been returned.

Mr. HELM. If the United States is importing potatoes for consumption, is it a crime for the people of Alaska to import potatoes also?

Mr. FERRIS. No; but the gentleman well knows, if he is earnest in his efforts to secure information, that attempts to raise Alaskan potatoes are not successful. On the contrary, the soil is so sour and mucky and devoid of fertility that potatoes raised upon it have no quality that makes them palatable. Potatoes from outside were imported into the gentleman's home town—the town of the gentleman who has presented this matter to the House so creditably and favorably. Under the circumstances, I can scarcely fathom his motive in making such a remarkable statement as he has made.

In his own town they had to import a thousand tons of potatoes, and his town is the olive branch that they hold out. All three of these railroads are headed for Fairbanks. What for? To carry in potatoes to keep the Fairbanks people from starving to death. [Laughter.] Why, we ought to bring those people out and board them where we can board them cheaply.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Besides those potatoes we have brought out \$75,000,000 of gold inside of 10 years from that same town.

Mr. FERRIS. I will not take the time now, but I have the gold figures here. I should like to present those figures. They are falling off at the rate of \$4,000,000 a year. I will present them to the gentleman. Turning to page 33 of the report for 1912, let us see how we are getting along on potatoes, wherein it says:

It is a question whether the potato market will continue to be a profitable one. The population gradually diminishes as the placer ground is worked out, and the homesteaders are gradually extending the area in potatoes. The time will come when the price of the native-grown potato will be so low that there will be no profit in it. In this connection it is well to call attention to the fact that potatoes grown on lowlands, as a consequence, suffer from early frosts and seldom mature normally. They are therefore soft and watery when cooked, and when placed on the market they ruin the reputation of the Alaska-grown potato.

In the lowlands, where the soil is rich, the frost gets them, and on the high mucky soil they die for want of fertility; so in either event you raise nothing. Continuing, the report says:

Ranchers should transfer their potato growing to southern slopes of the low hills. There they will get a potato of better quality, which will not be discredited in the market.

What a spectacle that is!

Mr. HARDY. Is it not the excessive freights on potatoes that make them cost, when imported, a dollar a pound?

Mr. FERRIS. I think it is; but if the country had the fertility its friends claim for it there would not be any need to import foodstuffs. They could feed themselves.

Mr. HARDY. I will ask the gentleman to deal with this question: If the freight rates are so high that potatoes cost a dollar a pound, ought we not either to close up that country or give some access to it? [Applause.]

Mr. FERRIS. I will tell the gentleman frankly what I think about that. Let me read again in the report for 1911 and see what the Agricultural Department says about that. Here we have what the Agricultural Department says, which ought to be placed before the people who anticipate going there.

First, however, let us for a moment sum up what our agricultural investigations in Alaska have really resulted in. First, the expenditure of \$298,000 out of the Federal Treasury, with

a return of \$22,000. I presume the Auditor for the Treasury Department will audit this amount as so much for experience in agriculture in Alaska. So far as I am personally concerned, I think the money has been well spent, for I believe it will prevent many of our patriotic home-seeking people from getting on the rocks of starvation and disaster by ever going to Alaska at all and taking up a homestead there.

One of the stations at Copper Center has already been abandoned. I have no doubt but that that station is buried in the one cemetery site that has heretofore been patented, and I have no doubt but that in the near future there will be four freshly made graves for the other stations now in existence there, namely, Sitka, Rampart, Fairbanks, and Kodiak. I shall not attempt at this time to make reference to what would be a proper inscription upon the tombstones of these costly and unsuccessful ventures.

Again, at page 31 of the same report of 1912, we will observe where the agricultural report shows that potato culture will in all probability have to be abandoned altogether, due to the fact that as they work out the placer mines and the population begins to recede there will be no demand for the potato. The language is as follows:

It is a question whether the potato market will continue to be profitable, however. The population gradually diminishes as the placer ground is worked out, and the homesteaders are gradually extending the area in potatoes. The time will come when the price of the native-grown potato will be so low that there will be no profit in it.

In this connection it is well to call attention to the fact that potatoes grown on lowlands, as a consequence suffer from early frosts and seldom mature normally. They are therefore soft and watery when cooked, and when placed on the market they ruin the reputation of the Alaska-grown potato. Ranchers should transfer their potato growing to southern slopes of the low hills. There they will grow a potato of better quality, which will not be discredited in the market.

Let us now for one moment go up to the Tanana Valley, in the vicinity of Fairbanks, and observe conditions there through first-handed information secured from the agricultural representatives, who must of necessity be the highest authorities upon whom we can depend for information as to the agricultural conditions in Alaska. At pages 49 and 50 of the report of 1911 we are again favored with a report on the conditions of wild grass and hay. The report is as follows:

The writer challenges the many reports that are continually appearing in eastern papers—

That is some more of my friends Wickersham and Humphrey's moving-picture shows—

magazines, and other current literature, calling the public attention to the supposed vast areas of meadow lands in the Tanana Valley, which are calling forth innumerable letters of inquiry.

These moving-picture fellows are raising potatoes to beat the band in Boston and New York and around this Capitol. The main way that they raise potatoes is in these moving-picture shows. Continuing, the report says:

It is true, travelers often see small meadows and short stretches of good grazing, but when we consider the great area comprised in the Tanana Valley we lose sight of the few scattering grassplats. There are probably not a dozen of the 200 or more homesteaders in the valley who can cut enough wild hay on their homesteads to winter a team.

Mr. MADDEN. What are horses worth up there?

Mr. FERRIS. They do not have any. Let me read to you here. They have no hay to feed them with if they had them, but they do not have any. I will present the agricultural report:

Nearly all homesteads, however, do afford some grazing four or five months in the year.

Considerable grazing land may be found near the headwaters of the Tanana and also occasionally small areas are found on the hills above timber line. Where forest fires have devastated the timber grass usually springs up in abundance until choked out by a new growth of timber and moss.

It costs \$125 an acre to remove the moss.

Continuing, the report says:

While a few of the more prosperous settlers have cleared up enough land to raise their own feed and some to sell, the great majority of homesteaders do not have any stock at all, but hire their neighbors to plow a small area, and they finish the cultivation by hand, while others devote their whole time to cutting wood for a living.

That answers the gentleman's question. They do not have any at all, but hire their neighbors to plow up a small area, and they finish the cultivation by hand, while others devote their whole time to cutting wood for a living.

Mr. MADDEN. What do they do with the wood?

Mr. FERRIS. I guess they toast their toes by it. They have eight months darkness and the thermometer goes down to 80° below zero. They need firewood worse than anything else, and somebody ought to build a fire under some of these moving picture fellows and stop them from misrepresenting these things in the East, and their own Agricultural Department says so.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Why should they be cutting wood in a country where the wood is mostly conserved and the coal is right there?

Mr. FERRIS. I will get to that. The gentleman and I are pretty nearly in agreement about that. I have a plan to propose about that, and I will come to it presently.

The reports even show that the agricultural agent in charge up there has even become vexed at the lack of knowledge on the part of our people in the States as to true conditions in Alaska. You will observe, he says, that in that wonderful valley, which has been pictured to us as the great millennium of agriculture, that less than 200 homesteaders are there, and that there are probably not a dozen of them who can cut enough hay to winter a team, many of them having to devote their whole time to cutting wood for a living. How does this compare with the boom literature we find emanating from chambers-of-commerce and real-estate men up in that country? I ask this House, Will you employ men to go to Alaska in charge of your affairs and instruct them to obtain the facts, and when brought home to you free from excitement, free from noise, will you turn them aside and follow the booster sheets and moving-picture shows of the chambers of commerce and interested parties instead? Alaska would not be entitled to have this said about her but for the fact that it is necessary to bring about an awakening to the extent that the Federal Government will not, through a misapprehension, break precedents in making large expenditures of the public moneys for a proposition totally wanting in feasibility, practicability, and common sense.

Again, at page 53 of the same report, we again meet the true conditions with reference to tame hay, and there the experiment station, after four long years of preparation of the ground, has the following to say:

As has been stated in former reports, the hay crop is much improved by summer fallowing and frequent cultivating through the summer. The ordinary land will not stand cropping every year without using some fertilizer.

Early seeding is highly important, as it is next to impossible to cure hay cut after the first week in September.

I think it is unnecessary to say to this House, even though many of you have not been connected with agriculture, that where the land has to be plowed each year, or lay idle, that no human being can make it profitable. I have been fortunate in having more or less to do with agriculture all my life, and I think every farmer in this House will bear me out in the statement that the uncertainty of getting a "stand" is so great that unless it would stand from 10 to 20 years it would not be considered valuable for a crop. In the report you will observe that they treat tame hay as an annual crop that must be planted yearly, and the report goes on to say that the land can be cropped only every other year.

I shall not devote more time in calling attention to the numerous and voluminous reports that show conditions in Alaska and the preposterousness of trying to hold out to this Government or anyone else the fact that agriculture in Alaska will ever afford any tonnage for a railroad. The only possible good such railroads could serve would be to carry in food from the States to ward off starvation from the people who live within, and I think the excerpts from the reports of the man on the ground in charge warrant a statement as drastic as this one.

At page 22 of Bulletin 36, by ex-Secretary of the Interior Walter L. Fisher, it being a bulletin from the Bureau of Mines, he there very ably discusses the method of opening coal mines, the inadvisability of Government operation, and so forth. His words on pages 22 and 23 are as follows:

METHODS OF OPENING THE ALASKAN COAL FIELDS.

[Page 22, Bulletin 36. By Mr. W. L. Fisher, Bureau of Mines.]

On the other hand, direct Government operation, including the mining and the selling of coal, involves such deep and far-reaching changes, both of policy and of administration, that there is no likelihood at the present time of its adoption to the exclusion of private operation. Unlike the Government ownership of railroads, public coal mining has never been held by the courts to be a function of government. It would be regarded by many sincere and disinterested citizens as an invasion of the field of private enterprise, and would involve such general and uncompromising opposition that even those who believe in its adoption as a matter of principle should not insist upon tying up the coal fields of Alaska until the great economic and political questions that are involved in its exclusive application to these fields have been fought out to a practical conclusion. The true function of government is not merely the preservation of public order or the regulation of the conduct of individuals, but the carrying on of any enterprise which will promote the welfare of the community as a whole more effectively if carried on by the organized community than if left to the voluntary action of individual members of the community. But to determine whether a particular activity answers this test depends in every instance on a final and complete analysis involving a consideration not only of immediate results, but of the far-reaching consequences upon humanity and upon the social order. While, therefore, much can be said in favor of permitting the Government to enter experimentally into those fields upon which industrial development and the welfare of society depend, which perhaps may in the future include the development and distribution of power and the means by which power may be created, I do not believe that the Government alone should preempt these fields or exclusively assume their development until it becomes far clearer than it is to-day that their development by private enterprise can not be effectively controlled. For this reason I am opposed

to the policy of having the Government alone own and mine Alaskan coal.

Here it will be observed that ex-Secretary Fisher is inclined to be against having the Federal Government mine the coal in Alaska, and he is undoubtedly right about it. The building of a railroad in Alaska does not in any sense solve the problem, but, on the other hand, it must yet be met. We should first bravely meet the problem and then solve the railroad proposition later. I do not always agree with ex-Secretary Fisher in all things, but he deals so clearly with problems that are of great moment to our people that the country may well find itself indebted to him for it.

Again, at pages 27 and 28 of Bulletin 36 of the Bureau of Mines, by ex-Secretary Fisher, he says:

CONDITIONS TO BE INCORPORATED IN COAL LEASES.

With records at hand giving the results of a large volume and great variety of experience covering the operations of both private and public coal-land leases in our own and many other countries, it should not be difficult to decide upon the ordinary conditions and requirements that should be incorporated in a leasing system for the Alaska coal fields—working conditions that will meet the legitimate demands of the prospector, the investor, and the operator, safeguard the health and life of the mine worker and the property of the Government, to the end that the public may secure an adequate supply of fuel at the lowest cost consistent with these conditions.

It may be practicable to provide in connection with the renewal of leases at their termination that such renewals shall be subject to the then existing laws applicable thereto. This principle has been successfully adopted in the Australian leases. Our first leases can well be made more favorable than those which follow, so that prompt development may be secured; and if they are for reasonable but fixed periods, and if we lease only as much of our coal lands as may be required for the existing market and its effective extension, we can thus proceed experimentally, correcting early mistakes and meeting future conditions as they arise.

The prime requisites of a leasing system are that only sufficient coal lands should be leased to meet the existing market and encourage its development; that the terms of the lease should be such as to attract capital and protect both the capital invested and the public interest; that the quantity leased to any one lessee should be limited to the amount that can be profitably mined as a unit and yet be large enough to attract investors; that the lessee shall pay his royalty as he mines his coal; that this shall annually amount to at least a fixed minimum which will make it unprofitable for him to hold the land without production; that he shall mine his coal without unnecessary waste and with due regard to the health and safety of his employees; that he shall not engage directly or indirectly in any combinations, agreements, or understandings to control the price of coal; and that the revenues derived by the Government shall not be used as a source of Federal revenue or as a substitute for taxation, but shall be devoted to the development of the State or Territory in which the coal is mined. These at least are the principal features which should be embodied in a leasing law. It is to be noted, however, that the Alaska coal fields will not require the large permanent plants that economic development justifies in certain Pennsylvania and West Virginia fields. Indeed, the physical condition of the Alaska fields makes the limitation of the area and of the investment under a single lease a natural if not a necessary feature of their development.

Here ex-Secretary Fisher shows with amazing clearness that it would be easy to incorporate in the lease provisions which would meet all the legitimate demands of the prospector, the inventor, the operator, and well safeguard the life and property of the mine worker and likewise the property of the Federal Government. At almost the same breath he shows that the public may secure an adequate amount of fuel at a low cost, further explaining how safeguards could be placed in the leases to ward off monopoly and viciousness on the part of any of those who may enter the field for mining purposes.

Again, on page 23 of Bulletin 36 from the Bureau of Mines, ex-Secretary Fisher dwells on the many advantages of the leasing system. His words are as follows:

SOME ADVANTAGES OF AND OBJECTIONS TO THE LEASING OF COAL LANDS.

[Page 23, Bulletin 36. By Mr. W. L. Fisher.]

I believe that the leasing system avoids the controversies and the difficulties of both extremes of public and of private ownership. It has been adopted with conspicuous success in the great mining communities of Australia and New Zealand. It is now the established law of the Yukon territory lying in Canada just across the border line from Alaska. It is the system under which much of the privately owned coal land of the United States is in fact to-day being developed. Under it we can insert as matters of contract and as requirements which promote the public interest, the enforcement of some of which by mandatory law might be unconstitutional. By making the terms of our leases liberal we can make them even more attractive to capital than if we adopt the policy of an outright sale of the fee.

Let us consider for a moment what ordinarily happens with coal land that is sold outright. Comparatively little of it is mined by the original purchaser. He usually disposes of his title to a succession of others, each of whom in turn adds to the cost of his purchase the profit in consideration of which he sells, and with increasing frequency the final result is the operation of the coal mines by a lessee who must pay a return on these accumulated profits and who adds his own, transferring the burden of it all to the consumer. One hundred and fifty-six million tons of coal, or 34 per cent of the total production of the United States for the year 1909, were mined from lands operated under private leases, and these leases are common in every coal-mining State. Considering the naturally much more so in some States than in others. Considering the areas involved, we find that in West Virginia, in the great Pocahontas and New River coal fields, which yield the finest steaming coals of the continent, about 90 per cent of the area in the Pocahontas district and

about 60 per cent of that in the New River district are mined on a private-lease basis, which pays the lessor a royalty fee averaging 10 cents per ton.

Here it will be observed that the lease can be so arranged that it will be attractive to investors to come and develop Alaska; then Alaska's purposes will all have been served and our Government will have practiced prudence and economy. We will only be walking in the wake of New Zealand and other countries that are carrying on coal mining in this way and by this system the Alaska Territory may reach her highest goal of development.

Even if railroads should be built by the Federal Government, the real problem yet stares you in the face of How shall the coal be mined? How shall it be handled? How is monopoly to be crushed? How shall the weak be protected from the strong? All these, nay more, questions stare you in the face as before. Why not solve the real problem first? Then, if conditions do not hold out sufficient inducements to invite railroads, wagon roads, and other developments, then it would be time enough, after a fair trial, to look to Government ownership and the knotty problems that go with it.

On this proposition of leasing, I again call your attention to the words of ex-Secretary of the Interior Hon. Walter L. Fisher, appearing on page 132 of the Senate hearings, and which are as follows:

They will all be agreed upon the proposition that the way to handle these fields is to have the Government lease them, and lease them upon terms that will encourage development, will protect the operator, and will give him a far better chance in the practical operation of the coal mines than he can possibly get under the existing system. You do not propose to throw this coal land open under the present law except in very small quantities, so small that it is not profitable to operate, so small that certainly if there is any operation it is upon the most uneconomic basis.

Further, on page 133 of the Senate hearings, speaking of the leasing plan and the method of opening Alaska, ex-Secretary Fisher says:

Now, the Federal Government can make a lease that will make the royalty whatever it wants, and it can impose conditions with regard to the protection of the interests of the miners and the workmen that will be right and proper—not unreasonable, not finical, or anything of that kind, but right, and if that involves a financial expense on the operator that ought to be taken into consideration, it can be taken off the royalty. So far as I am concerned, I do not care whether the royalty amounts to anything or not in cash money if the Government gets the things it wants and if the public gets the things it ought to get instead of actual money.

I am again proud to refer to the remarks of ex-Secretary Fisher, at page 135 of the Senate hearings, as follows:

In the past we have made land grants, and we have given other assistance to railroads. I think that time has definitely gone by. I do not believe that Congress is going to make any more land grants in aid of railroads.

Now, as to the question of what would happen in the event a leasing system properly safeguarded were put into vogue in Alaska, we are again proud to have what ex-Secretary Fisher says, as shown at page 140 of the Senate Hearings, the exact colloquy being as follows:

Senator WALSH. You are apparently of the opinion, Mr. Fisher, that if these roads were built, or if any of them was to be built to the coal fields, and a law were passed providing for the leasing of coal lands, that lessees would appear in abundance?

Mr. FISHER. I have no doubt whatever of it, Senator. I have been told by many men that there would not be any question about it.

Senator WALSH. If, then, such an act were passed making provision for the disposition of the coal land under such a system as that, so that the coal lands were to be opened up, would it be your opinion, then, that private enterprise would construct these lines in order to carry out the coal thus to be mined?

Mr. FISHER. I think private interests would construct lines necessary to carry out the coal, both at the Bering field and at the Matanuska fields.

Senator WALSH. Under a leasing system?

Mr. FISHER. I think so.

I am in favor of leasing the coal lands in Alaska on a royalty basis, just as a farmer would lease his farm for one-third of the wheat or one-fourth of the cotton, or the usual crop rent, so that the man who mines coal in that country will not only make a profit for himself, but for the Federal Government and for Alaska herself, and will help develop the country—with no scandal, no noise, no buncombe, no Guggenheimism, and no blinding, blighting, idiotic statements, challenging the patriotism of men who are here to do their duty. [Applause.]

The leasing system is one you will have to come to anyway. We are doing it in Oklahoma, we are doing it everywhere, and now I ask the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. WICKERSHAM] how does he stand on a leasing law? You were against it in the hearings.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. What is the use of a leasing law if there is no coal up there, as the gentleman says there is not?

Mr. FERRIS. The "gentleman" does not say there is no coal there. He has never said so and he does not say so now.

But I want to know how does the gentleman stand on a leasing law?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I am in favor of it, provided that it is so arranged that the Guggenheims can not get control of it.

Mr. FERRIS. The gentleman did not so state in the hearings. The gentleman then said that he was against a leasing law.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes—

Mr. FERRIS. What has changed his opinion?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Nothing.

Mr. FERRIS. Is the gentleman for it or against it?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I am against it if—

Mr. FERRIS. He who is in favor of real conservation, of real development, is in favor of opening the mines under a leasing law free from exploitation.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Will the gentleman let me answer his question?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I am in favor of a leasing law such as is indicated in the language of President Wilson in his last message. Is the gentleman in favor of that?

Mr. FERRIS. I do not recall just what that language was, but I am in favor of more that President Wilson stands for than is the gentleman from Alaska. The gentleman wants to drag us up into Alaska to spend \$36,000,000, where he only has 35,000 white souls with only the pitiful increase of 733 souls for the last 10 years.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes.

Mr. HARDY. Can the gentleman expect a man to go up into Alaska mining coal and getting enough out of it to pay \$1 a pound for potatoes that they must have?

Mr. FERRIS. Well, the gentleman has asked a question that will call for a considerable digression, and I do not think he expects me to go into that. I have a way of remedying that. If you lease the coal and control monopoly by Federal and trust legislation, you have solved the problem. Whether you pass the railroad bill or not, you have to come to the lease law for Alaska, and you know it. We are merely getting the cart before the horse. I am not in favor of the Guggenheims grabbing any more of Alaska, and I am not in favor of letting anybody else grab Alaska, but, on the contrary, I am in favor of leasing the minerals of Alaska, and that is the only way to solve the problem.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes.

Mr. HARDY. Would anybody go up there and accept a lease under the present conditions and the law?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes; they would be glad to do it. The hearings are full of the names of people crying to do it.

Mr. HARDY. Under present conditions?

Mr. FERRIS. Under present conditions. There is no lease law on the statute books. It is the duty of this brilliant, clear-headed, progressive Wilson administration to give Alaska laws which will enable them to lease these lands; and they ought to do it without any more ceremony, and I welcome the aid of the Progressives and the Republicans to do it.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. I will.

Mr. LENROOT. I am thoroughly in accord with the gentleman.

Mr. FERRIS. I know the gentleman is.

Mr. LENROOT. I want the gentleman to tell the House what reason he has to believe that under proper laws which will guard against monopoly the railroads will be built into these fields?

Mr. FERRIS. Read Mr. Fisher's statement in his bulletin on Alaska. He says in substance that he has no doubt that they will, and I believe that they will.

Mr. LENROOT. Does the gentleman place greater credence in the judgment of ex-Secretary Fisher, a Republican, than he does in the statements and opinions of Secretary Lane?

Mr. FERRIS. Not at all. I think they are both clear-headed, patriotic gentlemen; but because men happen to differ in opinion on a single proposition, it is no sign that they are lacking in patriotism, intelligence, or true worth that goes to make up manhood.

Mr. SIMS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes.

Mr. SIMS. In case the Government builds the railroad, could not it lease the property for better returns?

Mr. FERRIS. Possibly it could and possibly it could not; but you are getting the cart before the horse in that way; we

should solve the conservation proposition first and build the railroads later.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. Certainly.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Does the gentleman remember that Secretary Fisher appeared before the Committee on the Territories and strongly recommended this bill?

Mr. FERRIS. I do; he was in favor of the bill, and he was in favor of a lease law, which the gentleman did not favor and is not in favor of now.

Mr. LENROOT. There is nothing inconsistent with this bill and a leasing law.

Mr. FERRIS. I think the leasing law makes this bill unnecessary.

Mr. HARDY. I think I am with the gentleman for a lease law.

Mr. FERRIS. And I want to say to the House that if anybody thinks that the appropriation of \$36,000,000 out of the Treasury at this time will stop the noise and clamor for more railroad appropriations, he is wrong. I want to call attention to the fact that the passage of this bill and an appropriation of \$36,000,000 will in no sense solve the problem in Alaska. Is there a man in the Progressive Party, is there a man in the Republican Party or in the Democratic Party, who would stand up here and advocate that the Federal Government ought to go up there with a pickax and dig that coal out and load it on to freight cars? No good man would have the temerity to stand up and advocate any such a thing as that.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, I certainly believe it will be all right for Uncle Sam to do that.

Mr. FERRIS. There is one lone Progressive. [Laughter.]

Mr. BRYAN. And supply the market with coal—

Mr. FERRIS. Brethren, are there any others? [Laughter.]

Mr. BRYAN. It will be so much better than the West Virginia scheme and the Colorado scheme that there will be no comparison.

Mr. FERRIS. Can there be others? Mr. Chairman, there is a sample of the Progressive Party for you. There is a man who would have the Federal Government leave the ordinary functions of government behind and go up with a pick in hand to dig coal in Alaska. What do you think of that? [Laughter.] I see 19 or 20 good Progressive Party men sitting around here, all good fellows, who would not think of such a thing as that, I know. They are all lovable, good fellows, that have the milk of human kindness in them, and I am with them lots of the time; but what a spectacle that would be. Still, the gentleman lives near Seattle, where the moving pictures come from, so that may account for it. [Laughter.]

Mr. BRYAN. I will state this, that we have none of those Indian shows which the gentleman has spoken about, with Buffalo Bill as a central figure.

Mr. FERRIS. I know the gentleman is a few days in advance of us on that.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman if he thinks, seriously, that with a leasing system any railroads would be constructed to the two coal fields that we have in Alaska?

Mr. FERRIS. Undoubtedly; and they are clamoring to-day and they will do it, and we can put the protection of the Interstate Commerce Commission around them so that they can practice neither monopoly nor extortion, and that is the sensible thing to do.

Mr. TOWNER. I had supposed that the reason that these railroad projects to these coal fields had been abandoned was because the projectors could not get hold of the coal fields. Is not that the gentleman's idea?

Mr. FERRIS. That is largely true. No one can mine coal there now. A lease law will cure this, so things can move on without scandal and true conservation will be in vogue.

Mr. TOWNER. I know that is very true, and I am with the gentleman on the leasing proposition; and is it not likely, if that is true, that a leasing system would prevent any large monopolization, or certainly control, of those coal fields?

Mr. FERRIS. It would, because we could write into the face of the lease every safeguard that we wanted in there.

Mr. TOWNER. That being true, would any of these syndicates—these people who have been building railroads, or any other large interests that would take up railroad building—be likely to go to the coal fields?

Mr. FERRIS. I think they would if they could get tonnage.

Mr. TOWNER. That is a problem I think we will have to consider very seriously.

Mr. FERRIS. True, indeed.

Mr. TOWNER. The leasing system will do no good unless the coal can be taken to the seaboard.

Mr. FERRIS. True enough.

Mr. TOWNER. And it will not be worth while for us to pass a leasing law unless that will result in allowing the coal that is mined to be taken out and made available.

Mr. FERRIS. Precisely; but let me answer the gentleman.

Mr. MADDEN. Suppose that we have a railroad and that we do not have a lease law; how will we get the coal to the seaboard?

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I want to answer the gentleman from Iowa. I have ample authority here that I may not have time to present; but it shows that the two coal fields that are merchantable in character are very near the coast.

The Bering Sea field is 25 miles from Cordova Bay. The other one has a railroad built 70 miles above Seward and by the construction of 110 miles more will go clear through to the Matanuska coal field and will be built if they can get the tonnage. The history of railroad construction since it began has been based on the fundamental principle of tonnage, and tonnage is a thing that brings railroads—nothing else. And with a lease law you have that tonnage. Why? Because men can be made certain in their investments, can know what they can earn, can know what the Government will exact in the way of royalty, will know on the face of the contract precisely what they have to do; they will know that instead of being governed by a noise, they will be governed by law, by contractual relations, by decent relations, which will bring honest, patriotic development; that there will be no monopoly, that there will be no oppression of labor, that there will be no extortion of freight rates, or any of the things of which both the gentleman and myself complain.

Mr. TOWNER. One other thing I want to call attention to. In reading these hearings—I do not want to take up the gentleman's time.

Mr. FERRIS. I know, but we are a little short of time, if the gentleman will pardon me.

Mr. TOWNER. Then I will not press the inquiry.

Mr. FERRIS. I dislike very much not to be able to yield further; I like to be considerate and at all times courteous to Members, but I must hasten on. Passing from the agricultural phase of it, I want to say this, particularly to my own side of the House. I have probably less source of information and right to make a suggestion to my own side of the House than anyone here, but nevertheless I am going to venture one. I want to call attention to the growth of appropriations.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURROX] did it more forcibly than I can hope to do and I have kidnaped some of his figures and used some of my own. We promised the people in our platform that we would be careful in our expenditure of the people's money and, without any criticism, I believe our party is pledged to it, and I think every Democrat here can point with pride not only to-day but as long as he is here, to the great strides we have made in our progress and development and along lines that will tend to put Woodrow Wilson and his administration and our party in history as a great progressive set of men making up a Democratic Party that proposes to do something. Now, I do not want to see anything that tends to blight or blast our beautiful prospects by a wild expenditure of money that is not based on something fundamentally sound. Now, let me call attention to the growth of appropriations. In the Army appropriation bill of 1873 the appropriations were \$28,000,000. In 1914 the appropriations were \$94,000,000. The naval appropriation bill in 1873 was \$18,000,000, and in 1914, \$140,000,000. The appropriations for rivers and harbors in 1873 were \$5,000,000; in 1914, they were \$51,000,000. The Department of Agriculture in 1881 had an appropriation of \$253,000; in 1914 it had an appropriation of \$17,000,000. We appropriated for pensions in 1873, \$30,000,000; in 1914, \$180,000,000. The total appropriation for the Forty-third Congress amounted to \$653,794,991; in the Sixty-first Congress we appropriated \$2,654,584,510.90.

Senator BURROX calls attention to the fact we have increased our appropriations 366 times since 1790, while our population has only increased 24 times. Now what is the result? When every one of these appropriations started they said this will only be for a few years and we will hold them down next year.

It shall not be my purpose to condemn any one of the above appropriations, for, on the contrary, we can all recognize good in the expenditures of the money and the improvements effected by them. It is always easy to call attention to the good things that money will buy; it is always painful and disturbing to debate the source from whence money comes; it is true in private life, in local municipalities, in the county, in the State governments, and in the National Government. I can not help but feel, however, that it is the duty of some one, somewhere, to

call attention to where we are really drifting. As the above figures disclose, we launch out at a particular time on what looks to be a small venture and a correspondingly small expenditure only to find ourselves a few years later appropriating sums so vast and so enormous that it would stagger the judgment of any man who even had a passing thought for the welfare and perpetuity of the Federal Treasury. I can not think it would be unfair to offer the above growth in appropriations as a somber criterion for what will follow in the event we commit the Federal Government to the ownership of railroads, which is more far-reaching, more enormous, and more unfathomable than any of the figures preceding us.

Let us pause for a moment to ascertain something of what Government ownership really means. To ascertain what it really means is important, irrespective of whether we favor it or not.

It means, first, the ultimate taking over of all railroad lines in the United States, aggregating a total mileage of 248,888, and a salaried roll of 1,669,000 employees. It likewise means the taking over of the telephone, telegraph, and express companies and an addition to our pay roll in that regard of 322,044 employees at an annual salary of \$164,825,435.

The total number of Government employees, exclusive of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, is 469,528. It is not possible to assume actually what amount of money is estimated to pay these salaries, but the growth in the appropriations made by Congress since it has reached the \$2,000,000,000 mark is indicative of what we are getting into should we add the long list of telephone and telegraph and express companies and railroad salaries to the list. The enormity of such a proceeding can hardly be fathomed or understood.

The United States with her 248,888 miles of railroad is not to be compared with European Government ownership, countries that are densely settled and whose railroad mileage is not to be compared with ours. The 16 European countries which have Government ownership range in mileage from 318 to 37,996. There are five countries in America other than the United States, which have Government ownership, their mileage ranging from 3,526 to 24,726. There are six countries in Asia having Government ownership, the mileage ranging from 637 to 32,092. There are five countries in Africa having Government ownership. The exact mileage is not given separately, but in each case the mileage is so small that it makes comparison unpardonable. Australia has seven subdivisions having Government ownership of railroads, ranging in mileage from 633 to 4,011.

Government ownership would divest the several States of \$103,873,193 in taxes annually, equitably apportioned among the respective States according to the railway mileage in the States. The taxes range from \$130,031 for Delaware to \$7,561,014 for New York. It may well be asserted, and we are undoubtedly within the facts, to say that the purchase and taking over by the Federal Government of the railroads, telephones, telegraph lines, and express companies would increase the personnel of the national pay roll approximately 3,000,000, or, to be exact, 2,818,345.

It will be observed that the last 10 presidential elections elected Presidents by a plurality varying from 7,000 to a little more than 2,500,000. Might we not well anticipate what the increase to the Federal pay roll of such a number would amount to in the controlling of a political machine to choke, strangle, and even overthrow this Republic?

But whether we believe in Government ownership or not, this particular project we are discussing is totally lacking in feasibility. The construction of a railroad will not solve the problem. Legislation must be passed authorizing the mining and removal of coal and minerals, otherwise a railroad would be of no avail. It has been asserted that Alaska is overrun with grafters and crooks. For my purposes it is not necessary to either affirm or deny this assertion, but, in my opinion, the construction of railroads would increase rather than diminish this element, unless proper safeguards were thrown around the mining and removal of both the coal and the mineral.

Are we going to start in and build all the railroads in Alaska that the moving-picture people want up there? Falcon Joslin, proponent and president of one of the defunct railroads up there, says it will take 10,000 miles of railroad to open Alaska, which calls for an expenditure estimated at \$480,000,000. There are 35,000 white people there, an increase of 733 in 10 years. Can any Democrat, can any Republican, can any gentleman other than the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN], who wants to have us go up and dig coal and raise potatoes, can anybody justify such a venture as that?

Mr. BRYAN. As far as going into that point you just suggested, they could mine the coal without suspending the Constitution as they did in West Virginia, but I am not suggesting anything in regard to that. But did Falcon Joslin say it would take 10,000 miles of railroad to open Alaska?

Mr. FERRIS. He did in substance. I am not trying to quote verbatim.

Mr. BRYAN. Did he not say it would take that to develop Alaska?

Mr. FERRIS. That is only the difference between tweedledee and tweedledum. You give one community in Alaska 733 miles of railroad and there will be 732 other communities that would want a like amount immediately. Here comes a Member of Congress with an appropriation for rivers and harbors in his district. His brother Member across the aisle must have as much as he, and Tom, Dick, and Harry say that they must have as much as he has, and so on ad infinitum.

Mr. MADDEN. What percentage of the present population would be served by these 733 miles of railroad?

Mr. FERRIS. That has been figured out and has been stated in the last few days. The big bulk of the population lives down on the seacoast, and they do not need the railroads; and the rest of the population is scattered throughout the interior.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Would it bother the gentleman to state what the 10,000 miles of railroad of which this railroad president speaks would be put in there for?

Mr. FERRIS. The theory is that the chambers of commerce up there want them. That is the main reason, I observe, and the people of Seattle want them, because every time we appropriate \$36,000,000 for Alaska, Seattle figures on getting \$30,000,000 of it.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Will the gentleman yield? Mr. FERRIS. I will.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. In order to be entirely fair to Mr. Joslin, for whom I know the gentleman has a high regard—

Mr. FERRIS. I have heard him to be a lovable character. Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Is it not true that in speaking of the development of Alaska he referred to the time it would be developed until it would have the number of inhabitants of Norway and Sweden?

Mr. FERRIS. That is a blissful time, which will never be reached.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Was not that the statement?

Mr. FERRIS. I have the statement here, and it does not state that. I have his statement in the hearings and I will print it in my remarks. Mr. Joslin says:

Over 99 per cent of the area of Alaska is public domain. It cost the Government scarcely 2 cents per acre. Less than 1 per cent of the area has been reduced to private ownership. At least 10,000 miles of railroad will be required to develop the Territory.

I will read you another extract over the signature of Falcon Joslin from a letter dated April 15, 1912, addressed to the editor of the New York Times in reply to an editorial that appeared in the Sunday Times on the "United States Railway in Alaska." Mr. Joslin says:

You say, "Doubtless Alaska urgently needs a railway and ought to have one." What Alaska really needs is not "a railway," but many railways. One railway does not develop a continent. The instant need of Alaska is one or two trunk railways connecting tidewater with the navigable river systems of the interior, with two or more spurs opening up the nearest coal fields. One thousand miles of road properly distributed would do this. Even 500 miles might be sufficient to start with, but 10,000 miles of railroad will evidently be required before the Territory is well developed.

Now comes my suggestion:

A SUGGESTED REMEDY.

The citizen or the Representative who stands in opposition to an undertaking should be both able and willing to advance something in its stead more feasible. Three methods of actually opening up the coal mines in Alaska are before us, and only three.

The first is to permit, in the old way, private individuals to acquire title in fee to the coal lands in Alaska under existing law.

The gentleman from Alaska [Mr. WICKERSHAM] said in the hearings that he was not in favor of a leasing bill, so we assume he is in favor of this one.

Now, as to method No. 2: To have the Federal Government own, operate, mine, remove, and market the coal through its own agents and its own instrumentalities; and third, that of having the Federal Government execute a lease properly safeguarded with proper limitations to insure, first, development; second, to prevent monopoly; third, to ward off extortionate

prices; and fourth, to prevent abuse and maltreatment of labor.

So far as I am concerned, in the face of conditions here present, I shall take my stand with the leasing method, giving to the Federal Government full power to work out a lease that will be properly safeguarded; that will have due regard for the welfare of Alaska, the welfare of labor, and with no opportunity for selfish monopoly to step in and retard Alaska's progress.

The method I have proposed, I think, will meet with the ardent approval of every patriotic conservationist in the United States; it will be objected to by a few of the anticongressionalists of the United States; it may be partially objectionable to probably all of the anticongressionalists of the United States. It is this, invite the President, the Department of Justice, and the Secretary of the Interior to join in the drafting of a leasing bill for the Territory of Alaska on a royalty basis, the royalty to be governed and based upon the net profits derived from the mining and removal of the coal. I think the bill should contain a provision carefully drawn which would ward off monopoly, oppression, and extortion, and the provision should go in the face of the lease so the same could not be avoided.

I would place the power to fix the area in the President of the United States, so that Alaska could immediately be put on a working basis without coming back to Congress to have any particular phases of the lease modified or changed. My personal opinion is that the lease contract should likewise contain a strong provision well guarded and the strongest sort of a forfeiture clause for the maltreatment of labor either by reduced wages, inhuman hours, or other inhuman treatment.

Second. Ample authority should be given the Interstate Commerce Commission over such matters as come under their jurisdiction; power to regulate rates and prevent extortion in that regard. The Alaskan Territorial Legislature should be given power, if they do not already have it, to fix rates within the Territory. A corporation or railway commission within the Territory should likewise be created so railroads would be forced to deal justly with the people and at the same time be reasonably secure in the return of their investment and the operation of their rates.

The mere building of a road does not solve the question as stated; more questions will stare you in the face than before; they would still await solution at your hands, because as the matter now stands the coal claims are all withdrawn from entry; no Secretary of the Interior or President would be willing to restore them under entry and acquirement of the old law. Too many claims have been initiated by the Guggenheims and others already that might become valid if this course were pursued, so the plan proposed is not only theoretical but it is something that must be done whether railroads are or are not built, and it is my earnest judgment, and I believe I can show from the highest authority that it is the judgment of those who know most about it, that if a course of this kind were pursued that the door of opportunity to Alaska would swing open; that railroads and wagon roads would follow as fast as the business of the community would warrant; monopoly, graft, and irregular dealing would no longer be present, and the Federal Government could avoid committing itself to the enormous expenditure of \$36,000,000 at this time, which is only to serve as a predicate for the expenditure of millions in the future, so the Federal Government could avoid launching upon a scheme of doubtful propriety without precedent or without information that few, either inside or outside of Congress, can either fathom or understand.

I am full well aware that the treatment accorded Alaska has been difficult for them to forbear. The withdrawal of all their lands from public entry has naturally retarded railroad development, naturally retarded wagon-road development, naturally decreased the production of their mines and resources; and something no doubt should be done. Still, at the present time, to do a thing not properly worked out, to do a thing improperly understood, to do a thing without precedent, to raid the Federal Treasury for a scheme of doubtful propriety, is asking more of the Federal Government than should be expected at our hands.

My friends, did you know that since 1867 but two coal claims have ever proceeded to patent of less than 200 acres? My friends, did you know that only 163 homesteads have ever proceeded to patent since 1883? No developments! Alaska has not been treated fairly? Alaska has not been treated fairly, they say; but, my friends, perhaps it has been treated as fairly as it could be treated under the circumstances. What should be done now is to open the door by the leasing system, and proceed orderly and decently up there to open the country.

Suppose for the moment that the Federal Government builds this 733 miles of railroad for \$36,000,000, does anyone think

that act by itself will open the mines in Alaska, will mine and remove the coal from its hidden walls or load it on to the cars and find a market for it? Does anyone think, either in Congress or out, that the expenditure of such an enormous sum for the construction of three lines of railroad would make the other portions of Alaska less clamorous for their share and grab at the Public Treasury?

The growth of our appropriations heretofore mentioned belies any such a theory, but, on the contrary, is but the holding out to them of roseate hopes that can never be realized upon as long as even the semblance of economy and prudence remain within the make-up of any of us. Do the proponents of this bill think that the American Congress will spend this enormous sum and construct these precarious lines of railroad and then turn Alaska over to them for exploitation and misuse? Do the proponents or the citizenship of Alaska themselves believe that the Secretary of the Interior or the President will release those Cunningham coal claims and the other partially segregated claims in the Bering and Matanuska coal fields? No; it will not be done; Congress will not permit that; public sentiment through the press and through the country will not permit that; but, on the contrary, we will have an expensive railroad, an expensive undertaking, with no tonnage to patronize the railroad, and with the same troublesome, perplexing problems to confront us that have heretofore perplexed this Nation and retarded the growth of Alaska for the past series of years.

Let us for the moment presuppose that the enactment of a leasing bill—which, after all, is but the placing of the Federal Government in the prudent and careful position that an individual citizen would place himself in had he coal lands under his ownership—should prove a failure; what, then, would be the status of the Alaska problem? The Federal Government would still have the right to construct a railroad if it then desired it; the Federal Government would still either own its coal lands and mineral lands or the royalties from them; they would still have the key to the safe door of the costly treasury until such time as the matter could be equitably and successfully settled. On the contrary, the proponents of this bill would have the American Congress take a leap in the dark and commit the United States to a policy that is both dangerous and uncertain.

The proposal I have suggested is not a new one, but, on the contrary, a very old and well-defined one. In Australia they have a minister of mines who looks after the leasing and handling of their mines. In our country the Interior Department would doubtless perform that function, and, in my judgment, we are especially blessed with a clear-headed, statesmanlike Secretary. In New Zealand, where the leasing system has been in vogue for years, it has worked amicably and admirably; in Nova Scotia the system is in vogue; and it is the leasing of the Alaskan mineral and coal lands where the real solution of this problem must finally lie. It is right, it is just, it is logical. It will open Alaska; it will be workable. No matter what becomes of this railroad scheme, the lease law for Alaska is where we will all finally land. [Loud applause.]

I yield back, Mr. Chairman, any time I may have remaining.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BRUMBAUGH] is recognized.

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on the Territories of the House of Representatives gave long and careful study during the past summer to the bill which is now, through the honored chairman of the committee, presented to this House for the development of the great rich wonderland of Alaska.

The committee invited and held extensive hearings, hearing freely and fully at great length experts and others from all parts of the United States, Canada, Alaska, and the world at large.

The results of our labors—the complete reports of the hearings—are printed in book form and have been available to all. It is but fair to state that the committee approached the consideration of this great subject with open minds, and that those of the committee who could or would attend the hearings and thus make up their decision from the evidence in the case and the facts deduced have given their support to this measure; moved to that position wholly by the justice and benefits of this great measure both to all the people of the United States as well as to the people of Alaska themselves.

PRESIDENT WILSON'S STATEMENT FOR ALASKA.

We are more than gratified that our position is so completely sustained by our great President, whose wonderful grasp of affairs and fine statesmanship has not only met every delicate emergency with consummate ability but whose keen sense of right and justice is leading the thought of the world to higher planes and better things.

You all heard what he said in his masterly address before the House and Senate December 2 last on the subject of the need, the benefits, and the justice of Alaskan development. The President speaks of Alaska as a great storehouse, and points out that the development of Alaska is an imperative duty that confronts us. I want to refresh your minds with his clear, logical, and forceful statement based on reports obtained from most minute and thorough inspection of all parts of Alaska. The President says:

A duty faces us with regard to Alaska which seems to me very pressing and very imperative; perhaps I should say a double duty, for it concerns both the political and the material development of the Territory. The people of Alaska should be given the full Territorial form of government, and Alaska, as a storehouse, should be unlocked. One key to it is a system of railways. These the Government should itself build and administer, and the ports and terminals should itself control in the interest of all who wish to use them for the service and development of the country and its people.

But the construction of railways is only the first step; is only thrusting in the key to the storehouse and throwing back the lock and opening the door. How the tempting resources of the country are to be exploited is another matter, to which I shall take the liberty of from time to time calling your attention, for it is a policy which must be worked out by well-considered stages, not upon theory, but upon lines of practical expediency. It is part of our general problem of conservation. We have a freer hand in working out the problem in Alaska than in the States of the Union, and yet the principle and object are the same, where we touch it. We must use the resources of the country, not lock them up. There need be no conflict or jealousy as between State and Federal authorities, for there can be no essential difference of purpose between them. The resources in question must be used, but not destroyed or wasted; used, but not monopolized upon any narrow idea of individual rights as against the abiding interests of communities. That a policy can be worked out by conference and concession which will release these resources, and yet not jeopard or dissipate them, I, for one, have no doubt; and it can be done on lines of regulation which need be no less acceptable to the people and Government of the Nation at large, whose heritage these resources are. We must bend our counsels to this end. A common purpose ought to make agreement easy.

A FAIR, JUST MEASURE.

We believe the bill herewith presented is a fair, just, and reasonable measure that merits the favorable action of this House. The bill is not only a measure for the development of Alaska, but, as conditions now exist in Alaska, it is a measure for the very preservation and salvation of Alaska.

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT'S GREAT SERVICE.

President Roosevelt did a great service to future generations when he pried the hands of the special interests of greed and avarice, who were planning to take and appropriate this richest country on earth, loose from the throat of Alaska. But to stop there and to continue in the resultant cessation of activities would and must mean the destruction of Alaska.

We must start Alaska on a new life of industrial freedom and development, or, more properly speaking, simply give Alaska a chance to start and give her that assistance to start that any sensible Government has always given any frontier land; just as the United States in the past has given every new frontier part of the United States assistance to start. And then let Alaska free to work out her own destiny, and Alaska will work it out, and answer the call of the future with fine American States, of fine American citizens to safeguard the Pacific coast and make all possible future wars with the Orient impossible. [Applause.]

GIVE ALASKA UNBIASED CONSIDERATION.

I trust this great question will be considered by this Congress—as all great questions ought to be considered—without party or sectional bias or interests, but with an eye single to the honor and glory of our great land we all love so well and to the great needs of this great Alaska, of such splendid and wonderful possibilities, whose trustees we are, and bound, therefore, by every honor and tradition of the past to treat her fairly, as we have been treated in like cases in every part of our national domain by the Government of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, we know so little about the real Alaska, and the little we know has been all so incorrect, that it may be appropriate to describe briefly the Alaska we would develop.

FALSE CONCEPTIONS OF ALASKA.

Possibly no country on earth has suffered so much by the conception held of the whole land as obtained from the parts of it which are usually visited as has Alaska. The traveler sails along the 7,000 miles of coast line and sees nothing but a high range of snow-capped mountains, with but three gateway valley inlets through them into the great interior beyond, or he visits the Klondike, one of the worst climatic regions on earth, and comes away saying and thinking that like these is all Alaska. He does Alaska the same injustice that a traveler would do the United States who saw only the slums of New York and went away saying and thinking so is all the United States; or who saw only the eternal snow-capped Pikes Peak, of Colorado, knew nothing of the beautiful world beyond, and

went away saying and thinking like Pikes Peak is all of the United States.

ALASKA DESCRIBED BY COMPARISON.

Possibly the best way to describe Alaska is by comparison. To continue thinking of Alaska as a glacier field of snow and ice and mountain limitless wastes is to do violence to truth and ordinary intelligence. Alaska has wide areas of valley lands and timber, with as many varieties of climate as can be found in the northern parts of the Middle States. The warm Japan ocean current does for many parts of Alaska exactly what the Gulf Stream does for Great Britain, Ireland, Norway, and Sweden, and many parts of Alaska has a northern temperate climate, where people can live in all the comforts of the northern Temperate Zone.

ALASKA A WONDERLAND OF WONDERFUL POSSIBILITIES.

We must wake up to the truth and to the fact that here is a great tract of land larger than Norway and Sweden, capable of outranking in population and wealth both of these combined, with a much better climate and much better farm lands, infinitely richer mineral deposits, with rivers navigable more miles than the Mississippi or the Ohio, with valleys where future American States can be planted, where ten to twenty millions of people can live just as comfortably and successfully as they can in northern Minnesota, Wisconsin, the Dakotas, or Canada. In fact, Alaska is a great slumber land awaiting the awakening touch of development; ready to give happy, comfortable homes to millions of people; ready to give and guarantee a cheaper coal supply to all the people of the United States for centuries to come; ready to give us the greatest copper, gold, and silver mines the world has ever known; ready to grow a future brave, strong, hardy race of men and women such as inhabit Norway and Sweden, future American citizens to safeguard our Pacific coast, to defend the Government that will nourish it into life and to give back to us and to do for us infinitely more than we can or need to do or give to Alaska. With this view and conception of its future let us think of Alaska, and thus come to know the possible Alaska of the future and appreciate the grandeur and patriotic responsibility of our part in this great measure now before us.

ALASKA BY COMPARISON.

Alaska's importance and value to the United States can best be comprehended by comparison with other lands of like climate and soil. As a history-making epoch event the purchase of Alaska stands second in importance only to that great epoch-making event in history known as the Louisiana Purchase. The Louisiana Purchase consummated by Jefferson doubled the then existing area of the United States, and gave us the great domain of the Union along the Mississippi River from the Gulf of Mexico to Canada and out to the mountain ranges and beyond, and therewith gave us full possession and ownership of the great Mississippi River and its tributaries. The consummation of the Louisiana Purchase by that great future-seeing President and statesman—Thomas Jefferson—was one of the great epoch-making events in the history of the world, and has been regarded by the world as the very flower of consummate statesmanship. It changed the map of the world and the destiny of the Governments of the earth.

Second only in importance to this momentous event of history is the purchase of Alaska from Russia, consummated by Secretary Seward in 1867. During the darkest days of the Civil War, when we feared that England would declare for the South, Russia's mysterious fleet stood out to sea. Later Secretary Seward desired to find a way to pay our moral financial obligation, and he found the excuse to pay the debt by buying from Russia, for \$7,200,000, what was supposed to be worthless Alaska. It has turned out to be like buying a hidden gold mine with a copper 1-cent piece, and our income, measured in dollars and measured in benefits and blessings to all, will prove a like prosperous investment and return on every dollar spent to develop Alaska.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. I regret I can not. I have but a little time. I am nearly through. When I have finished I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FESS. I wanted to ask the gentleman about the ridicule that Mr. Seward suffered when he bought Alaska.

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. I thank the gentleman. I remember very well that history so states that fact.

ALASKA HOLDS THE FUTURE GOLD SUPPLY OF THE WORLD.

We gave \$7,200,000 for Alaska. Last year we took out of Alaska, in gold alone, about \$22,000,000. In the last 14 years we have taken out of Alaska, in gold, silver, copper, coal, fish,

and furs, about \$475,000,000. On account of the lack of shipping and railroad facilities we have hardly begun to scratch the surface of Alaska. No one can estimate the billions of undiscovered wealth awaiting us in this undeveloped, unknown wonderland. In fact, Alaska holds the future gold supply of the world. The Transvaal now furnishes 40 per cent of the world's supply of gold. When we shall have permitted Alaska to develop in a normal, natural way, Alaska will furnish 40 per cent of the world's supply of gold.

COMPARISON AS TO SIZE, CLIMATE, VALLEYS, HOMES, AND OPPORTUNITIES.

Any attempted description of this wonderland must necessarily be both brief and very incomplete. Alaska in size: The shape of Alaska is that of a large rectangular with two long, broad wings. If Alaska were imagined to be placed upon the map of the United States, the first wing would begin at Columbia, S. C., and the body of Alaska would cover the States of Illinois, Missouri, Kansas, Iowa, Nebraska, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and North and South Dakota. The second broad, long wing would reach from Illinois down through the States, through Texas, and out into the Pacific Ocean. The body of Alaska lies alongside of British Canada; it almost touches the Empire of Russia, while its wing reaches down from out of the Western Hemisphere into the Eastern Hemisphere, sweeping north of the Empire of Japan. In square miles Alaska is larger than Norway, Sweden, Finland, England, Scotland, and Ireland combined. It is one-half times larger than the thirteen original States; it is as large as the United States east of the Mississippi River; it is 12 times the size of the State of New York; and in its present undeveloped condition, with but few of its known gold mines imperfectly worked, it produces yearly as much gold as the great gold-producing State of California. It has a climate as varied as that of Texas and Dakota, while it holds in its great area the greatest gold and copper mines and coal fields on earth and waits to house and home millions of American citizens. Its climate is more inviting, its soil more productive, with more acres of farm lands, than that of the great nations of Norway, Sweden, or Finland, which house and home more than 11,000,000 of the earth's hardest, healthiest people. The rivers abound with valuable fish; one-half of the world's supply of salmon comes from Alaska. On account of the Japan Current the valleys have the same climate as the northern parts of the United States or Canada. The summers there are long enough to permit the crops to ripen nicely. The winters for the interior valleys are about like the Dakotas or Minnesota and adjoining Canada.

Alaska's great river, the Yukon, is navigable more than 2,000 miles and is said to discharge one-third more water than the Mississippi. The Tanana River is the Ohio River of Alaska. Alaska has more coal in her hills than Pennsylvania, Ohio, and the Virginias; more copper than Montana and Arizona; more gold than California and Colorado; more tin than Wales; more fish than the balance of the waters of America.

THE POSSIBLE ALASKA—FARMING AND AGRICULTURE.

From Government reports—not statistics furnished by the "interests" or by their paid lobby—let us see what Alaska might become in a very few years as an agricultural country. In Europe and Russian Provinces lying north of latitude 60°, like Alaska as to latitude—Alaska lies between 54° 30' and 71°—the census statistics show us that there are now living in such valleys as they have fit for cultivation, together with the population of the cities, more than 11,000,000 people. There is under cultivation 8,373,000 acres of land, which produce yearly as follows: Wheat, 6,000,000 bushels; rye, 33,000,000 bushels; barley, 26,000,000 bushels; oats, 120,000,000 bushels; potatoes, 110,000,000 bushels; and about 8,000,000 tons of hay. The live stock is as follows: Horses, 2,000,000; cattle, 6,000,000; sheep, 4,000,000; hogs, 2,000,000; goats, 400,000; reindeers, 500,000.

FUTURE ALASKA COMPARED WITH NORWAY AND SWEDEN.

Compared with the above, let us see what Alaska could do. A study of the topography, climate, native plants, and crops shows that the conditions are very similar in the two regions, with the advantages in favor of Alaska. All the above could be produced in Alaska and more. In 1910 Prof. C. C. George, a man of wide practical experience, whom all agree is thoroughly trustworthy and reliable, estimated the tillable and pasture land of Alaska at 64,000,000 acres, as against 8,000,000 acres in the above Provinces, which sustain more than 11,000,000 people. Mr. J. W. Neal, who is in charge of the Government agricultural experiment station farm at Fairbanks, Alaska, states that by actual survey there are 9,700,000 agricultural acres of land in the Valley of the Tanana. This valley alone could, therefore, support more people and raise more agricultural products than the Provinces of Norway and Sweden

and Finland, with all the live stock, crops, and people above mentioned.

AGRICULTURAL POSSIBILITIES OF ALASKA.

Most people are incredulous when told of the fine agricultural possibilities in Alaska, because they imagine that the country lacks sunlight. They forget that every spot on the earth's surface during the course of the 12 months has the same amount of sunshine. The shortest day in Alaska is the 22d day of December, when it has not more than 2 or 3 hours of sunshine, but 6 to 8 workable hours of twilight. On the 22d day of June the Tanana Valley has from 21 to 22 hours of direct, vigorous sunshine and heat; and all the crops mentioned above are grown, matured, and harvested in the 4 months of this most constant sunshine and heat. During these 6 months the Tanana Valley has three-fourths of the year's sunshine—more sunshine in a like period of time than any point on the earth's surface south of it; more sunshine than California, Ohio, Georgia, or Florida has in the same period of time.

Mr. Chairman, I know the facts I have stated and the deductions I have made about the climatic conditions and the agricultural possibilities of Alaska possibly will be doubted by some and disputed by others. I have not given statistics furnished by the agents or interests of the Morgan-Guggenheim Syndicate, but statistics furnished by the departments of the United States Government itself. Of the immense, inexhaustible mineral deposits of coal, gold, copper, tin, lead, zinc, and so forth, there can be no dispute, and I therefore omit reference to these. I want to back up these statistics by the best possible evidence—the testimony of uninterested parties who know Alaska from personal observation. I believe it is reliable information we all want, and that when we find these things to be true that our sense of right, justice, as well as of national security and profit, will lead us to vote for this bill.

In the Washington Post of January 12, 1914, there appeared an interview with the Rev. Dr. P. T. Rowe, bishop of Alaska. The reverend bishop resides at Sitka, Alaska, and I desire to here insert his testimony on Alaska as given in said interview. The reverend bishop spoke as follows:

CHATS OF VISITORS TO THE CAPITAL.

"Alaska and Alaskans are becoming impatient at the continued attitude of the Federal Government in retarding development of the Territory," declares the Rev. Dr. P. T. Rowe, of Sitka, Bishop of Alaska, at the Raleigh. "With a generous policy toward Alaska, even as liberal a policy as the Government has shown toward the Philippines, Alaska will not only go forward with giant strides, but will profit the rest of the country as well as itself.

"Two things are necessary in the course to be pursued by the General Government—a change in the opposition to the extension of transportation facilities, and the releasing of the coal lands. I know these are hackneyed subjects in Washington, but they are live ones in Alaska, and Alaska will not become the great Territory that is possible until the Government has changed its tune. The possibilities in Alaska lie not only in its great mineral deposits—gold and copper—but in its coal and fisheries and its agriculture, and the last named is by no means the least. Prof. Georgeson, the Government agent at Sitka in charge of farm experiments, told me recently that the Tanana Valley alone is capable of producing sufficient crops to take care of 5,000,000 people. And the Tanana is not the only agricultural land in Alaska.

"It is well known that the coal deposits in Alaska are enormous. Our industries are crying for it, but it has been locked up securely in the name of conservation. We have to get our coal now from Australia, and to pay \$25 a ton for it. While I was in Nome, not long ago, two great freighters reached port with several thousand tons each. The Government established a naval base at Seward, but what good is it without coal? Suppose we were to have a war with some Eastern country, where would we get our coal? We could get all we need in Alaska at \$5 a ton.

"Instead of encouraging the extension of transportation facilities, the Government imposed a tax of \$100 a mile annually for the operation of the little narrow-gauge roads that were built to provide a route to the mining regions, and, of course, these roads had to stop work. The Guggenheim-Morgan road, which runs for a distance of 198 miles, has discontinued extension work because it costs too much, I suppose, for fuel.

"All we want is a fair chance in Alaska, as liberal a policy as that shown to the Philippines, and the Territory will discover remarkable development. The gold production has not shown any falling off in the last year, despite the obstacles placed in the way of development by the Government, but the population has remained stationary. The best part of the gold output is that it has disclosed quartz mines, which proves that it is permanent."

SECRETARY LANE'S STATEMENT.

I want to call attention to the statement of Secretary Lane, a thoroughly informed man on Alaskan affairs. In a letter to the Senate committee, among other things, Secretary Lane says:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR.

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

Washington, May 15, 1913.

MY DEAR SENATOR: My opinion is requested as to Senate bills 48 and 133. These measures, in a word, provide for the construction by the National Government of a railway system in the Territory of Alaska.

I favor the adoption of this policy. I believe it to be that under which Alaska will develop most safely and most speedily, and under which the resources of that Territory will most certainly become available to the whole people.

There is but one way to make any country a real part of the world—by the construction of railroads into it. This has been the heart of England's policy in Africa, of Russia's policy in western Asia, and is the prompting hope of the new movement in China. Whoever owns the railways of a country determines very largely the future of that country, the character of its population, the kind of industries they will engage in, and ultimately the nature of the civilization they will enjoy. The policy of governmental ownership of railroads in Alaska seems to me to be the one that will most certainly make for her lasting welfare.

To many of our people Alaska is little more than a land of natural wonders, here and there dotted with mining camps and fishing villages. If Alaska is to be nothing more, it is almost a matter of indifference as to who builds her railroads. I have talked with many who know that country well, and I am convinced that we should think of Alaska as a land not only of mines and fisheries, but of towns, farms, mills, and factories, supporting millions of people of the hardest and most wholesome of the race. If this conception of a possible Alaska is a true one, our legislation should be such as to most surely bring about this possibility, and it seems to me there is less of hazard as to Alaska's future if the Government of the United States owns the railroads which will make its fertile interior valleys accessible from the coast and bring its coal, iron, copper, and other mineral resources within the reach of the world.

This is a new policy for the United States. Very true. This is a new part of the United States. And policies properly change with new conditions. The one determining question in all matters of government should be: What is the wise thing to do? The ancient method of opening a country was to build wagon roads. The modern method is to build railroads. To build these railroads ourselves and control them may be an experiment, but such a plan does not suggest scandals more shameful or political conditions more unhealthy than many we have known in the new portions of our country under private ownership. And in the end we will be free to establish and maintain our own chosen relationship between Alaska and the rest of the United States unhampered by threats of confiscation or the restraining hand of any merely selfish influences. We can only secure the highest and fullest use of Alaska by making her railways wholly subordinate to her industrial and social life and needs—true public utilities.

Respectfully,

FRANKLIN K. LANE.

Hon. KEY PITTMAN,
Chairman Committee on Territories, United States Senate.

These are the words of a statesman, words of patriotic statesmanship. [Applause.]

I desire to further verify the statements I have quoted concerning climatic conditions and agricultural possibilities of Alaska from another witness. I want to briefly quote from the facts condensed and published by Mr. R. H. Stretch, whom, I am informed, is a gentleman of wide experience, trustworthy, conservative, and reliable.

I herewith desire to insert quotations from his compilation of facts on Alaska:

THE VALUE OF ALASKA TO THE UNITED STATES.

Alaska is a land whose area is equal to one-fifth of the United States, or 12 times that of the State of New York. Its production of gold for the year 1912 was \$17,398,945; that of our gold State, California, whose population is 37 times as great, was only \$19,928,500.

Alaska's per capita production of copper, the mining of which is only begun, is now equal to the per capita production of Montana. It has coal fields of greater area than those of Pennsylvania and arable lands greater than the entire State of Oregon. Tin, iron, gypsum, and all are found in commercial quantities, and its marble quarries rival those of Vermont.

The reindeer industry, established in 1902 with 1,280 head, has spread until the 47 herds number 38,000 head and promises to become a valuable source of food supply, while the extent of its fishing grounds exceed those of all the States combined and are excelled nowhere in the world.

Its undeveloped water power exceeds that of the entire Pacific Coast States.

On an investment of \$7,200,000 Alaska has given us in return, since 1867 (and by far the greater portion since 1893, or only 14 years), as shown in the reports of the United States Geological Survey, Director of the Mint, and other official documents:

Gold	\$213, 018, 719
Silver	1, 824, 364
Copper	13, 377, 194
Coal	355, 489
Other minerals	993, 119
Fisheries and furs	240, 830, 168
Total	470, 399, 053

And produced in 1912, as per preliminary estimates:		
Gold, silver, and copper	21, 580, 000
Other minerals	360, 000
Fish and furs	18, 120, 132
Miscellaneous	394, 046
Total	40, 354, 178

The commerce of Alaska for 1912 was:		
Imports	26, 758, 341
Exports	45, 982, 719
Total	72, 741, 060

These results have been obtained at a cost to the Government of about \$13,000,000 over and above the revenues collected in 45 years, showing a profit to the Nation of practically \$450,000,000 on an investment of \$20,000,000. Contrast this with the money spent in the Philippines on an alien nation, and with the results which will not bear comparison. If Alaska has achieved so large a measure of success under adverse conditions of every kind, what may not the results be under more favorable auspices?

SCENIC ALASKA.

Alaska is a country unique in its geographical situation, unique in its climate, and unique in its physical beauties. Point Barrow, its northernmost cape, is warmer than any point in the world as far north of the Equator, and its southern shores, bordering the North Pacific Ocean, are

likewise warmer than any point in the world in similar latitudes during the winter months, as the result of the beneficent influence of the Japan Current.

CLIMATE.

Alaska has its mountain areas with their snow fields and glaciers, with the loftiest summits in the Union, and broad expanses of mossy tundra, but it has also wide areas of valley lands and timber, and nearly as many varieties of climate as can be found in the Eastern and Middle States, controlled largely by the principal mountain ranges and by the Japan Current, which does for Alaska what the Gulf Stream does for Great Britain, Ireland, and Norway. The following remarks are as true to-day as when written some years ago:

It is not possible to judge of the climate of a country by a look at a map to see how far it is north of the Equator. When many people in the Eastern States, who are more or less acquainted with the inhospitable coast of Labrador, find on a map that the bulk of Alaska lies north of Labrador they appear to conclude that the conditions of life must be infinitely worse up there and that the stories of its ice and snow must be true. The town of Fairbanks, in Alaska, with its mines, farms, electric lights, and all the comforts of modern life, is more than 1,500 miles north of New York and 300 miles north of the southern tip of Greenland at Cape Farewell.

CLIMATIC PROVINCES.

(Authority, maps of the U. S. Weather Bureau.)

Special features easily divide the Territory into six natural subdivisions, according to rainfall, temperature, and latitude, the details of which are shown in the accompanying tables.

First. Southeast Alaska, 300 miles long by 125 miles in width, and the coastal region as far west as Cook Inlet is characterized by a heavy rainfall and moderate temperature, the average of the latter for the three winter months being similar to that of Boston and New York. The southeastern portion covers the Alexander Archipelago of some thousand islands, heavily timbered, possessing many available garden spots and a rank floral vegetation. In a narrow belt, lying between the ocean and the Chugach Mountains, this region extends westerly to Cook Inlet, and all its ports for the entire distance of 900 miles are open the year round to the commerce of the world.

Second. The second region covers the southern coast of the Alaska Peninsula, has a moderate rainfall and similar temperature, but it is almost timberless, the forests giving place to grazing lands. Like the first region, its harbors remain open during the winter.

Third. This covers the entire coastal region of Bering Sea from Unalaska to Point Barrow and beyond, and is characterized by wide areas of tundra and treeless plains, but, like many parts of Arctic Russia, is capable of supporting great herds of reindeer. As might be expected in its 2,000 miles of coast line, the rainfall and temperature vary greatly, both diminishing as we go northward. Including the snowfall, the total annual precipitation ranges from 84 inches at Unalaska to only about 7 inches at Point Barrow, where the average snowfall is only about 13 inches, showing that a far-north latitude does not necessarily involve great depths of snow.

Fourth. The Copper River Valley being protected from the heavy rains of the coast by the lofty Chugach Mountains, possesses a comparatively dry climate, with colder winter conditions, and is much less thickly timbered than the first region lying to the south.

Fifth. The Kenai-Susitna region offers a compromise between the first and fourth regions, the rainfall being moderate and the average summer temperature about 54°. Much of this region is heavily timbered and contains large areas of good farming land.

Sixth. This covers the central area, containing the great valleys of the Yukon and Tanana. Protected as it is on the south by the lofty Alaskan Range, with its extensive snow fields, it is well watered, although the average precipitation ranges from only 13 to 20 inches, while the thermometer in summer climbs to 90° or over in the shade, and the average summer temperature is about 58°, or somewhat higher than any other of the five regions, while the average of the low summer temperature is only slightly less than in southeastern Alaska.

The meaning of the foregoing details may be better appreciated from the following items taken from the daily reports of the Weather Bureau, January 6, 1912, covering 43 cities of the United States and southern Canada, and many such days might be duplicated:

Dutch Harbor reported a minimum of 20° above zero; 20 places in the United States reported lower.
Eagle reported 16° below zero; 6 places reported lower.
Nome reported 4° above zero; 12 places reported lower.
Sitka reported 34° above zero; 33 places reported lower.
Tanana reported 4° below zero; 3 places reported lower.
Valdez reported 18° above zero; 18 places reported lower.
Los Angeles and San Francisco were the same as Sitka, while Denver (22° below zero), Huron (18° below), and Winnipeg (30° below) were colder than any place in Alaska.

Sitka had a larger maximum in a list of 45 than 25 other places, among which were Chicago, Kansas City, Montreal, St. Louis, Denver, and St. Paul. Few people realize the ameliorating influence of the Japan current.

The length of the day at all latitudes is the same on March 21. On June 21 the length of the day at various places in Alaska is closely as given below:

	Degrees.	Hours.	Minutes.
Ketchikan and Prince Rupert, latitude about.....	55	17	20
Skagway, Cordova, Valdez and Seward, latitude about.....	60-61	18	50
Fairbanks, Eagle, Ruby City, Noma, latitude about.....	64-65	22	00
Bettles and Coldfoot.....	67	24	00

NOTE.—The places mentioned are approximately in the latitudes given.

I have dwelt upon the climatic conditions because you will be told by some who follow me that the Japan current has no effect on Alaska.

Table of Government experimental stations. Climate compares very favorably with towns in Minnesota, Wisconsin, the Dakotas, Washington, and Canada.

Table of Alaska temperatures.
[From maps of the United States Weather Bureau.]

	Highest record.	Average summer.	Average summer minimum.	Average winter.	Lowest.
SOUTHEAST ARCHIPELAGO.					
Timber and garden products:	° F.	° F.	° F.	° F.	° F.
Metlakatla.....	80	47	32	— 5	
Wrangell.....	93	56	49	30	—14
Juneau.....	88	55	48	27	—10
Pyramid Harbor.....	82	56	45	25	—22
Skagway.....	94	56	48	25	—21
Killsnoo.....	84	—	32	—	—10
Sitka ¹	87	54	46	35	— 4
Valdez, Fort Lisicum.....	86	51	45	20	— 2
SOUTHWEST COAST.					
Grazing and garden products:					
Kodiak ¹	85	54	46	32	—12
Coal Harbor.....	79	50	44	29	—12
Unalaska.....	76	49	43	32	— 7
BERING SEA COAST.					
Reindeer Land:					
Port Moller.....	68	48	43	29	—17
Ugashik.....	86	52	43	24	—10
Nushagak.....	81	53	—	18	—10
St. Michaels.....	77	52	44	—	—55
Nome.....	78	48	43	3	—32
Point Hope.....	60	40	—	—12	—41
Point Barrow.....	65	37	33	—16	—53
COPPER RIVER VALLEY.					
Farming and garden products:					
Copper Center ¹	79	54	38	10	—45
KENAI-SUSITNA REGION.					
Farming, cattle, timber:					
Sunrise.....	79	53	—	20	—29
Kenai ¹	87	52	49	20	—48
Tyonek.....	82	55	47	10	—27
YUKON-TANANA VALLEY.					
General farming and gardening:					
Anvik.....	82	55	—	— 5	—57
Tanana ¹	+90	58	45	—13	—76
Rampart ¹	+90	58	43	—13	—68
Fort Yukon.....	+90	55	47	—23	—68
Circle City.....	+90	58	47	—15	—57
Forty Mile.....	+90	58	45	—15	—66
Fairbanks ¹	+90	58	47	—13	—65

¹ Government experimental stations.

FISHERIES.

VALUE, \$17,391,578 FOR 1912—TOTAL VALUE TO 1912, \$167,420,118.

[Report of governor in 1911.]

Seventeen thousand nine hundred and thirty-two persons were employed in the fishing industries and the capital invested was:

In vessels of all kinds.....	\$5,559,534
Sea fishing apparatus.....	27,782
Shore fishing apparatus.....	724,383
Shore property.....	7,564,023
Cash capital.....	8,795,665
Total.....	22,671,387

Of this sum, \$19,931,215 was invested in the salmon cannery industry, producing 2,823,817 cases of salmon, valued at \$14,593,237. In 1912 the product was 4,060,189 cases, valued at \$15,551,794.

The value of mild-cured salmon was.....	\$419,138
The value of pickled salmon was.....	203,988
The value of fresh salmon was.....	108,922
The value of frozen salmon was.....	18,024
The value of codfish was.....	240,030
The value of halibut was.....	822,370
The value of herring was.....	201,909
The value of whales was.....	104,084

SEALS.

VALUE, \$416,992.40 FOR 1911—TOTAL VALUE TO 1912, \$52,252,125.

The immense herds of seals which annually resort to the Pribilof and St. George Islands in Bering Sea for breeding purposes was estimated at 123,600 on a recent count, being a slight increase over the previous year, and was estimated to consist of mature males, 3,885; young males from pups to 3 years old, 35,781; mature females, 41,480; young females from pups to 2 years old, 42,454; or a total of 39,666 males and 83,934 females.

The former leasing system has been abandoned, and the islands are now under the direct management of the United States Government. The following details are from the annual report of the Department of Commerce and Labor.

	1910	1911
Number of sealskins taken.....	12,920	12,002
Gross receipts for same.....	\$435,083.90	\$415,992.40
Average per skin.....	\$33.68	\$34.74
Net receipts for same ¹	\$403,946.94	\$385,862.28
Estimated receipts to United States under old lease system.....	\$131,007.00	\$122,720.45

¹ From which must be deducted the costs of management.

These herds, numbering 123,600, are all that are left of the 4,000,000 to 5,000,000 which formerly made these islands in Bering Sea their summer rendezvous. Overkilling, raids by poachers of various nationalities, and pelagic, or open-sea, killing having wrought the destruction. Under present conditions and the stoppage of pelagic sealing the herds seem to be increasing in number.

FURS.

VALUE FOR 1912, \$370,519—TOTAL VALUE TO 1912, \$22,216,872.

While the number of fur-bearing animals in Alaska is undoubtedly much smaller than in the days of Russian occupation, the annual output of skins is still an important industry, as may be judged from the following official table covering the year ending December 31, 1912:

	Number.	Value.	Average value.
Bear, black.....	618	\$5,676	\$9.18
Bear, brown.....	23	864	37.65
Bear, cinnamon.....	9	90	10.00
Bear, glacier.....	1	10	10.00

GRAIN CROPS AND GRASSES.

[United States agricultural reports and C. C. Georgeson, in charge of experimental stations.]

That oats, barley, and rye can be grown successfully has been demonstrated at the experimental stations in the Yukon-Tanana Valleys, as well as in that of the Copper River, and also by the farmers around Fairbanks and in the Susitna Valley, who have cut barley for hay, giving 3 tons to the acre. Much time has been devoted to the study and growth of all kinds of grain from northern countries, and the end is not yet. In the rooms of the bureau may be seen handsome sheaves of all these grains and their cleaned products, 60-day and Finnish oats, as well as hull-less and beardless barley.

The rapid growth of grain applies also to the grasses. Timothy springs up wherever imported hay has been fed to stock, and is rapidly becoming acclimated. Among the 40 native grasses redtop attains a growth breast high in 30 to 40 days, and also seems to be the richest in nitrogen among its congeners. It grows everywhere, but is said to be rebel against annual cutting, so that cropping every other year is recommended.

Several kinds of vetches and peas make excellent wild fodder, but do not take kindly to cultivation, so that experiments are being made with varieties of alfalfa from Siberia living under conditions similar to those in Alaska, the same being the case with Siberian wheat.

VEGETABLE CROPS.

[United States agricultural reports and C. C. Georgeson, in charge of experimental stations.]

It is possible to grow magnificent vegetables in all parts of Alaska, except on the tundras and mountains. To Alaskans they are no novelty, but to strangers unacquainted with the country they are a constant surprise. They include all the products of the Temperate Zone in America, and the bureau has in its exhibit potatoes, turnips, beets, rutabagas, sugar beets, carrots, parsnips, kohlrabi, celery, rhubarb, radishes, onions, cabbage, cucumbers, peas, and even tomatoes, and in one or two very favored spots even melons have ripened. The samples, both for size and quality, will compare with the markets of New York, although grown more than 1,500 miles north of that city. Every family can have its garden, which will not only furnish the necessities of life, but will beautify the home with a wealth of flowers. These facts have become so well known that notice of them has practically disappeared from the reports of the agricultural stations; but as the potato is so important an item in the daily menu, every effort is being put forth to secure those varieties best adapted to the climatic conditions of rainfall and sunshine. The following facts are from the latest reports of the station located at Fairbanks, in the Tanana Valley, only about a hundred miles south of the Arctic Circle.

Twenty-seven varieties of potatoes were cultivated during the season of 1911, of which three were planted on June 9, nine on June 9, and the remainder on June 10. They matured between September 11 and 22, with a yield at a rate varying from 7,260 to 18,876 pounds per acre on the experimental plots. In the open field three varieties produced 5 tons per acre after sorting and grading on second-year unfertilized ground. The character of the potato depends much on the kind of soil and method of cultivation. The best results are said to be secured by allowing the potato to sprout and setting them out on the surface of the ground with plenty of room between the rows, then covering with about an inch of dirt, to be subsequently well ridged up. On a gentle southern exposure of silty soil, such as is favored by the birch, potatoes grow to a large size and possess a fine mealy texture.

Cabbages from department seed made heads weighing from 8 to 12 pounds. Cauliflower was as fine as grown in any country. One gardener claims to have sold 16 tons of cabbage from half an acre in 1910.

There are several notices of the growth of sugar beets (but no information as to their sugar contents), and these, with other root crops such as rutabagas and carrots, can be grown in quantity for winter feed to stock.

Summing up the question, C. C. Georgeson, the best of all authorities, says: "All these vegetables can be grown and are grown as far up as the Arctic Circle and beyond. This is not saying that they can be grown with equal success in all places and in all conditions, for on this point the elevation, rainfall, soil, and local conditions as to climate are important factors. Nor do I say that there is not now and then a cold summer, in which only the hardiest of these things make satisfactory growth. But under normal conditions and with good culture all of these vegetables are grown successfully even beyond the Arctic Circle."

WILD FRUITS.

Alaska is a land of berries, not only in the profusion of fruit but in the great variety of species.

Currants, both red and black, abound in southeast Alaska, and in lesser degree elsewhere, and both are remarkable for the size of the fruit and the length of the bunches, rivaling, if not excelling, the best of the cultivated forms.

Strawberries of good size and excellent flavor abound in and on the coast belt from Yakutat to the Copper River Delta, and have been crossed with cultivated varieties, producing plants of more luxuriant growth than either of the parent forms both as to foliage and fruit.

Some hundred varieties of these hybrids are under cultivation at the Government experimental stations.

Raspberries are characteristic of the interior regions, especially of the Yukon and Tanana Valleys.

Blueberries are universally distributed and fruit in profusion, the berries attaining a diameter of half an inch. So abundant are they that two ladies near Nome put up 119 gallons in one season.

Huckleberries abound through the Pacific coast and interior regions, and form attractive pasturage for bears, both black and grizzlies.

Cranberries, both high and low bush, are characteristic of the interior plateau and Seward Peninsula.

Salmon berries grow luxuriantly in all the coast regions bordering on the Pacific Ocean.

If further proof of the climatic conditions and the agricultural possibilities or the wisdom of Alaskan development were needed, the following report should be to all fair-minded people conclusive:

In the fall of 1912, by act of Congress, the Alaska Railway Commission was appointed. The personnel of this commission was as follows: Jay J. Morrow, major, Corps of Engineers, United States Army; Alfred H. Brooks, United States Geological Survey; Leonard M. Cox, civil engineer, United States Navy; Colin M. Ingersoll, consulting engineer.

Briefly, the duties of this commission were defined by the act of Congress to examine railroad routes from the seaboard to the coal fields and to the interior and navigable waterways, and to recommend in respect to most available routes for railroads in Alaska, which will best develop the country and the resources thereof for the use of the people of the United States.

In their conclusions they state that "the commission is unanimously of opinion that this development should be undertaken at once and prosecuted with vigor; that it can not be accomplished without providing the railroads herein recommended under some system which will insure low transportation charges and the consequent rapid settlement of this new land and the utilization of its great resources." They state further that "the data presented shows that the United States possesses in Alaska a frontier territory of great size and of wonderful industrial possibilities. The commission believes that its climate is favorable to permanent settlement and to agriculture; that its mineral resources are vast and as yet but little exploited; that its population is sparse, but only by reason of its inadequate transportation facilities; and that its people are of the same type of hardy pioneers that have carried the United States frontier to its present limits."

The commission's report to Congress is embraced in House Document No. 1346, Sixty-second Congress, third session.

Does any sincere, candid man think that this commission would have so reported if Alaska were the bleak, useless country its enemies would have you believe it is?

Mr. Chairman, the opposition to Alaskan development has been very severe, and painted a very dark picture of Alaska. But has not this been the same with every new part of the United States? Read the speeches of Congressmen and Senators when the development west of the Mississippi River was contemplated. Daniel Webster thought it could never be inhabited. Other Senators said nothing can grow there—a vast worthless land. And so we have the critic and pessimist to-day. What charlatans this Government board to state the above if Alaska is what the opponents of Alaskan development say it is.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman permit an interruption right there for a very brief question?

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. If it will not be taken out of my time, I want to finish within the limit of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that it will be taken out of the gentleman's time.

Mr. HARDY. Does it not appear to the gentleman that the whole question before the House is whether we shall give the resources of Alaska away to private parties or build these railroads and own them ourselves?

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. That is the whole thing in a nutshell. I have prepared some tables from Donaldson's great work on the public domain, and I wanted to read them to show what the Government has done for the newer parts of the United States, but the table is so long that I omit it.

DEVELOPMENT OF ALASKA—WHY AND HOW.

The question very naturally arises, first, why should the United States spend the people's money to develop Alaska; second, if we consider development, how shall we develop—by Government control, by Government assistance, by gift, or subsidy? In answer to the question why the Government should assist in the development of Alaska, it can be argued that in fairness we owe this to ourselves and to Alaska as well; that every consideration of duty, obligation, and wisdom demands it, as well as every consideration of national security and national gain. If the development of Alaska is properly safeguarded and the people's rights protected, then the citizens of the United States as well as the Government can hardly fail to realize \$100 for every \$1 expended on Alaska.

SAFEGUARD THE FUEL SUPPLY OF THE FUTURE.

By taxation all the people of the United States helped purchase and pay for Alaska; Alaska therefore belongs to all the people of the United States. The fuel supply of the future is so essential to future generations that these deposits should always be safeguarded to the people of Alaska and the people of the United States, and never be surrendered to corporate or

private interests to promote any scheme of development of Alaska. Why, even those representing the interests admitted before the committee that we could get 10,000 miles of railroad built in Alaska if we would give Alaska away to have it done. Do you suppose the syndicate interest would do this in a useless and worthless land?

Again, it can be argued that the Government has always assisted to develop its frontier or its Territories; that this has been the policy of the Government in the past.

Donaldson, in his great work on Public Domain, a book of over a thousand pages, sets forth in detail what the United States has done to assist the development of different parts of the United States. I had thought to present a table dealing with this subject, but I find the United States has done so much for so many sections to assist in their development that the entire book is full of tables setting forth the work and the amounts expended.

GOVERNMENTAL HELP TO FRONTIER SECTIONS.

The Government began by assisting in the building of the first railroad in the United States—the old Baltimore & Ohio—from tidewater at Baltimore through the forests to the Ohio River; and this road, with assistance of the old national pikes, told the story of the future greatness of Ohio, Kentucky, Indiana, Illinois, and the other great interior States. Later the Government assisted the great Territories of the West in building the Pacific Railroad, which told the story of the great West.

LET THE GOVERNMENT SPEND MONEY TO ASSIST THE PEOPLE RATHER THAN ON BATTLESHIPS.

In fact, the Government can always and everywhere afford to expend the people's money where that expenditure gives protection to life and property, security to homes and home builders, assistance in opening up new fields to labor that helps to make the necessities of life more plentiful and cheaper. In fact, the millions that the Government yearly puts into the building of battleships that float the seas in idleness, at great constant expense, to challenge quarrels, can better be spent in opening up such a land as Alaska, providing cheap homes for pioneers, and in assisting its citizens in the flood-swept districts of the country to make safe their homes and the lives of their little ones by assisting in building fortifications to prevent such disasters as befell the cities of Ohio and Indiana and other sections of the United States in the recent great flood which devastated some of the best portions of our fair land.

RAILROAD DEVELOPMENT IN ALASKA.

The prime essential in the development of Alaska centers, of course, in railroad building. There has been already constructed in Alaska about 500 miles of railroad. This is all owned by private interests and does not penetrate the interior, and renders, therefore, little aid to the great interior development desired by all.

The consensus of opinion is that some railroad should be built from the south sea of Alaska up through the interior, so that by branch lines it would open the great coal fields and gold fields of the country and the great river valleys for home builders, ending at some great river navigable to the western ocean. Such a railroad, if but one is built, can be constructed with about 400 miles of trackage, with a cost of about \$20,000,000, that will give over 7,000 miles of traffic by railroad and water, not to speak of the branch lines of the railroad, thus opening up to civilization the great valleys that are able to house and home millions of settlers, support great cities, and give outlet to the greatest coal fields of the world. Such a road, accomplishing such great results, would cost no more than two battleships, or less than one-fortieth of that spent on the Panama Canal, or less than we yearly spend on the Philippines.

THE GREAT ADVANTAGE AND VALUE OF SUCH RAILROAD DEVELOPMENT.

The desirability and immense value of such development and its supreme importance to the United States is most apparent to all. Consider a few of the great results that would come therefrom. The southern shores of Alaska furnish the best sea harbors for our vessels and battleships on the western coast, better than at Seattle or Hawaii. These immense, unused harbors on the southern coast of Alaska are on the shortest line by over 1,500 miles from San Francisco and Seattle to the Philippines, Japan, or the Orient. These unused harbors would provide the best and safest defenses for our Navy. It costs this Government \$3,000,000 a year to ship the coal from the United States used by our vessels on the Pacific, while within 25 miles of these harbors we have coal in inexhaustible supplies—six years' shipping coal bill will build the Alaska railroad—equal to our best grade of Pennsylvania or West Virginia coal, ready to be used free of cost.

FUTURE FUEL SUPPLY OF THE UNITED STATES.

Again, consider the fuel supply of the United States. There are used in the United States yearly 400,000,000 tons of coal. There are used 85,000,000 tons per year more coal west of the Mississippi River than is mined west of the Mississippi River. It is plain, therefore, to all that the price of coal is fixed by the few Atlantic States for all the people of the United States. Coal is selling on the western coast for from \$8 and \$10 to \$12 per ton. Government experts, who have made an examination of the situation, report that at our present consumption of coal there is enough coal in Alaska, now explored, of the finest quality, to say nothing of the unknown coal fields of Alaska, to supply our needs for 500 years. In Alaska there is one coal field in area as large as the coal area of the State of Pennsylvania. Now, should we make it possible for Alaska coal to come out to the ocean by this railroad, and then into the United States, a few Atlantic States could not fix the price of coal for all the people of the United States, and should it save but \$1 per ton on the price of coal, it would save in our coal bill to the people of the United States \$400,000,000 yearly, or twenty times the cost to build the railroad each year, to say nothing of the value of the railroad in opening up the great valleys to home settlers from the United States and the coal supply for our fleet on the Pacific coast.

The consensus of opinion appears to be that the best way to insure the building of the railroad without scandal, collusion, quarrels, and delay is to put the matter entirely in the hands of the President, authorizing him to locate the road and construct the same.

ALASKAN DEVELOPMENT INEVITABLE.

Alaskan development is bound to come in some form or other. It is inevitable. If we do not provide for it, some more just and sensible Congress will. We should not let our incorrect knowledge and information of Alaska work to the detriment of this great undertaking. Because Alaska is not now settled and developed like Norway and Sweden argues nothing. Oklahoma was the same for centuries. The geographies of our grandfathers had Illinois and Missouri marked "The Great American Desert," and little development occurred therein until the Government gave assistance. Kansas, Nebraska, Colorado, and the great Oregon country remained undeveloped until the Government assisted in the construction of the Pacific Railroad. The poet Bryant, in his "Thanatopsis," compared Oregon to the Balkan Desert of Africa in these words:

Take the wings
Of morning, pierce the Barcan wilderness,
Or lose thyself in the continuous wilderness,
Where rolls the Oregon, and hears no sound
Save his own dashings—

And so forth.

OBJECTIONS AND THE OBJECTORS.

Mr. Chairman, the objectors to Alaskan development may all be classified under two general heads or classes—the constitutional argument need hardly be referred to: First, Government ownership of railroads. Those who say they fear that Alaskan development would commit the Government to Government ownership of railroads. The Government-ownership problem is not in this question at all. Because the United States Government in the past assisted many, many times in many places did not commit the Government to the policy of Government ownership of railroads, and neither will this great commendable statesmanship and humanitarian-like piece of work commit the Government in any way to the policy of Government ownership of railroads.

THE FELLOW WHO JUST OBJECTS.

Second. Those who object to the Government doing anything anywhere, except in their own locality, but do not object to it there. In fact, when I hear some of these Representatives of sections of our country where the United States Government has done so much, talk, I marvel that they have it in their hearts to do so poorly by Alaska. They just object. The great Jefferson found them crying unconstitutional and objecting to the expense of the Lewis and Clark expedition that made known to the world another world west of the Mississippi River, but the great Jefferson, with faith in the right and the future, did just what his great successor, President Wilson, is now recommending to be done.

THE LOGICAL POSITION OF THE OBJECTORS.

What is the logical position of the objectors who would prevent Alaskan development? For the defeat of railroad building either prevents Alaskan development or hands Alaska over to the syndicate to exploit—a prey to the interests—because without railroads by the Government none but the syndicate can get in or out of Alaska. Everyone must be aware of this. Without meaning to impugn the motives of anyone, yet it appears to me their position, logically, is this:

Those who would defeat railroad building in Alaska are willing and would continue the useless expense of \$3,000,000 a year shipping coal to our Pacific Fleet. They would continue to expend millions on naval harbors at Hawaii, far out from our coast in the ocean, where coal must be hauled at great expense, and leave unused the fine natural harbor nature has

made for us on the south Alaska coast with inexhaustible coal within 25 miles.

They would continue to leave our Pacific Fleet in peril; continue to buy coal from Japan and Australia; ship it from West Virginia and Pennsylvania, playing thus into the hands of the coal monopoly and Shipping Trust. They would leave the coal monopoly go on with the demand resting on West Virginia and Pennsylvania, largely, and let the high prices of coal continue for all time. They would be willing to leave our Pacific coast open to all the dangers of attack which our foolish policy of nondevelopment of Alaska invites.

They would keep out of Alaska all settlers, all home builders, all but the "interests." They would say to the people of Alaska, as brave a race of pioneers as ever braved pioneer dangers in any land or any age, "Bone of our bone, blood of our blood, leave the land where sleep your dead, or stay and starve."

They would say to the United States Government, "Pull down the flag of progress in Alaska, scuttle the ship of enterprise, beat the retreat on a magnificent opportunity, and abandon a magnificent responsibility."

Gentlemen, it will not be done; Alaskan development is bound to come. If we can not see the opportunity and do it, then some wiser Congress will; for God in His wisdom, I believe, would not permit Alaska to be forever blighted by such senile senility and such supine stupidity as such action as nondevelopment would imply and impose. [Applause.]

We should develop Alaska, because it opens up future homes for future American citizens, and we are legislating well when we open up cheaper homes for the poor. We can thus draw from our congested places in our great cities and solve the labor problems there. The farmers of the United States can find added markets in Alaska and Alaska can furnish the farmers and the business enterprises of the United States with the great fuel supply of the future and prevent coal monopoly and coal famines of the future.

We should develop Alaska because it gives the needed harbors and the greatest security to our ships at sea necessary to guard the Pacific coast. The Pacific coast defense is of the utmost importance, and coal is the one great essential. The United States is now purchasing coal in Japan and Australia and we are shipping coal from the coal fields of West Virginia and Pennsylvania to our Pacific fleet. Our naval vessels use 250,000 tons per year on the Pacific coast. In case of war we do not have and could not get enough coal to our fleet on the Pacific coast to last 60 days, for coal is a contraband of war, and during time of war could not be sold to us by any other country. Still more serious is the fact that our coal is carried almost entirely in foreign built and owned vessels, which could not be done in time of war.

We should develop Alaska, because we are pledged to that policy by the Baltimore platform of 1912, which promises immediate development of the resources of Alaska. In fact, platforms of all parties have promised this for the last 25 years. Besides, this has been the policy of the Government in regard to all the new parts of our country in the past. The Government spent \$8,000,000 in the building of the old dirt roads or pikes over the Alleghenys through Pennsylvania; it assisted Kentucky, Ohio, and other interior States by building the old Baltimore & Ohio from Baltimore to the Ohio River; it assisted the Territories of the West by giving the immense sum of 155,504,994 acres of land up to the year 1868 as a bonus to railroads through the West. In the Government's policy of the past referred to its help was purely a gift and it owned no part of the road in the end, but in now assisting in the development of Alaska the Government can get all its money back and not be out one cent; still own its own railroad, and can then operate it, lease it, or sell it as it may desire, and leave open this great country to future civilization for millions of American settlers and good, cheap homes for the future poor.

We should develop Alaska, because it speaks and indicates the growing life of the Nation. Any nation growing is safe. Any nation standing still is in danger. For us to take the latter course, when the former is open to us with every inducement of profit and sentiment and patriotism, would be most foolish and unwise.

We should develop Alaska, because the trifle spent, in comparison to the benefits to be derived both to us and to Alaska, would never be felt or noticed. For should the Government announce that this railroad would be built cities would spring up as by magic and the town sites of such cities alone would reimburse the Government for the money spent in constructing the railroad, while the cheapening in the Nation's coal bill for the people of the United States would repay all the money spent in building the railroad ten times over a year.

We should develop Alaska, because thereby we avoid the probability of any naval defeat in the Pacific Ocean, and therefore remove the temptation to attack us at any time, and thus avoid all the calamities of war.

We should develop Alaska, because we would thus perform a service and put in motion a movement for which future generations would rise up and call us blessed. We would make a bigger, better, stronger United States of America, where labor would be lighter, life sweeter, and the earth a better place to live upon; and upon our work, if consummated in justice, honor, and honesty, would rest the gratitude of future races to be and the benign benedictions of the skies. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. I should like to have five minutes more, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, it is not a matter of unanimous consent.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman for five minutes.

[Mr. KREIDER addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, in my opinion the Members of this House, and the country at large as well, should be congratulated upon one circumstance attending the discussion of this bill—a circumstance, I regret to say, that has not attended the deliberations of this House in connection with other important and fundamental legislation for some time past. I refer to the fact that the majority, whose proposition this bill is, has seen fit to permit it to take its chances in the arena of free and open debate, untrammelled by preliminary caucus obligation. I mean no invidious insinuation when I venture to express the hope that this course, so happily begun, may be continued to the end, and that when Members come to record their convictions upon the desirability of this legislation those convictions may be both freely and fearlessly expressed.

At the outset I desire to say that I am in favor of the construction of railroads in Alaska, and I want to say, further, that I am in favor of the Government of the United States constructing and owning such railroads, at least until such time as conditions seem to warrant the adoption of a different policy. This not because I am a convert to the policy of Government ownership of railroads in general, because I am opposed to that policy, but because I believe that conditions in Alaska are so peculiar that private capital can not be induced to enter the field of railroad building there in a way best calculated to open up that country unless we offer or permit as compensation an unwarranted sacrifice of Alaska's resources. When we built the major portion of our great railroads in this country we submitted at the time to what appeared to be the necessities of the situation, and we have since been reaping the results of the policy adopted; and, if I mistake not, we are likely to continue the harvest for some time to come. I, for one, do not want to repeat the experiment. I neither want to sacrifice the great natural resources of Alaska to the desires of a few who would exploit them to monopolistic ends, nor encourage the promotion of railroad construction there under a policy that will result in pernicious overcapitalization.

The chairman of the committee reporting this bill, at the beginning of his very interesting speech delivered in this House on the 17th ultimo, remarked that "in the consideration of this measure the question arises, Is this country—Alaska—worth developing?" This question I shall not take the time of the committee to discuss. I shall assume that Alaska is worth developing, for I believe that to be a question upon which there is practically no diversity of opinion in this House, and little throughout the country. I believe that Alaska, with its great deposits of coal, copper, gold, silver, and other mineral, its fisheries and fur product, together with the fact that its agricultural qualities are sufficient to sustain any population that is likely to become permanently resident there, constitutes a great augmentation to our national wealth.

A consideration of this bill, however, does present the question how best to initiate the development of Alaska; whether we shall pursue a policy calculated to conserve and develop Alaska's resources for the benefit of the people of the United States, offering equal opportunity to all within reasonable limits, or whether we shall pursue a policy which, merely because it lessens tasks and shifts responsibilities of government, will enable a few to monopolize the great harvest that is now ripening there, leaving the worthy many who may come after to glean the discarded remnants.

The gentleman from Alaska, the author of this bill, in his great speech delivered a week ago to-day said:

The bill under discussion is in the interests of the people and puts the issue of Government or Guggenheim control in Alaska squarely to the vote of this House. Which shall it be, Government or Guggenheim?

This is but another way of stating the alternate policies that I have suggested. I am in full sympathy with the gentleman from Alaska so far as concerns the ultimate object of his effort. I only wish I were so sure as he that the bill under discussion presents the question as he seems to see it. As to whether this bill presents the question of Government or Guggenheim, I am in serious doubt. I greatly fear that it presents the question of Government and Guggenheim, and that if enacted in its present form it will lead to an entangling alliance that we will in the future seriously regret, and it is this danger lurking, as it seems to me, in the bill to which I shall direct my attention.

The general knowledge of Alaska that has been acquired during the last 15 years or more, supplemented by more recent special investigation, seems to have crystallized a general opinion that an essential preparation for the development of Alaska is transportation facilities from the seaboard to the interior. That in order to make available and accessible the mineral and agricultural products and possibilities of that country, railroads should be built connecting the open harbors on the southern coast with the inland navigable waters, at the same time penetrating the most wealthy mineral regions and the great valleys best adapted to agriculture.

Alaska's greatest navigable river is the Yukon, which, rising in British America and flowing westward, cuts Alaska almost midway, emptying into Norton Sound. The valley of the Yukon, together with the valley of the Tanana, its principal tributary on the south, contains a large portion of Alaska's most valuable agricultural land. The second great river is the Kuskokwim, rising in central Alaska and flowing southwesterly into Kuskokwim Bay. The valley of this river also contains a large amount of agriculturally adapted land. These river valley regions, except during the short period of navigation, must be reached overland from the ocean harbors on the southern coast. Along that coast trend high and almost continuous ranges of mountains. The gentleman from Alaska has told us, as well as other gentlemen, both on the floor and at the hearings, that there are three great gateways through these mountain ranges through which access can be gained into Alaska's interior—the White Pass gateway, the Copper River gateway, and the Seward gateway. These gateways, with the wonderful harbors lying at their portals, witness what seems to have been a wise providence of nature. Through these gateways and into these harbors the great current of Alaska's future commerce must flow. This fact was shrewdly foreseen by those enterprising spirits who first undertook Alaska's exploitation, and they quickly laid claim to and posted sentinels at these great doorways.

The White Pass gateway opens through at the lower end of the Panhandle and leads into Canadian territory and thence into the valley of the Yukon. This gateway is now occupied by the White Pass and Yukon railways, the lines, terminals, and harbors of which are owned and controlled by the Morgan and Guggenheim interests. This gateway is thought to be impracticable for the purposes of this bill. The Copper River gateway, beginning with the harbor in Orca Bay and extending up the Copper River Gorge and Valley, is also occupied and controlled by the Morgans and Guggenheims. The Seward gateway, including the great harbor in Resurrection Bay, through the Alaska Syndicate, is also practically owned and controlled by the Morgans and Guggenheims. I quote from the testimony of the Delegate from Alaska given at the hearings before the committee reporting this bill. On page 406, Mr. WICKERSHAM says:

You now see how the White Pass gateway into Alaska is controlled—is in partnership with the Alaska Syndicate—and I want to go with you now to the Copper River & Northwestern Railroad and talk to you about that, because that occupies the next great gateway into Alaska. It is a main gateway up the Copper River on a water grade, and is the principal gateway into Alaska, and yet it is in the charge, control, and ownership of the Morgan-Guggenheim combination. They built the Copper River & Northwestern Railroad through that pass at an expense of about \$20,000,000. It is a fine standard-gauge railroad. It has beautiful fine iron bridges. It is well built, well ballasted, and runs from the town of Cordova up the Copper River to Chitina, and thence to the right along the Chitina River to their great copper mines at Kennicott or Bonanza.

I again quote from the speech of the gentleman from Alaska to which I referred. His language will be found on page 1662 of the RECORD of January 14:

I have gone into this matter thus carefully to show you that the Alaska Syndicate not only owns the Copper River & Northwestern Railroad gateway into the interior of Alaska, and that it is a partner with the owners of the White Pass and Yukon gateway, but that it is

substantially the owner of the Alaska Northern Railway and in control of that gateway. In short, we find the Alaska Syndicate in control of three of the principal gateways to the interior of Alaska.

A little further on, at the bottom of the same page, the gentleman says:

There is a side gateway from Valdez which cuts into the Copper gateway, and there is said to be a side gateway that opens into the Seward route. It would not be much of a trick to condemn the Seward road and take it over by paying its value. It is a bankrupt concern, closed down, and has not been in operation for three or four years.

If I were inclined to doubt the testimony of the gentleman from Alaska and others or the consensus of opinion entertained both at this and the other end of the Capitol, I should still find evidence sufficient for me in the fact that the Guggenheims and gentlemen of the Alaska Syndicate were on the ground with all the skill and facilities that money could buy at a time when the opportunity to pick and choose was unlimited, and that they exercised and embraced their opportunities to the fullest extent of their desires. If they refrained from laying hold of anything, either of existing, potential, or strategic value, I have only to say that I am seriously mistaken in my estimate of these gentlemen; they are not the men I took them for.

Mr. Chairman, this is a remarkable situation that we find ourselves in. A great mountain-locked empire to be developed, and the three principal gateways into that empire in the occupancy, ownership, and control of the Alaska Syndicate, and we are to congratulate ourselves upon the fact that there yet remains an obscure side gateway through which the Government of the United States may steal for the purpose of gaining access to its great domain. Under existing conditions the front entrance into the people's great warehouse of Alaska seems to be reserved for the Alaska Syndicate and the Guggenheims, and it is proposed that the majesty of the people of the United States as represented by the National Government must resort to the deviously approached side entrance, usually "reserved for servants and tradesmen."

Now, were it not for this remarkable situation, I think there can be no doubt what Congress would do at this time. A bill would be passed authorizing the construction of one or two lines of railway connecting the open ports upon the southern coast of Alaska with the inland navigable waters. One of those lines would be projected from Orca Bay, at Cordova, up the Copper River to Fairbanks and, ultimately, to the Yukon. The other line would be projected from Resurrection Bay, at Seward, around Cooks Inlet, across the Susitna Valley, and westward to the Kuskokwim River. The former line, with the aid of a short branch, would tap the Bering River coal fields, and the latter line would tap the Matanuska coal fields. These lines, respectively, would penetrate the broad, fertile valleys of the Tanana, the Yukon, and the Kuskokwim. These lines of railroad, together with adequate seaboard terminals and the great ocean harbors from which they are projected, would be owned and controlled by the Government of the United States. The two great gateways to the interior of Alaska would be in control of the Government of the United States, and the portals of these great highways would be kept in trust for the people of the United States, offering equal opportunity to all who might enter there.

In the light of our present knowledge of Alaska, is it not worth while to stop and consider whether these great commanding advantages are irretrievably lost? Shall we yield without question the permanency of dominion taken under fraud and in bad faith, or shall we not ask, in the language of the gentleman from Alaska, "Who are these Colossi who stand astride not one but three of the gateways of the Territory of Alaska?" Shall we not examine into the character of their title, legal and equitable? Shall we not even satisfy ourselves that their present hold is in fact secure upon these great strategic positions? It seems to me that a great responsibility rests upon the House and the Senate in this respect—a responsibility which we must acknowledge and discharge to the uttermost or leave ourselves open to imputation of unfaithfulness to the greatest duty of the occasion.

This brings us to the question of the policy to be pursued by the Government in initiating the construction of railroads in Alaska. Shall we begin at the bottom and lay a secure foundation, clearing away if needs be the obstructing rubbish, or shall we begin with the superstructure, building upon this rubbish and trusting to its sufficiency, durability, and adaptability to answer our ultimate purposes? In my opinion we should begin at the bottom. We should examine into the rights of the occupants of these gateways and of their relation to the people and to the Government of the United States. We should ascertain what obligations they and their predecessors assumed when they laid hold of the public domain and whether they have discharged those obligations, and whether they can

be trusted in the future to continue to discharge their obligations and responsibilities. And then, if we shall find that they have entered in bad faith, that they have failed to discharge their obligations, that they are unable or indisposed to discharge them in the future, I believe there is power in the Government of the United States to say to these "Colossi" who now stand "astride" these gateways to stand aside and yield possession and control to the original proprietor. If, upon investigation, we shall find that these occupants have made improvements for which we are legally or morally obligated to pay, I believe the value should be fixed upon the basis of present conditions. If we are to acquire the present lines of railroad and terminals, we should acquire them upon the basis of incomplete, failed, abandoned concerns; that we should not wait until by the enactment or in pursuance of the proposed legislation we have brought about conditions which will infuse into these properties many millions of dollars of unearned increment. That we should acquire the lines occupying these two principal gateways, together with their terminal sites and harbor bases, I am convinced. If we are justified in spending thirty-five or forty millions—aye, sixty or seventy millions—before we are through in building a fragmentary portion of a system without any gateways, terminals, or harbors, leaving all of these in the possession and control of the Alaska Syndicate, we are surely justified in spending eight or ten millions more to get possession and control of all of these essential portions of the equipment.

I shall ask the attention of the committee while we examine the record in connection with the location and construction of the two railroads projected from Seward and Cordova. During the second session of the Sixtieth Congress a letter from the Secretary of the Interior transmitting certain data relating to railroads in Alaska was made House Document No. 1201. This document gives valuable information touching the origin of all the Alaska railroads. I first call your attention to the Alaska Northern. This road is the successor of the Alaska Central Railway, which was projected from Resurrection Bay. On page 2 of the document referred to we get the information that the Alaska Central Railway was incorporated under the laws of Washington and that the purpose of its organization was to build a railroad over a certain route. The route described in the articles of incorporation is from Resurrection Bay to the Yukon River; that this company filed 15 maps of preliminary location—one from Resurrection Bay to a point on the Yukon, another from Resurrection Bay to the Tanana, and to various other points. Now, mark you, the proposition under which the Alaska Central laid hold of the public domain, including terminal site and the harbor in Resurrection Bay, was that it would build a railroad from this seaboard terminal into the interior of Alaska to some point on the Yukon or Tanana River; that it would open up a great public highway for the development of Alaska. But we find that, after a more or less checkered and stormy career, and after taking possession of the harbor and terminal site and constructing about 72 miles of railway, it is bankrupt, construction abandoned, and in the hands of the Alaska Syndicate, with no pretense now being made of continuing the line to the Yukon or the Tanana. The opposing parties to the compact with the Government, after seizing this harbor, this strategic terminal site and the gateway to the interior, have utterly failed to deliver their part of the consideration. They do not purpose to deliver it. Under these circumstances shall they hold us to the bargain? I now call your attention to the Copper River & Northwestern Railway, which is the successor of the Copper River Railway.

The Copper River Railway Co. was incorporated under the laws of Washington for the purpose of building a railway over a certain route. The route described in its articles of incorporation is from a point near the mouth of the Copper River to a point on the Tanana River near Fairbanks, and branch lines. The Copper River & Northwestern Railway was later incorporated under the laws of Nevada, and it took over the properties of the Copper River Railway. Its articles of incorporation described a route from a point near tidewater in western Alaska tributary to the Copper River Valley in a general northwesterly direction to a point in the vicinity of the Copper River copper fields and extensions in the general direction of Eagle City or Fairbanks, with branch lines. In pursuance of this proposition the Copper River & Northwestern Railway has acquired practical control of the harbor at Cordova, with the choicest terminal grounds there, and a right of way extending to the Copper River and up the gorge or valley of that river to Chitina, with a branch thence to the copper fields. This company took possession of this property with all its strategic advantages under the pretense of building to the Tanana River. Their avowed purpose was to build a great

public highway for the purpose of developing Alaska. It soon became apparent, however, that their purpose was to develop Alaska for themselves only, and when their purpose in this respect was thwarted they abandoned the enterprise, at least in all respects not directly pertaining to their private interests. The Guggenheims have completed the line to the copper fields owned by themselves. They do not now purpose to extend the line to the Tanana or to any other point. They have the harbor at Cordova, the terminal grounds, the gateway through the mountain range. They have placed their property there, but in such a way and to such an extent as serves their own interests only.

In other words, they have repudiated their obligations to the Government and to the people of the United States; they have built no public highway for the development of Alaska, and the fragment of railroad which they now have, when considered for that purpose, is almost valueless. We are now confronted with the question whether these people shall hold the Government and the people of the United States to the bargain. Shall they be permitted to hold this, the principal gateway into Alaska, as a private equipment to their copper mines? They have failed to deliver their part of the consideration or to live up to their side of the compact; why should not the Government lay hold of this gateway, designed by nature to serve as the route of a great public highway, for the benefit of the people of the United States and devote it to that purpose?

If the Government is ever to gain control of the harbors and gateways at Cordova and Seward, it should do it now. If we are to condemn and take these properties we should make that course certain by the provisions of this bill, and not merely suggest it as a contingency. We should adopt our course while the present status of those properties exists. We should determine the matter while they may be acquired at their present actual value as railroads and railroad facilities, and not after we, by legislation and Executive action, have given them a status which will increase their value as railroads tenfold. As I have stated, these lines are of little value when considered in a proper light as lines of railway. The Alaska Northern is practically an abandoned project. It is not being operated. It is not in the course of being extended so as to become more valuable.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. If the gentleman has read the bill carefully, does he not think that under its provisions the President would have authority to condemn and take over either one of these roads?

Mr. SCOTT. I think he would; but I think that is a responsibility that rests upon this House, and that it is too great a responsibility ever to let pass beyond the doors of this House.

Mr. HARDY. Does not the gentleman think that if this bill had emphatically and absolutely directed the President to buy or condemn that road it would have stiffened the price he would have had to give for it if he wanted to get it?

Mr. SCOTT. No; because we can condemn that property and its value will be fixed under existing conditions, under the law and the rules of evidence.

Mr. HARDY. My opinion is that if it is known that we are either going to buy that road or build another, whichever seems best to do, the road itself will offer to surrender for a far less consideration than if they know that the President has to buy it.

Mr. SCOTT. But whenever you make it legally sure by legislation that a line is to be extended, then you have given the existing line a legal status different than it now occupies. You have given it the opportunity, when you institute your condemnation proceedings, to offer itself as part of an assured continuous line to the Yukon, and you will find that under the law and under the rules of evidence you will have to pay from five to ten times the amount that you would have to pay if you made this matter sure at the outset.

Mr. HARDY. My idea was that this bill did not make that an assured continuous line at all.

Mr. SCOTT. It will be the very minute Executive action is taken under this bill.

Mr. TOWNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. Certainly.

Mr. TOWNER. Is it not true that this bill contemplates two extensions, not either of them a complete system, but one an extension of the line from Chitina on to Fairbanks and the other an extension of the line from Kern Creek, the terminus of the Alaska Northern Railroad, up into the Kuskokwim Valley and the Matanuska coal fields?

Mr. SCOTT. I think there can be no question about that.

Mr. TOWNER. And does not that mean that the very determination and projecting of the idea of building these two railroads will immediately add to the value of these other railroads, because they could not possibly be made available unless they

used the Guggenheim road that runs into the Copper River Valley and the Alaska Syndicate road that runs north?

Mr. SCOTT. The legal status will be changed immediately. It may properly be considered as junk. The Copper River & Northwestern Railway, while capitalized at nearly \$28,000,000—\$27,698,400—reported to the Interstate Commerce Commission for the fiscal year 1913 an operating and maintenance deficit of \$163,765.84, or, when reduced to mileage, \$839.91 per mile. It is pertinent now to consider what are 195 miles of railway worth that can not be operated except at a loss of \$839.91 per mile annually. And why are these properties in this condition? The answer to this question ought not to be difficult. These lines do not reach their objective points. They are mere fragments, no longer even in the course of construction. They have no future under existing conditions. If these lines were condemned by the Government of the United States now, they would be valued under existing conditions. The reports of their owners to the Interstate Commerce Commission would be competent evidence of that value. I do not mean by that that they are absolutely worthless; they have a potential value, but not as a part of an assured line which when completed would constitute a successful railway.

Let us suppose that the course suggested in the message of President Taft and in the report of the Alaska Railway Commission should be followed. Suppose that this bill should pass and the President should locate lines of railway from Chitina to Fairbanks, and from Kern Creek around Cook Inlet and westward to the Kuskokwim River, and the construction of those lines should be legally assured. What effect would this action have upon the Alaska Northern and the Copper River & Northwestern? They would not each only become the lower main trunk of a through line, but would own and control the terminals and the harbor at the foot of such line.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. Certainly.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Did they in the same report give any opinion as to the value of the ore they carried which belonged to them?

Mr. SCOTT. They did not.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. There is where they make the profit.

Mr. SCOTT. Property that is now commercially worthless would be of great value. The Government of the United States would own two fragments of railway, but the harbors, the terminals, the trunks projecting through the great gateways of Alaska would be owned and controlled by the Guggenheims.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I will.

Mr. HARDY. It seems to me that the gentleman's purpose of mind is the same, but our conclusions are just the reverse. It seems to me that the bill declared that it was going to build the road, say, from Cordova to Fairbanks, using the Copper River road as a part of it; that would give the value that the gentleman is talking about; but if it is left optional with the President whether he would condemn the Guggenheim road or build another, then it becomes in the nature of junk, as the gentleman said, and the liberty in the bill avoids the conditions.

Mr. SCOTT. There is where the gentleman falls into a trap. If the initial step makes it certain that we are to take these lines, that fixes the status that they must occupy in the court in the condemnation proceedings.

Mr. HARDY. If the bill declared that the road should be a part of the route, then it would do the very thing the gentleman says.

Mr. SCOTT. If you will examine the bill carefully, you will come to another conclusion.

Let us suppose that the Government should then undertake the acquisition of the existing lines and institute condemnation proceedings to that end. Would the Government be able to acquire these lines at their present value? Would the same rules and limitations of evidence apply in establishing that value? Not at all. If condemned under existing conditions, applying well-known rules of evidence and law, the value of those lines would be fixed at much less than original cost. Those connected with the promotion, construction, and ownership of those lines have already sustained a great loss. That loss should rest where it has fallen. If the Congress of the United States by legislation shall make legally assured the continuation of those lines to their original objectives, that loss will not only be made good, but in case the Government should in the future attempt to acquire those properties, the burden not only of that loss but an additional great profit to the present owners would be shifted to the Government. There is but one rational course in this connection. That is to acquire these lines either before or simultaneously with definite action by the Government

with respect to the establishment of routes and the locations of lines.

On August 24, 1912, an act of Congress was approved authorizing the President to appoint a commission to conduct an examination into the transportation question of the Territory of Alaska, to secure surveys and other information with respect to railroads, information in respect to coal fields and their proximity to railroads, and other matters. The President appointed such commission, which made the investigation referred to and transmitted its report to the President, which was later transmitted to Congress. I have no doubt that nearly every Member of the House is familiar with that report. It in substance recommended the building of a line of railroad from Chitina to Fairbanks and from Kern Creek around Cook Inlet to the Kuskokwim River, these lines connecting with the existing Copper River & Northwestern and the Alaska & Northern lines. The aggregate amount of new construction was to be 773 miles and the estimated cost \$35,000,000. Among the principal reasons urged for the connection with existing lines was the superiority of the harbors in Orca and Resurrection Bays and the facilities which the existing lines had on those harbors.

The objections I would have to the carrying out of the recommendations of the Alaska Railroad Commission are that it would involve the construction and ownership by the Government of the portions of lines extending from Chitina to Fairbanks and Kern Creek to the Kuskokwim River, leaving the lower portions of the continuous lines together, with their terminals, harbors—in fact, the two great gateways into Alaska—in the control and ownership of the Alaska Syndicate and the Guggenheims. It would necessitate the Government entering into contract relations with the Alaska Syndicate and the Guggenheims, which would forever seal the hold of these interests upon these two great gateways. It would prevent the Government from ever acquiring the control of those gateways, harbors, terminals, and railroad trunks except at stupendous cost, at a valuation which would capitalize the very act and policy of the Government for the benefit of the Alaska Syndicate and the Guggenheims.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. SCOTT. Certainly.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Does the gentleman know that at Resurrection Bay, fronting on the bay, the Government has large reservations of the water front and large reservations for town-site purposes which nobody can get, and from those water sites owned by the Government they may build into the interior without purchasing anything of the Alaska Central? That is not true at Cordova, but it is at Seward.

Mr. SCOTT. The gentleman may be correct, but I apprehend that when these interests took hold of this property they did not take the worst position. I apprehend that if there was any choice there they took advantage of the choice.

The fundamental objection that I have to this bill is that it is calculated to bring about the same result as the Alaska Railroad Commission plan. As this bill was introduced it embodied a plan substantially identical with that recommended by the Alaska Railroad Commission in the respects referred to. It required the location and construction of a line or lines not exceeding 733 miles in the aggregate, to be so located as to connect one or more of the open Pacific coast harbors on the southern coast of Alaska with the navigable waters of the Tanana, the Yukon, and the Kuskokwim. Now, the distance from Chitina to Fairbanks plus the distance from Kern Creek to the Kuskokwim River over the routes referred to in the commission report is exactly 733 miles in the aggregate. Two lines of railroad built so as to connect open harbors on the southern coast with these inland navigable waters could only be kept within the limit of 733 miles by extending the existing lines from Chitina and Kern Creek; and, again, these two lines could only be so constructed within the limits of \$35,000,000 under the estimates by extending them from these points. The purpose of this bill as it was introduced was as clear as noonday; it was the Alaska Railroad Commission plan.

The bill has been amended in the committee by striking out the 733-mile limitation, but the \$35,000,000 appropriation remains the same. The requirement that it be "so located as to connect one or more of the open Pacific harbors on the southern coast of Alaska with the navigable waters in the interior" is still there. And it will be observed that this requirement can be fulfilled by building from Chitina and from Kern Creek. It will be noted that the bill does not require the lines to be constructed by the Government to extend from the harbors to the interior waters, but only requires that they shall be "so located as to connect." This requirement, of course, can be fully met by connecting with the existing lines. The purpose of the bill

in this respect is further made apparent by the provision authorizing the President "to lease" any other existing line or lines of railroad in Alaska which may be necessary to complete the construction of the line or lines of railroad designated or located by him in the first instance, or to make contracts and agreements with any other railroad for joint transportation of freight and passengers. In other words, the bill fully authorizes the President to locate and construct a line at Government expense from Chitina to Fairbanks, and to lease the Copper River & Northwestern line from the Guggenheims, or if a lease is not desirable, to make a contract or agreement with the Guggenheims for joint transportation of freight and passengers. The same plan is authorized with respect to the other line. Under the bill as amended, the President is given full authority to carry out a plan identical with that of the Alaska Railroad Commission, leaving these two gateways and harbors with all their advantages as they now are in the control of the Alaska Syndicate and the Guggenheims. Indeed, the appropriation carried by this bill contemplates that very course, and as I view it, permits no other course.

It has been pointed out, of course, that the bill does not restrict the action of the President; that it authorizes him to build a through line, to acquire wharfage and harbor facilities, and terminals if he deems that course wise. It seems to me, however, that these provisions of the bill are calculated to mislead. The President is required to construct lines that will connect the open harbors on the southern coast with the navigable waters of the interior, but he is also required to connect with coal fields of ample capacity, and to so construct the lines as best to aid in the development of the agricultural and mineral and other resources of Alaska as a whole and the settlement of the public lands. Of course, the President could confine himself to the construction of a single line connecting one port with one of the navigable rivers, but I do not believe that anyone anticipates such a course. It is desirable to reach both the Bering River and the Matanuska fields and the Tanana and Kuskokwim Valleys. This can only be done under the present bill by connecting the proposed Government roads with the existing lines, or incurring expense far in excess of the amount of the appropriation.

Here is the situation as I view it. It is essential to the proper development of Alaska that railroads be built connecting the seaboard with the coal fields, the copper fields, and the agricultural sections. Those railroads must be projected from good harbors on the south coast. They ought to be projected from the best harbors. The best harbors and gateways to the interior are the Seward and the Copper River harbors and gateways. One is in the possession of the Alaska Syndicate and occupied by a derelict fragment of a railroad. The other is in the possession of the Guggenheims, and is occupied by good terminals and a good line of railroad, extending to the Guggenheim copper mines, but constitutes no public highway for the development of Alaska. The Alaska Syndicate and the Guggenheims have not kept faith with the Government of the United States. Those harbors and gateways in justice belong to us. Have we the wisdom, the courage, and the disposition to take them; or shall we supinely acknowledge the permanency of their claim? The responsibility for the solution of this question rests with the Congress of the United States. That responsibility can not and ought not to be shifted to any other department of the Government. When this bill leaves this House it should carry the command of Congress to condemn and take the Alaska Northern and the Copper River & Northwestern Railways and the two great gateways now occupied by them. This bill should not leave this House without that command. [Applause.]

Mr. CURRY. Mr. Chairman, I shall have to disagree with the conclusions of the honorable gentleman who has just preceded me [Mr. SCOTT] in one or two particulars. The United States Government, should this bill be enacted, will not have to take either by condemnation or purchase any railroad constructed in Alaska, whether in operation or not, but the Government through the President of the United States may select a route entirely different from any occupied at the present time, or the President may purchase, if he can obtain a good bargain for the United States, the Alaska Northern, or if its owners try to stand him up he may parallel the Alaska Northern or any other road. The United States Government owns the best water frontage at Seward, and should that place be selected as the ocean terminus of the road the Government would not have to purchase any land for harbor, wharfage, or terminal purposes.

The Alaska railroad bill has been fully and ably discussed pro and con by those who have preceded me. I shall not, therefore, in my remarks go very extensively into statistical details for fear of repeating what has already been said.

The reasons why the Federal Government should construct a railroad in Alaska—its feasibility, prospective routes, and comparatively moderate cost of construction—have been clearly explained in detail by Judge Houston, the chairman of the Committee on the Territories, and by other Members.

The vast extent of Alaska, the wonderful fertility of its valleys south of the Yukon River, the abundance of crops of the hardier vegetables and cereals that can be grown on the valley land after it has been cleared for and subjected to agriculture, the extent of its natural pasturage and the possibility of raising large numbers of domestic animals have been presented. Its inexhaustible mineral resources, including coal, copper, and gold, in the valleys and coast ranges of mountains south of the Yukon have been dwelt upon.

The healthfulness of its climate and the ability of the Territory to maintain in comfort, happiness, and the highest degree of Christian civilization a large white American population have been shown.

This wonderfully rich country has been bottled up by Executive orders, national legislation, and by the assumption and exercise of authority by the departments for a great many years. [Applause.]

The original bottling up of Alaska by the Government may have been excusable as necessary to prevent its being pioneered and monopolized by exploiters from their offices in New York, Chicago, Boston, and Montreal, but there is no reason on earth why that policy should be continued in perpetuity. The time has come when the settling and developing of Alaska by genuine American home-building pioneers should be encouraged by the Government and, if necessary, made possible by proper legislation.

The President now has it in his power, through Executive order, to relieve the conditions, and I believe the chairman of the Committee on Territories has satisfactorily discussed the situation with him. But legislation should also be enacted by Congress that will permit and assist the pioneering and developing of Alaska and at the same time prevent its mineral wealth from falling into the hands of syndicates. Its natural resources should be properly conserved and worked under Government supervision that will effectually prevent the monopolizing of its wealth.

The only tenable reason for a man to leave his home and the comforts of civilization to pioneer a new country is an opportunity to better the conditions of himself and family. Under existing conditions no such opportunity awaits him in Alaska. He will find that the law has more consideration for the brown bear of the Territory than it has for an Alaska pioneer; that it is a misdemeanor to pick up and use driftwood on the beach; that the administration of the Forestry Service is so strict that wood brings \$16 a cord on the edge of a forest; that the law will not permit him to mine coal for his own use; and that within a few miles of an almost inexhaustible supply of coal he is forced to pay from \$16 to \$25 a ton for coal shipped in from Canada.

Any man, with the exception of a Government official, who would go to Alaska with the intention of making it his home under existing conditions is playing hockey from an insane asylum.

Alaska can not be effectively pioneered and developed without a railroad is constructed on which to ship out the products of its mines and to ship in supplies.

Private capital can not and will not construct a railroad in Alaska without the Government makes unreasonable concessions, and I do not believe this Government will ever again give a dollar or an acre of land to a railroad company as an inducement to build a road.

Of course you could find promoters who would jump at the chance to accept a franchise to build a road for the opportunity it would give them to make a clean-up by selling stock and bonds, but legitimate capital can not be interested in an Alaska railroad enterprise without it is given an opportunity to own and develop some of the mines, and that opportunity I hope will never be given.

The construction of a Government railroad would pioneer Alaska, develop its resources, and populate its domain with sturdy Americans.

Those who oppose the bill have exercised their ingenuity in manufacturing and plausibly presenting excuses as to why it should not pass. You will find some who worked hard for the passage of the Hetch Hetchy bill fearing the socialistic tendencies of the Alaska railroad bill. Now, where is their consistency? The San Francisco-Hetch Hetchy water and power plant will be a public utility, built, operated, and owned by the municipality of San Francisco, and it will cost San Francisco between two and three times as much to develop her water and

power supply and plants as it will cost the Federal Government to build the Alaska railroad from a harbor on the southern Alaska coast to navigable water on the Tanana River, and San Francisco will sell water and power in competition with private business enterprise, while the Alaska railroad will not compete with any other railroad, but will only develop an undeveloped country.

The cry of public ownership of public utilities does not scare me, as it does some people. It is true that the business of Government is to govern and not primarily to engage in business enterprises, but public ownership of public utilities is right when such ownership is clearly in the interests of the people and can be better conducted and maintained under public ownership than under private business enterprise. It has always been so recognized and in many places and instances adopted and used in this country both by the Federal and local governments.

It is dangerous to the liberties of the people to place in the hands of any human being or human agency, including the Government, any great or extraordinary power over the means of subsistence, existence, and happiness of the people and the natural rights and individual liberty of men, and the greatest valid objection—if it is a valid objection—to the public ownership of all public utilities and their operation by the Government is the extraordinary power and influence it would place in the hands of the Government and the opportunity it would make for and give to officials either insidiously or by the exercise of direct authority to dominate, command, and oppress the people and control the electorate and the fact that as yet no adequate check to the possible assumption and exercise of such authority and power by Government has been thought out.

The Alaska railroad bill provides that after construction the road may be operated or leased or sold by the Government, as may best serve the interests of the people, and no Member who fought for Hetch Hetchy need fear to vote for this bill on account of its public-ownership features.

It is much better that the Government should build the road for the benefit of all the people, with the probability of in time being reimbursed for the original cost, than that a few capitalists should be permitted to build it for their personal benefit, and in return for their enterprise be given the privilege of exploiting the people and monopolizing the rich mineral resources of the Treasury, which should be reserved and protected by the Government for the hardy men and women pioneers and for its future citizens on whom the genuine development and prosperity of Alaska must depend. [Applause.]

I have heard the fact that there are but 35,000 white people in Alaska advanced as an excuse against the Government constructing the road. It has been stated on this floor that there are but 35,000 white people in Alaska, and it is proposed to build a \$35,000,000 road for them, a railroad the construction of which will entail on the Government the expenditure of an amount of money equal to \$1,000 per capita for every white man, woman, and child in the Territory. I wonder if the honorable gentleman who made that statement knows that when the populous, rich, and magnificent State he represents in this House was a sparsely settled Territory with less than 35,000 white inhabitants the railroads constructed through it received Government aid, and that practically all of the Western States, then Territories, had populations of less than 35,000 when railroads were constructed through them with Government aid, and that if the roads had not received Government aid they would not have been constructed, and if they had not been constructed those magnificent and prosperous States would to-day be sparsely settled wildernesses? Oregon and California, I believe, were the only two Western States that had a larger population than 35,000 when Government-aided railroads were constructed through them.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURRY. I will.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. In 1870 the Territory of Washington only had 23,000 people. The land grants for the Northern Pacific were made by act of Congress in 1864, six years before that Territory had its 23,000 population.

Mr. CURRY. I was in the Territory of Washington when its first railroad was constructed, and I donated a full day's work to the first railroad that was built through there, and I would do it again. [Applause.]

Would it not have been better for the Government-aided roads to have been constructed by the Government than as they were?

The Government has spent and is spending hundreds of millions of dollars in digging the Panama Canal, which, by the way, is another instance of public ownership, construction, and operation of a public utility—and there are only 37,428 people on the Isthmus, and only 5,288 of them are white. Are we digging

the canal for that handful of people? Oh, no; the canal is being constructed by the American Government with American money primarily for the benefit of the American people, but also for the benefit of the shipping and commerce of the world. Of course, the people of Panama will also be incidentally benefited. And we do not intend to build the Alaska railroad for the benefit only of the 35,000 people in Alaska. As a matter of course they will be benefited, and they ought to be benefited, but the primary object of building the road will be to pioneer and populate the Territory, develop its resources, and supply our Pacific squadron and the people of our Pacific States with good coal at about one-half the cost of what they have to pay for coal at the present time. The construction of the road will also encourage gold and copper and other mining. Enough prospecting and development work has already been done to prove that Alaska is one of the richest gold fields in the world. The dredge mines are working ground that prospects from \$2 to \$10 a cubic yard. In California we make money from ground that produces 7 cents a cubic yard. Of course, most of the dredge mines of California yield a much higher value.

Since 1880 Alaska has produced \$228,200,000 in gold, about 27 per cent of this amount from quartz mines, and there has been little or practically no quartz mining in the interior, away from the navigable waters, because of the prohibitive cost of transportation of machinery, the repressive policy of the Government, and the underhanded methods and tactics of monopolists in their attempts to syndicate the resources of the Territory. The gold output in 1913 was \$15,450,000; Silver, \$220,000; and copper, \$3,014,000.

There are inexhaustible supplies of coal covering an area of nearly 13,000 square miles, as surveyed, platted, and estimated by the Geological Survey. The greatest deposits are in the Matanuska and in the Bering fields. The Matanuska, producing the best coal, is the field through which the Government will undoubtedly build the road if it is constructed.

In my opinion the time has come when the Government should change its policy in Alaska. It should build a railroad and encourage the pioneering and developing of Alaska by genuine pioneers, and at the same time prohibit and prevent the exploiting and monopolizing of Alaska by the sharks who pioneer by proxy. [Applause.]

As a Californian, I am very much interested in the development of Alaska. We need her cheap hard coal in my State for our homes, our factories, our smelters, and our steamships; and while we have not developed the Alaska trade as we should, and have permitted the merchants of Seattle to monopolize 99 per cent of her commerce, while our merchants in return have been content to control the bulk of the commerce of Hawaii, if this bill passes, I predict that though, on account of her nearer location, Seattle may continue to enjoy the bulk of the Alaska commerce, the San Francisco merchants will go after and get their share of that trade.

San Francisco is located on the most beautiful, the greatest, the safest, and the best natural harbor in the world; she is, and she is destined to continue to be, the commercial and financial metropolis of the Pacific. [Applause.]

If the Government intends to do anything for Alaska and her people, now is the time and here is the opportunity to do it. The passage of the railroad bill should be followed by Executive orders gradually releasing the mineral and agricultural land to occupation by actual settlers, but preventing and prohibiting their monopolization.

If, on the other hand, the Government does not want Alaska inhabited and developed, now is the time and here is the opportunity to say so and to let the Alaskans know that fact while most of them are still young enough to leave the Territory and establish themselves elsewhere. I hope, however, that the mistreatment of the people of Alaska by the Government is about to end, that the policy of the Government toward Alaska will change, and that the Alaska railroad bill and other legislation that will encourage the development of Alaska and will permit her industrious and energetic people to go to work and establish prosperous and happy homes for themselves will be enacted during this session of Congress. [Applause.]

Our committee has given a great deal of thought to the Alaska problem. We worked hard and conscientiously in the preparation of the bill. Exhaustive hearings were held, at which a great deal of testimony was taken. The hearings were published for your information and for the information of the public. We sought and secured illuminating information wherever obtainable. The chairman of the committee has compiled and filed a convincing favorable report on the measure. We have reported to you a bill which, in our opinion, will safeguard the interests of the Government, and at the same time will promote the welfare of and encourage individual enterprise in the

development of Alaska. We believe that if this bill is enacted into law Alaska will be developed by genuine pioneers, and not exploited by the interests, and that it is not likely that the Government will ever be called upon to take up the bond issue of \$35,000,000 authorized by the bill, as in time that liability will be met by the earnings of the road. For these reasons, and for many others that I have not the time to present, I believe the bill should pass. [Applause.]

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURRY. Certainly.

Mr. HARDY. Is there anything in this bill, or anything in the conception of the gentleman, which prevents, contemporaneously with the passage of this bill, the enactment of a leasing law which shall properly safeguard the rights of the public, such a law as was spoken of by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS]?

Mr. CURRY. No. I think that would be a good measure with which to supplement the enactment of this bill.

Mr. HARDY. And it would afford no reason whatever for refusing to pass this bill?

Mr. CURRY. None whatever.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HARRISON). The time of the gentleman from California has expired. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SWITZER] is recognized.

Mr. SWITZER. Mr. Chairman, the enactment into law of the pending measure, carrying an authorization to borrow \$35,000,000 on 30-year bonds at 3 per cent interest for the construction of railways in Alaska, would, in my opinion, commit our Government to a colossal undertaking.

Mr. Joslin, an Alaskan, who indorses this proposed legislation and who testified before the House Committee on Territories, stated that it would require from 10,000 to 15,000 miles of railway to properly develop Alaska. And when you fully comprehend its enormous size—something like 600,000 square miles of land and water—a territory as large as all that part of the United States lying north of Tennessee and east of the Mississippi River—the estimate of Mr. Joslin appears to be exceedingly modest.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SWITZER. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I want to ask the gentleman a question. If it is a fact that in all the country north of Oklahoma and west of the Missouri River the famous land-grant railroads amount to only 5,300 miles, how does it come that from 10,000 to 12,000 miles of railroad have since been constructed in that country? Did not the original land-grant railroads open the West?

Mr. SWITZER. I think so; but I am now discussing this bill with reference to Alaska.

If it requires \$35,000,000 to construct 733 miles of railway, as contemplated by this bill, it will require not less than half a billion dollars to construct the railways referred to by Mr. Joslin, whether they are made standard gauge or narrow gauge; and if the money is raised by bond issues it would result in an annual interest charge of not less than \$15,000,000 a year, a sum almost equal to the whole amount of revenue derived from Alaska since the time of its acquisition in 1867 down to the present hour.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SWITZER. Yes; for a question.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. There is nothing in this bill that commits anybody to that.

Mr. SWITZER. Nothing in the bill, but you know how it is when you put your hand to the plow.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. And Mr. Joslin will have nothing to do with it if the bill passes.

Mr. SWITZER. But the enthusiastic agitator who favors this initiative step toward the maelstrom of governmental railway ownership will contend that it will not be necessary to construct more than \$35,000,000 worth of railways to unlock the undeveloped resources of Alaska.

You will recollect that President Wilson, in his first message delivered from the throne at this session of Congress, stated, among other things, that—

Alaska as a storehouse should be unlocked. One key to it is a system of railways. These the Government should build and administer.

It will be noted that he is not committed to any particular system or committed to a limited mileage. He says, in effect, that a sufficient number of miles should be built to unlock the storehouse, and Joslin states that a proper unlocking will require from ten to fifteen thousand miles.

You will also observe that the President, while committing himself to governmental building and ownership, does not com-

mit himself to governmental operation of these proposed railroads after they shall have been constructed.

When he arrives at this proposition, he uses the broad word "administer" instead of the word "operate," which the up-to-date Socialist is demanding.

Whence comes the sudden demand for the adopting of this socialistic stunt?

We know that our President is in a neck-and-neck race with the great leader of the Bull Moose Party to put over certain so-called progressive measures, regardless of who first declared for the same.

But neither the Republican nor the Democratic national platforms have ever yet contained a plank declaring for Government ownership of railroads. True, our distinguished Secretary of State some years ago, after an extended trip abroad, became so imbued with this schism that upon his return to this country he immediately repaired to Madison Square Garden, in New York City, and delivered his famous speech in which he advocated the taking over of all railroads and telegraphs and, in fact, all interstate public utilities by the Government; but it created such a furor within the rank and file of his party and brought forth such a loud, strong, and violent protest that upon this subject from that day to this he has been as still as a mouse, although he has since been the candidate of his party for President and dictated the nominee as well as the platform of the last Democratic national convention.

Within a few hours after the deliverance of his message the majority report of the Committee on Territories was filed in the House, setting forth that—

The building of this road by the Government and its ownership by the Government does not at all imply that the Government shall operate the railroad. It is far preferable that the roads, when built, should be operated by lessees. There is much opposition to Government operation, and this idea, it seems, has unjustly prejudiced the minds of some against the Government construction and ownership of the road.

A remarkable utterance by a body of men who recommend the passage of a bill to give the President full power to operate or lease railroads. They find there is much opposition to Government operation and that the minds of many are prejudiced against Government ownership of the roads.

But this is not all. After the discussion of the bill on two legislative days and the light of day had been let into the "wild-goose scheme" by Mr. DAVENPORT and others, an echo of the voice from the throne is heard reverberating from the President's cabinet room through the door opened by his Secretary of the Interior in his report for the fiscal year ending June 30 last, released on the 24th day of December. This report seems to have not been fully completed until after the deliverance of the President's message; and it was not released until after hearing from Mr. DAVENPORT. So it seems that the President's message, the report of the Committee on Territories, and the Report of the Secretary of the Interior are all exceedingly well timed and that there is behind this proposed legislation a strong arm which up to this time has been all-powerful with the majority side of this Chamber. The majority side of this House is again confronted with the proposition of deferring to the views of the President or asserting their self-respect by voting their honest convictions at the risk of incurring his displeasure.

The bill proposes to give the President full authority and absolute control, but the Secretary of the Interior, after hearing from Mr. DAVENPORT, recommends the enactment of further legislation, creating an administrative board to deal with all Alaskan problems. So we are now confronted with scheme after scheme, pyramided on schemes, and many of them as visionary as the maudlin dreams of an ultra conservationist or those emanating from the mind of the writer of the Arabian Nights.

The Secretary of the Interior suggests the creation of an administrative board to which is to be given jurisdiction over all Alaskan territory—"her lands, fisheries, Indians, Eskimos, seals, forests, mines, waterways, railroads—all the Nation owns, cares for, controls, or regulates."

One of the chief reasons assigned by the Secretary of the Interior for the creation of this board is that there can be no satisfactory administration of the land laws or any other laws at the distance of 5,000 miles from the point of action. Much less is it possible where the two sections of the country are separated by an ocean and the land calling for attention is closed to the world for one-half of the year. He further says that "the eye that sees the need should be near the voice that gives the order."

Secretary Lane says that it is not possible to satisfactorily administer any law 5,000 miles from the scene of action, especially situated as Alaska is. So, if you pass this bill, you do it with the echo of the voice from the throne ringing in your ears that it can not be satisfactorily administered by the President 5,000 miles from the scene of action. I wonder if the President

is beginning to doubt the ultimate success of the proposed scheme? Is he now wishing to escape full responsibility? Have the speeches of Mr. DAVENPORT and Mr. FORDNEY set him to thinking? Is he now wavering in the faith? Must a board or commission be created, so that when the time comes that he who runs can see the miserable collapse of this already apparent frigid scheme? A scapegoat can be made of some board or commission by charging it with incompetency, mismanagement, or some other excusable action or inaction.

The President and the gentleman from Wisconsin and others who have heretofore voiced the passage of this measure parade the ghosts of the "special interests" as a scarecrow to frighten Members of this body into voting for the bill. We are told in plaintive tones that the Guggenheims have some time in the past set the laws of the land at naught, and have caused murders to be committed on the soil of Alaska, and that Morgan & Co. have actually refused to loan money to some would-be rival exploiter of Alaska's unknown resources. And that, because the Morgans and the Guggenheims have refused financial aid to some misguided exploiter of this region of ice and snow who has become much wearied in his tollsome march as a speculator and a promoter, therefore the Government should now pour out of its coffers untold millions for the construction of railroads in Alaska for the benefit of our people and as a slap at some hideous "special interests." What people are to be benefited? Who is to lease these railroads which it is proposed for the Government to build? Will it be some of the common people of the land, or will it not be some person or corporation with millions at his or its command? Who is to mine the coal at the low cost figured on by the commission? Will it not be some person or corporation with millions at his or its command?

Mr. Joslin, on page 64 of his testimony before the House Committee on Territories, makes the following statement:

If your trunk lines are held by the Government and operated by the Government, I gravely doubt whether sufficient inducement could be offered to private capital to build these branch lines.

If the Government contemplates the operation of the lines, then it must at once consider the construction of branch lines and spurs when needed, thereby bringing about exclusive Government ownership and development of railroad lines and transportation systems for all time to come. I do not think that ought to be done; I do not think the Government should proceed that far.

And when asked the following question, on page 62—

Is there any doubt, in the event this railroad is built, that the Government would be able to find an operating company?—

he makes the following answer:

I do not think so, except this: I do not think the operating company could afford to pay interest on the cost of these roads from the beginning and give bond to do it. * * * The lease should be from 30 to 50 years, then private capital would build branch lines. * * * It is possible that the Government would have to forego interest on the cost of the lines four or five years.

And again, on page 64, he states as follows:

Now, if these lines are built and owned by the Government and are not leased, but are held and operated by the Government, then you can see that the obligation immediately falls upon the Government to build these necessary spurs and branch lines. If they do not construct the branch lines, the trunk line will not pay. The trunk line needs the branch line just as much as the branch needs the trunk lines.

So, according to Mr. Joslin, if the Government leases the railway it must be to some one with sufficient money at his command to enable him to construct hundreds and hundreds of miles of sidetracks and branch lines in order to make the railroads pay. No man of moderate means could meet the pay roll for the hundreds and hundreds of employees necessary to maintain and operate the railways and furnish the money for the construction of the branch lines necessary to make it a going concern. The lessee of the coal mines, if leased, in order to put the coal at the coast for the low cost estimated by the railway commission, must be some one who has sufficient money to install four or five hundred thousand dollars of mining equipment, and maintain a pay roll of three or four hundred men in a country where the lowest paid laborer is now receiving \$7.50 a day.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The gentleman is not quite correct.

Mr. SWITZER. What dark-horse special interests are to profit by this proposed enormous governmental expenditure?

In order to keep out Guggenheim it is necessary to spend from \$35,000,000 to \$100,000,000 to bring forth a dark-horse Hoppenheim? What is the difference which special interests reap the profits, whether it is Guggenheim or Hoppenheim? No one will undertake to mine coal in Alaska unless he believes he can reap a profit, and no one can undertake to deliver this coal out of the mine to vessels on the coast unless they are backed by large capital. And if they are not a Guggenheim when they start the operation they will soon become one unless the venture proves unprofitable. Men hold up their hands in holy horror at the thought of Guggenheim or Morgan & Co. owning and operating a railway in Alaska, even when it is not

making money; but they propose voting for a bill which proposes the building by the Government of an immense system of railways and leasing it to some other representatives of predatory wealth. You can rest assured that no responsible person or corporation is going to lease or operate these railways and coal mines unless they believe there can be reaped large profits. No one is going to bond himself to operate these lines unless he knows something as to the net profits. Where do the common people come in? True, they can dig coal for the wealthy mine operator; they can run an engine, brake a freight car, or ballast a railway track for some wealthy railway operator; but will they be paid any more money for their work than if it was operated by Morgan & Co.? If Guggenheims are committing murders in Alaska, invoke the aid of the criminal law and see to its enforcement; if Morgan & Co. are maintaining an armed force in open rebellion to the laws of our land, dispatch the naval and military forces of the Nation at once to Alaska, or so much of it as may be necessary, to maintain peace and order and uphold the courts in administering the law. I take it that this could be done at no large expense and at much less than \$1,000,000 a year. So, casting aside the ghosts of the invisible special interests and coming down on terra firma, let us investigate some of the other reasons assigned for the building of railways by the Government. It is claimed that it will open up and develop an immense agricultural country, as well as a large coal territory. The copper industry has already been fairly developed by the Guggenheims, and any further development of this industry in Alaska will no doubt have to be backed by millions of capital before it could be operated successfully.

And, by the way, I have failed to note any complaint in the report of the railway commission or by any witnesses appearing before the Committee on the Territories to the effect that the Guggenheims were not paying their employees fair and remunerative wages in the operation of their copper mines, railways, and smelting plants, as well as their shipping interests on the Pacific. This is certainly strange, for I do not understand how this band of outlaws, murderers, and land pirates described by the gentleman from Wisconsin could ever find it in their hearts to accord anything like fair and humane treatment to their large force of employees.

Mr. DAVENPORT has certainly demonstrated the absolute futility of undertaking to develop Alaska as an agricultural country. If railways will bring farmers to Alaska, why have they not brought them to those parts of it where railways are already built? So far as the coal development is concerned, it only takes 25 or 30 miles of railway to reach the Bering coal field. Coal companies in the United States think nothing of putting in 25 miles of railway tracks in order to provide an outlet for their coal.

But when you read the reports of the railway commission and the reports of the naval tests made of this coal, which is said to be the best coal in Alaska, there appears to be much doubt of its utility and whether it has little or any commercial value. At any rate, there is no necessity to spend \$35,000,000 in building one or two hundred miles of railway to ascertain whether the Alaskan coals possess a commercial value. As to the value of Alaskan coals for fuel and commercial purposes, the Alaskan Railway Commission have this to say, on pages 132 and 133 of their report:

It may be stated, however, that to be assured of any portion of this market the Alaska coal will first have to show its suitability and then meet the price of the known and established eastern coals, such as New River, Pocahontas, and Georges Creek. The best information at hand seems to indicate that, while Alaska coal seems to be suitable as to composition, it may run too high in slack to meet naval requirements.

Besides changing the quantities required by the Navy, the completion of the Panama Canal will effect an immediate change in the Pacific coal markets. This is difficult to forecast, depending, as it does, on prices of coal in the East and on the condition of the transportation market. It is probable that if the present prices continue the Navy can deliver coal in San Francisco from the eastern mines at a price, including the cost of the coal, of about \$6.60 per ton; this by using large colliers with no return cargo. If commercial ships can be assured of obtaining suitable return cargo, they should be able to deliver coal at a lower price. It is possible that these coals may be bought in cargo lots at San Francisco at as low a price as \$5.50 per ton, and at Seattle at prices but little higher. Should Alaska coal prove suitable for naval use it will have to meet whatever these prices may be, and it is probable that if it can meet the San Francisco price it can also meet the price of the eastern coals delivered at Honolulu and Manila.

The question of the establishment of Alaskan coal in the Pacific markets is finally one of cost. In a recent bulletin of the Geological Survey a member of this commission gives an analysis of the consumption of coal in Pacific waters. This analysis would tend to show that despite the advances in the use of oil for fuel purposes there is on the Pacific coast an annual market for nearly 1,500,000 tons of coal at points where competition by Alaska coal is not impossible, this amount being considerably less than half the total present coal consumption of the Pacific Coast States and Alaska.

The principal objection to such coal as has been obtained from the Bering fields is the low proportion of lump in the product. A development of the fields may locate coals running considerably higher in lump, but the geological indications are such as to give little promise of this.

The tests of this coal made in December last under the direction of certain Government departments, after the expenditure of \$150,000 to make same, certainly confirm the grave doubt as to the utility and commercial value of this coal that one necessarily forms from reading the report of the Alaskan railway commission.

The following is an account of the recent tests, appearing in the Washington Star:

ALASKA COAL A FAILURE—VALUELESS FOR NAVY, ACCORDING TO OFFICIAL REPORT OF TESTS.

Preliminary tests of Alaskan coal from the Bering River district have been very discouraging to officials who hoped they might develop a new fuel supply for the Navy. Rear Admiral Griffin, in charge of the investigation, has reported to the House Naval Affairs Committee that the Bering River coal tested has fallen so far under expectations in practical use as to be of no value, but that from the Matanuska fields and other sections of the Bering district, from which coal is yet to be tested, the Navy is hoping for better results.

Chemical tests of the Bering River coal indicated that it contained a higher efficiency of thermal units than the Pocahontas coal of West Virginia, but when put to firing tests in the Navy, notably aboard the cruiser *Maryland*, it developed only 43 per cent of the same efficiency and caused a great deal of trouble. It made immense clinkers, which clogged the furnaces and covered the grate bars with a molten substance like tar, which shut off the draft and hampered steaming.

Congress has appropriated \$75,000 for experiments with coal from the Matanuska district, and these will be carried on.

Those who are opposing the Alaska railway bill now being debated in both Houses of Congress are pointing to the admiral's testimony before the Naval Committee as an added argument in their favor. One of the arguments advanced by the supporters of the bill is that a Government railroad is needed to tap the northern coal fields and bring a fuel supply to tidewater for the Navy.

The Railway Commission figure the Alaskan freight tariffs at from 5 to 7 cents per ton-mile, which is from 10 to 15 times higher than charged by railways here. So if it is possible to raise a few thousand bushels of potatoes in the Yukon Valley it would be possible to ship them to this country only at abnormal prices—say, at \$2 or \$3 per bushel. Just imagine a farmer on the Yukon picking that frozen moss off the land and awaiting the thawing process described by Mr. DAVENPORT, and paying labor \$5 or \$6 per day for this work as well as for planting and harvesting his crop, then 5 or 6 cents per ton-mile on his product for it to reach the coast, and then the cost of transferring it to some seafaring vessel for the ports of the United States or the Orient. It would likely be more sensible for him to load it on a dog sled and to start out to hunt a market among the Eskimos nearer the pole. It is said that cattle can be raised in this icy region, but an investigation of the matter discloses that it is claimed that a herd can be bred which may withstand the arctic cold. Reindeer raising is claimed to be a success, but evidently it has not supplanted the American beef, as people pay as high as \$40 and \$50 a ton to have it transported to them, when I take it reindeer can be obtained for the mere killing. I imagine that this meat, so highly complimented by Mr. HOUSTON, possesses a toughness which is not relished by the American immigrant.

By the expenditure of forty or fifty millions of dollars on the Mississippi River levees within the next three or four years it is estimated that 20,000,000 acres of land in the delta of the Mississippi can be fairly well protected from the floods which frequently course their way down the Father of Waters, and that an additional twelve and one-half million acres of land made available for farming purposes. On this can be grown yearly more cotton than has ever yet been raised in any one year of the past history of our country. Eight hundred thousand bushels can be grown yearly and millions of bushels of potatoes. In portions of this delta, I am told, three crops can be raised in a year. More farm and garden products can be raised on the lands possible to be reclaimed in the Mississippi delta in one year than will likely be grown in the whole of Alaska in the next 100 years. These products, grown in the heart of the Nation, close to the large cities located in the Mississippi basin, and easily accessible to the marts of the eastern coast of the United States, would be of inestimable value to the people of the Nation. Here in the central part of the country are tried and tested farm lands that, when protected from the floods, we know to be available for the raising of all farm products; where it will not be necessary to pick off the green, icy moss from the soil, at an expense of \$125 per acre, and wait for the arctic sun to draw the frost from the ground for a couple of seasons before undertaking to raise a few farm and garden products. This land can be drained and cleared and put in a high state of cultivation for fifty to one hundred and fifty dollars per acre, and great railway trunk lines are already in operation for the distribution of the bounteous harvests to be gathered therefrom, while the development of Alaska's farming resources would only inure to the benefit of the mere handful of Caucasians residing there. I do not want it understood that I am averse to voting reasonable aid for

assisting in developing Alaska's resources, but I believe it should be in conjunction with private enterprise and where private capital must bear the burden of maintenance and the greater part of the risk and the loss in the event of failure.

So, as it is not possible to develop agriculture in Alaska or stock raising, for export, and as railways are not needed in developing her sealing and fishing industries, and the copper industry seems to have been sufficiently developed, there is nothing left but the gold and coal propositions.

It has been contended here for several years and fairly demonstrated that the great increased production of gold since 1890 has depreciated the gold dollar to such an extent that it will not purchase as much as it once did, and thereby increased the cost of living.

So I do not suppose that it will be seriously argued that we ought to spend \$35,000,000 for the purpose of further decreasing the purchasing power of the gold dollar and increasing the present high cost of living.

The coal is shown to be of exceedingly doubtful utility, but if it be later found to possess a commercial value and private capital is given an opportunity, there will be no trouble as to its development.

Under this Government ownership scheme and proposed leasing scheme, what is going to become of section 4 of the bill? The report of the Secretary of the Interior shows that they do not expect to derive any royalty from the coal for quite a number of years. The Government will own the railroad and it will be nontaxable and, in my opinion, not self-sustaining. And it is proposed to hold the forests in cold storage. So what will there be to derive a revenue from to aid in the development of Alaska as recommended by the Secretary of the Interior and to pay into the redemption fund provided for in section 4 of this bill?

No one will certainly be so inhuman as to require the settler who has the courage to undertake farming under such adverse conditions to pay any more for the land he preempts than the cost of surveying and registration fees.

So the income from these sources will not exceed the expenses and salaries of the officials looking after their collection; and section 4 becomes a huge joke.

From a careful examination of the record of the hearings on this bill, and from all the information so far brought to my attention, I fail to find any justification for the expenditure of \$25,000,000 in building railways in a Territory inhabited by only 65,000 people, including all races, and having an increase of population in the last decade of less than 1,000 persons, and where there is only 1 human being to every 6,000 acres of ice and snow, and cause us to meet an annual interest charge of not less than \$1,000,000 for the next 30 years, as well as the ultimate payment of the principal, together with all the other millions that will necessarily follow from embarking in Government railway building and operation and the colonization of Alaska with an additional horde of high-salaried public officials. [Applause.]

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I come to the consideration of this question with an open mind. If I have any prejudices it would rather be against governmental ownership and probably would be regarded in opposition to the bill; but, as I say, I come with an open mind, a student listening to the representations of the men who have made a study and who from their store of knowledge are giving us the information needed to vote intelligently on this bill. The first question that had to be answered in my own mind was whether the future possibilities of Alaska would justify any effort whatever in the building of this proposed railroad. I have never been in Alaska; I have only been a student of its development. I have sat here and listened to the representations of the men who know, both those who are in favor and those who are opposed to this bill, and I have been trying to weigh the strength of the arguments upon the question of the future possibilities of Alaska with reference to making up my own mind as to how to vote, and, giving due credence to all the arguments offered for and against, it seems to me that I am convinced that the future possibilities of Alaska would justify an effort on the part either of private capital or the Government in the building of this railroad. [Applause.] The argument that has been offered against it on the basis that there is no possible future, due largely to the condition of climate, and, following that as a corollary to the soil, could have been offered also in the early times against the development of the Northwest, the development of Washington, and the development of the northwestern part of Canada. The same sort of argument was offered in opposition to the stimulation of the growth of population beyond the Rockies. If the Gov-

ernment or private enterprise would have listened to that argument we would not have bullded the continental railroads as we did, marrying the West with the East. Why, my friends, the strongest possible representation upon the same basis was made against our purchase of Louisiana in 1803. That very argument was made, but it was not that argument that troubled Jefferson, but a constitutional one. He said we did not have, as he saw it, constitutional authority to buy it, because of his strict construction views which denied implied powers, but when he consulted Albert Gallatin as to whether he should do it or not, Gallatin said the possibility of the new country will justify it, and he urged that the purchase be made.

And Jefferson said:

I stretched the Constitution until it almost cracked, in order to do it.

The identical argument was made against the development of the Southwest when we began the development of the vast empire which came to us through the Guadalupe-Hidalgo treaty with Mexico in 1848. In 1850, on the 7th day of March, Daniel Webster delivered the only speech known in our history by the day on which it was given, and which is always referred to as the "fatal 7th of March speech." In this address Daniel Webster declared this Government ought not to enter upon a controversy over this particular section of country, because "you can not develop a country where nothing grows but sagebrush and cactus bush." That statement was made 63 years ago in reference to the vast country that came from Mexico as the fruits of the Mexican War.

Tom Corwin, Ohio's greatest political orator, I think, in any time before or since the war, stood upon the floor of the Senate, in 1846, and made his greatest speech. Among other things, he spoke against the occupation of Oregon, on the ground that the mails could not be carried from this section of the country to Oregon without having the standing Army accompany them. That was pronounced the greatest speech Tom Corwin ever made in Congress, and yet its most significant utterance is found in the blunder of its prophecy. See what has been the development from the day he made it until the present hour. To-day that portion of our land is the seat of an empire dotted with centers of a virile population, such as Seattle, Spokane, Portland, Tacoma, Walla Walla, etc. These statements are to-day revived on this floor.

When, in 1867, William H. Seward purchased Alaska the people ridiculed him and said he had "bought the refrigerator of the North," and had paid the fabulous sum of \$7,200,000 for it; they ridiculed him to the point where the scholarly Secretary had to come out in self-defense to state why he had purchased Alaska. And he convinced me as a student of history—I do not mean that I was a student in 1867, but since I became a student—that he was more far-reaching in his penetration than the statesmen of his day, for he understood that \$7,200,000 was but a paltry sum in comparison with what would be the output of that great country in the Northwest.

Why, I am told by the eloquence of Government reports that over four hundred millions of wealth, minerals, furs, and lumber, and so on, have come out of that country, while only \$7,200,000 was paid for it originally.

So I say that, coming to this question with an open mind, desiring to vote right, I am convinced that the future possibilities of Alaska will warrant the construction of this railroad. And the only question to be decided in my mind is whether we shall do it by Government aid, by Government control, by Government ownership, if you please, or shall we do it by making concessions to private capital and allow it to develop the vast undeveloped country? If you say that the Government can not afford to do it, then I ask you Why? Private capital stands ready to quickly develop it if you make concessions to it. The keenest geniuses in the world are the captains of industry—the great financiers of this country. They will not undertake an enterprise that has no profit in it. However, they stand ready to build a railroad in Alaska if we give them a concession. I do not believe we ought to do that. However, I am not criticizing the Government for what was done when the first transcontinental railway was completed in 1869. Do you not recall that we voted out of the Treasury of the United States \$60,000,000 as a subsidy and gave away 130,000,000 acres of land as inducements to capital to build these railroads? But I am not criticizing the Government, as I have said. That action developed the great West. It married the West with the East. I think Congress did right; but I believe that you will agree with me if it could have been done by the Government, or at least if the Government could have leased it, it would have been better than to give away so much valuable public property, and we as a people would have been better off to-day if we had done it in that way. And yet I say I am not criticizing the

Government for what was done. I rather vindicate the Government for it, since no one had in 1859 to 1869 dreamed of the possibilities of that great country.

But the question now comes to us as Members of Congress whether we shall allow private enterprise, by giving like concessions, to build this Alaska railroad, as was done in other days, or shall it be built as a Government enterprise. Why should we not do it in the latter way? If there is profit in it, and there can be no doubt of this, otherwise private capital could not be interested, why not allow the Government to do it? I would rather not do anything by the Government than the individual can do, provided that in order to get the individual to do it you need not do what must militate against the public welfare. But I am afraid in order to get private capital to build this road to develop the future of Alaska, you will be compelled to make concessions that we will wish ultimately we had not made. Therefore, I am not in favor of thus inducing a syndicate to do the work. I am in favor, my friends, as a Member who does not believe in Government ownership as a principle, in the Government building this road, not simply to make homes in Alaska, for the agricultural possibilities might be a question of doubt, although after hearing this luminous statement of the Delegate it does not seem to me to admit of serious doubt, for his representations, based upon actual observations, seem convincing. Aside from any consideration of agricultural possibilities I do not think it is a good policy for our Government to give away mineral wealth. It is certainly not a good policy for this Nation to give away to syndicates the mines of Alaska or of any other part of this country whose strategic position as a national storehouse is vastly important if our Nation will embrace her opportunities and employ her ability to utilize the immense trade of the Orient, now made the more attractive since the completion of the Panama Canal. The Pacific is our coming trade route, and with Alaska, an important station, the fulfillment of Seward's prophecy will soon be realized.

We had better hold this treasure in our own possession and develop it under our own control. If we build this road ourselves as a Government, it does not commit me to the proposition of Government ownership. Not at all. Not any more than the building of the Panama Canal commits us to Government ownership. It is simply a choice between two things. One is, Shall we leave Alaska undeveloped? If not, we must enter upon the work, and when we come to do it, shall we do it by making to private enterprise concessions, by giving away the vast wealth, or shall we, on the other hand, proceed to do it by retaining the wealth in our own possession, and starting it as an enterprise of profit for the Nation rather than for the individual?

These are the facts that are in my mind and which have convinced me of my duty. I am going to vote for the proposition, although I do not believe in Government ownership. However, I do believe we ought to care for the future of that great country, and this bill provides a way to do it. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HARRISON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1739) to authorize the President of the United States to locate, construct, and operate railroads in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD upon a bill that I have introduced, requiring manufacturers to certify and place their names upon the articles they produce.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bill of the following title:

S. 541. An act granting to the Emigration Canon Railroad Co., a corporation of the State of Utah, permission, in so far as the United States is concerned, to occupy, for a right of way for its railroad track, a certain piece of land now included in the Mount Olivet Cemetery, Salt Lake County, Utah.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. LIEB, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence for three days, on account of important business.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, January 22, 1914, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the vice president of the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co., transmitting annual report for the year ended December 31, 1913 (S. Doc. No. 370); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the president of the United States Civil Service Commission, submitting detailed statement of all expenses incurred from June 30 to December 1, 1913, for attendance of officers and employees of the Government at meetings or conventions of societies or associations (H. Doc. No. 626); to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on preliminary examination and plan and estimate of cost of improvement of inland waterway from Charleston, S. C., to Savannah, Ga., including inland waterway from Beaufort, S. C., to Savannah, Ga. (H. Doc. No. 627); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. DECKER, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9574) to authorize the Missouri, Kansas & Texas Railway Co. to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River near the city of Hannibal, in the State of Missouri, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 180), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred sundry bills of the House, reported in lieu thereof the bill (H. R. 12045) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war, accompanied by a report (No. 179), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LENROOT, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 1262) for the relief of Hugh P. Strong, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 181), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1296) granting a pension to Rachel D. Barnes, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GOEKE: A bill (H. R. 12046) to amend section 4 of an act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12047) to authorize and empower the President of the United States, by and with the consent of the Senate, to appoint clerks of the circuit courts of appeal, and to repeal section 124 of an act to codify, revise, and amend the

laws relating to the judiciary, passed March 3, 1911; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12048) to amend section 125 of an act to codify, revise, and amend laws relating to the judiciary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12049) to authorize the President of the United States, by and with the consent of the Senate, to appoint clerks of the district courts, and to repeal section 2 of an act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary, passed March 3, 1911; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERGUSON: A bill (H. R. 12050) reserving from entry, location, or sale lots 1 and 2, in section 33, township 13 south, range 4 west, New Mexico prime meridian, in Sierra County, N. Mex., and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 12051) authorizing and directing the Secretary of Agriculture to purchase a site and put in operation an agricultural and live stock experimental station in the first congressional district of Georgia; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12052) providing for the appointment of a board of survey for the purpose of selecting a suitable site for a naval armor plant at or near Savannah, Ga., and submitting an estimate of the cost thereof; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. STONE: A bill (H. R. 12053) to acquire a site for a public building at Lacon, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. NELSON: A bill (H. R. 12054) providing for the erection of a public building at the city of Monroe, Wis.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DANFORTH: A bill (H. R. 12055) to amend the act authorizing the National Academy of Sciences to receive and hold trust funds for the promotion of science, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 12056) to regulate the hours of labor in continuous working plants of the United States; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. QUIN: A bill (H. R. 12057) relinquishing to owners thereof any claim the United States of America may have in any grant, sectional subdivision, or section arising from any increase in the acreage thereof by reason of a relocation of the lines thereof after entry from the United States, the State of Georgia, the Kingdom of Spain, or the Empire of Great Britain, or the Kingdom of France; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. PARKER: A bill (H. R. 12058) to provide for a site and public building at Mechanicsville, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LENROOT: A bill (H. R. 12059) directing the Secretary of War to make preliminary survey of harbor at Duluth, Minn., and Superior, Wis.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. POU: A bill (H. R. 12060) to enable the Secretary of War to pay the amount awarded to the Malambo fire claimants by the joint commission under article 6 of the treaty of November 18, 1903, between the United States and Panama; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 12101) for the extension of the period of payments under the reclamation act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. STEVENS of New Hampshire (by request): A bill (H. R. 12102) to amend sections 2 and 3 of an act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MANN: Resolution (H. Res. 384) providing for printing House Document No. 1236; to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 12045) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war; committed to the Committee of the Whole House.

By Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 12061) granting a pension to Hiram Colwell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12062) granting a pension to Anna Huth; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 12063) granting an increase of pension to Oliver C. Hurd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BUTLER: A bill (H. R. 12064) for the relief of Lieut. Richard Philip McCullough, United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CASEY: A bill (H. R. 12065) to reinstate George H. McConnon as a passed assistant surgeon, United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GREEN of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 12066) granting an increase of pension to Albert J. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12067) granting a pension to Rachel E. Howard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: A bill (H. R. 12068) granting a pension to Ambrose Chrisman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DERSHEM: A bill (H. R. 12069) granting an increase of pension to John Rice; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOUGHTON: A bill (H. R. 12070) for the relief of the trustees of the Davenport Female College; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 12071) for the relief of the Importing & Exporting Co. of the State of Georgia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12072) for the relief of R. L. Horne; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12073) granting an increase of pension to Jennie Townsend; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FERGUSON: A bill (H. R. 12074) granting an increase of pension to Maria Antonia Martinez de Mink; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12075) to correct the military record of A. W. Sudduth; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12076) for the relief of the owners of the Nicolas Duran de Chaves grant; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GILLET: A bill (H. R. 12077) granting an increase of pension to Emeline E. Phelps; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HART: A bill (H. R. 12078) granting a pension to Richard De Groat; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12079) granting an increase of pension to Mary T. Hochstrasser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12080) granting an increase of pension to William K. Evans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12081) for the relief of James Dodds; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12082) for the relief of David Robbins; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HELVERING: A bill (H. R. 12083) granting an increase of pension to William R. Zook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12084) granting an increase of pension to Ira C. Sage; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: A bill (H. R. 12085) for the relief of George D. Root; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12086) granting an increase of pension to Stephen Wood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND: A bill (H. R. 12087) for the relief of Emma E. Skaggs; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 12088) for the relief of Sherman Lewis; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LAZARO: A bill (H. R. 12089) for the relief of estate of Joseph Block; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12090) for the relief of heirs or estate of Michel Emonet, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LOGUE: A bill (H. R. 12091) to place the name of John W. Boughton upon the unlimited retired list of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOSS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 12092) granting an increase of pension to Henry Trackwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PARKER: A bill (H. R. 12093) to reimburse Le Grand C. Cramer for the amount of damage to his motor launch *Winninich* by the U. S. launch *Guedamertriv* at Morris Heights, N. Y., on March 31, 1911; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RUBEY: A bill (H. R. 12094) granting an increase of pension to William A. Kerr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12095) granting a pension to William A. Malloy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12096) granting a pension to William F. Monday; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 12097) granting a pension to Charles L. Grogan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SLOAN: A bill (H. R. 12098) granting an increase of pension to William H. Carson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAVENNER: A bill (H. R. 12099) granting a pension to James Garbett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 12100) granting a pension to Dock J. Minyard; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GALLAGHER: A bill (H. R. 12103) granting a pension to Ellen A. Cardenas; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of the Turnverein of Joliet, Ill., against flooding Congress with resolutions and protests which tend to rob citizens of their rights of free speech; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), petition of Ewart & Son, of New York City, N. Y., protesting against the passage of House bill 9302, for celebrating "One hundred years of peace among English-speaking peoples"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), memorial of the Hides and Leather Association of New York, favoring the reorganization of the Foreign and Domestic Commerce Bureau as proposed by the President of the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Memorials of Local Union No. 162, of United Brewery Workers, and other labor unions of Newark, Ohio; a labor union at New Philadelphia, Ohio; and the Boiler Makers' Union of Newark, Ohio, favoring an investigation of labor conditions in Michigan; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BAILEY (by request): Petition of citizens of nineteenth district of Pennsylvania, favoring the Lindquist pure-fabric law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BOOHER: Petition of the Chicago Federation of Labor, favoring investigation of strike conditions in Michigan; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: Memorials of Local Union, No. 875, Beaver Dam, Wis., and Local Union No. 316, of the Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers, of Sheboygan, Wis., favoring an investigation of conditions in Michigan; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, memorials of the German-American Alliance of Marshfield and Marinette, Wis., and Germania Unterstuetzungs Verein, Superior, Wis., protesting against House joint resolution 168; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of Locals Nos. 657 and 678, International Longshoremen's Association, of Sheboygan, Wis., favoring an investigation of strike conditions in Michigan; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CARY: Resolutions which were unanimously adopted at a mass meeting of the Chicago Federation of Labor, representing over 250,000 working men and women, urging an investigation as to the conditions in the copper mines of Michigan; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolutions by the Eleventh Ward Social Democratic Party of Milwaukee, Wis., urging an investigation as to the conditions in the copper mines of Michigan; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolutions adopted by the Milwaukee Printing Pressmen's Union, No. 7, Milwaukee, Wis., urging an investigation as to the conditions in the copper mines of Michigan; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolutions adopted by the Third Ward Social Democratic Party of Milwaukee, Wis., urging an investigation as to the conditions in the copper mines of Michigan; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CLAYPOOL: Petitions of the German-American Alliance of the State of Ohio, representing 50,000 American citizens, protesting against the passage of House joint resolution 168 and Senate joint resolutions 50 and 88, relative to the manufacture, etc., of alcoholic liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of citizens of New York, favoring House bill 6060; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Maritime Association of the Port of New York, favoring House bill 3328; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of Commodore Barry Branch No. 311, Continental League of America, Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against appropriation of money for celebration of "One hundred years

of peace among English-speaking peoples"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DANFORTH: Petitions of citizens of Rochester, N. Y., protesting against the appointment of a committee in the House of Representatives on woman suffrage, and Socialist Party of Rochester, N. Y., favoring an investigation of the trouble in the copper regions of Michigan; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DIFENDERFER: Petitions of citizens of Pottstown and Quakertown, Pa., and Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Souderton; Order of Independent Americans, of Ardmore; Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Norristown; Knights of Malta, of Ambler; Daughters of Liberty, of Pottstown; Order United American Mechanics, of Doylestown; Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Springtown; Senior Order United American Mechanics, of Riegelsville; Daughters of Liberty, of Lansdale; Daughters of Liberty, of Pottstown; Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Perkaskie; Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Ardmore; Order of United American Mechanics, of Pottstown; Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Bristol; National Camp, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Philadelphia, all in the State of Pennsylvania, favoring H. R. 6060; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of the State of Pennsylvania protesting against the passage of House bill 9674, the Sabbath observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of the eighth congressional district of the State of Pennsylvania favoring the passage of the Lindquist pure fabric and leather bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EAGAN: Petition of the American Association of Foreign Language Newspapers, protesting against Bennett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. EDMONDS: Petition of the County Cork Men's Patriotic and Beneficial Association, of Philadelphia, Pa., and Valley Forge Branch of the Continental League of Pennsylvania, protesting against the celebration of "One hundred years of peace among English-speaking peoples"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH: Petitions of the German-American Alliance, of Chilton, Marinette, Mayroth, Medford, Milwaukee, Marshfield, Sheboygan, Hartford, and Superior, all in the State of Wisconsin, protesting against House joint resolution 168; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARR: Petitions of the Stone Cutters' Association, of Scranton, Pa., and citizens of Carbondale, Pa., favoring investigation of strike conditions in Michigan; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, memorial of citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring a Federal reserve bank to be located at Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of citizens of New York against the Senate bill 136; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of State administrators of vocational education favoring Senate joint resolution 5; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. FERGUSSON: Petitions of the Socialist Party of Guy, Oscuro, and Deming, N. Mex., favoring an investigation of strike conditions in Michigan; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of citizens of Hagerman, N. Mex., protesting against Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GARDNER: Petition of Marine Society, Boston, Mass., protesting against Senate bill 168; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GOEKE: Petition of citizens of fourth congressional district of Ohio, favoring Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HINDS: Memorial of Socialist Party of Old Orchard and Woodford, Me., favoring an investigation of strike conditions in Michigan; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, memorial of the York Pomona Grange, of York County, Me., indorsing the Lever agricultural extension bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOWELL: Petitions of citizens of Cedar City, Utah, and Socialist Party, of Paragonah, Utah, favoring an investigation of strike conditions in Michigan; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of L. Dahlquist, of Salt Lake, Utah, protesting against Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of citizens of Iron County, Utah, favoring Lindquist pure-fabric law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LANGHAM: Petitions of J. S. Kirkwood, of Arcadia; E. E. Cribbs, of Blairsville; C. E. Schrenkengast, W. T. Mayhaff, of Cherrytree; William Lickyer, of Marion; G. W. Cribbs, of New Florence, and L. A. Shumaker, all in the State of Pennsylvania, protesting against prohibiting through the mails the circulation of a paper called *The Menace*; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the Chicago Federation of Labor, of Chicago, Ill., favoring an investigation of the trouble in the copper mines of Michigan; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LEVY: Petition of N. H. White & Co., of New York City, favoring an amendment to the currency law; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of David Haub, of New York City, favoring investigation of strike conditions in Michigan; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petitions of Alcock Manufacturing Co., Alfred L. Simon & Co., and Fritzsche Bros., all of New York City, favoring legislation to prevent floods along Mississippi Valley; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: Petition of the Trades and Labor Assembly of Brainerd, Minn., favoring the Government ownership of the Michigan copper mines; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petitions of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen and Order of Railway Conductors and Railroad Trainmen, favoring the passage of employers' liability legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Local No. 46, Socialist Party of West Hartford, of West Hartford, Conn., favoring an investigation of labor conditions in the copper mines of Michigan; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MOTT: Petitions of the Riverside Council, Daughters of Liberty, of Fulton, N. Y., and New York State Council, Junior Order American Mechanics, favoring Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the National Civil Service Reform League, protesting against elimination of assistant postmasters from the classified service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the George Washington Branch of American Continental League, of Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against appropriation of money for celebration of "One hundred years of peace among English-speaking peoples"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Women's Trade Union League, of New York City, favoring House bill 29; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petitions of the Chamber of Commerce of Fulton, N. Y., and Branch No. 892, Post Office Clerks, of Fulton, N. Y., favoring the Hamill bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of Chicago (Ill.) Federation of Labor and Socialist Party of Watertown, N. Y., favoring investigation of strike conditions in Michigan; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of the Cloak and Shirt Makers' Unions of New York City, protesting against immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Petitions of the Rhode Island State Congress of Mothers; Dr. Mary E. Baldwin, of Newport, R. I., secretary of the Charity Organization of Newport, R. I.; H. R. Stout, honorary president Newport Medical Society, favoring House bill 29; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of the Providence (R. I.) Central Federated Union, favoring investigation of strike conditions in Michigan; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, memorial of the Rhode Island State Lodge, No. 130, of Providence, R. I., protesting against Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Gorham Manufacturing Co., of Providence, R. I., protesting against House bill 1873; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Local No. 486, Loomfixers, United Textile Workers of America, of Pawtucket, R. I., favoring the Bartlett-Bacon bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the board of directors of the Rhode Island Humane Education Society, protesting against the transfer of certain wild animals from Yellowstone National Park; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. PARKER: Memorial of the board of trustees of the village of Mechanicsville, N. Y., favoring the passage of House bill 11336, for the improvement of the Narrows of Lake Champlain; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. PATTEN of New York: Petition of the Deutsche Branch Hellgate Socialist Party, of New York City, N. Y., favor-

ing an investigation of the troubles in the mining regions of Michigan; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, memorial of the joint board of the Cloak and Skirt Makers' Unions, protesting against the passage of House bill 6060, restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of the Order of Railway Conductors, protesting against the workmen's compensation law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Maritime Association of the port of New York, favoring the passage of House bill 3328, for four new revenue cutters; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. RAKER: Memorial of the Seattle Commercial Club, of Seattle, Wash., favoring the immediate printing of the tables and maps relative to the kelp survey of California, Oregon, Washington, and Alaska, relating to the potash industry; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Pacific Grove (Cal.) Letter Carriers and the Pomona (Cal.) Association of Post Office Clerks, protesting against the elimination of assistant postmasters from the classified service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the Juvenile Protective Association, of San Francisco, Cal., favoring the passage of House bill 29 relative to eight-hours-a-day work for women; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petition of the mayor and council of the borough of Highlands, relative to building a sea wall along the Sea Bright peninsula; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SLOAN: Petition of Socialist Party of Fairbury, Nebr., favoring an investigation of strike conditions in Michigan; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. J. M. C. SMITH: Petitions of Elmer McArthur, of Eaton Rapids; Samuel Adams, Elmer L. Long, Webb Curtis, of Vermontville, Mich., relative to free press and free speech; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STRINGER: Petition of the Chicago Federation of Labor, favoring an investigation of the mining trouble in the copper regions of Michigan; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of Kewanee Trades and Labor Assembly of Kewanee, Ill., favoring the passage of the seamen's bill; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TUTTLE: Petition of the Members' Branch, No. 1492, National Association of Letter Carriers, relative to the provision in the Post Office appropriation bill for employees injured in the discharge of their duties; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. WALTERS: Petition of citizens and organizations of Pennsylvania, favoring House bill 6060; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WHITE: Petition of rural carriers of Guernsey County, Ohio, favoring increase of pay for carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: Petition of the United Lithuanian Societies of Chicago, protesting against the literacy test in the immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of International Baking and Confectionery Workers, Local Union No. 203, of Quincy, and Union No. 796, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, of Rock Island, Ill., favoring an investigation of the strike in the copper regions of Michigan; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, memorial of Kendall County Bar Association, protesting against the passage of House resolution 9573, relative to re-arranging of the United States judicial districts of Illinois; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: Memorial of the joint board of the Cloak and Skirt Makers' Union, protesting against the passage of the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of the Commodore Perry Branch, No. 311, Continental League of America, of Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against an appropriation to celebrate "One hundred years of peace among English-speaking peoples"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Maritime Association of the port of New York, favoring the passage of House bill 3328, for the building of four new revenue cutters; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of Brooklyn and Brooklyn Council No. 21, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring the passage of the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.