effect of it is more largely felt; the results are very much greater. The reason for the disparity, however, is that the negroes are concentrated; they are more thickly settled in the community than is the case among the white people.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I shall say but little more upon this subject.

I have sought to let Senators see that the white men of Georgia are not entirely neglectful in the effort to do something for the upbuilding of the negro. I have sought to let Senators see that even if a broader spirit did not influence them, if they were moved only by selfishness, it would be dollars and cents in their pockets to improve these negro farmers. I have sought to show that the negro agricultural and mechanical college is scarcely more than a mechanical school. I am sure that if we had been able to hold more of them on agriculture the State would have contributed more from its treasury toward the school, but while we have tried to check it the preponderance of work there is simply learning a trade.

I have sought to show, and I think I have shown, that the best of all ways to help the negro in our State is through farm demonstration; that there is a great institution there, with the ablest scientists we could gather from all over the Union and from Canada working out scientific truths; that a vast amount of information valuable to the farmer is already there; that under the demonstration which they will conduct every truth they can discover, every truth they have, will be carried to the people of the State and furnished to the farmers of the State, and every effort will be made by them to induce the negroes to use it; and that those who advocate the other course, either through lack of knowledge or from a mistaken sentiment, would seek to divert the fund from its valuable service to one of inefficiency.

I wish the Secretary would read now the letter I sent to the desk. It is a letter telling how the work is done in Mississippi. It will take only a moment, and I shall be glad if Senators will hear it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

FEBRUARY 2, 1914.

Hon. JOHN S. WILLIAMS,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I note a running debate in the Senate on the agricultural extension bill. The impression seems to have been left, in the minds of some at least, that the negro in the South will not get any direct benefit from this extension work. Such is not the case. I am in the extension field in Mississippi, paid by State funds, but have opportunity to see and know what men are doing who are in the Federal demonstration service. They are giving this service to colored as well as white people directly, and have both colored demonstrators and many colored cooperators on the farm. The colored farmers are invited to our meetings, and we hold special meetings for them in many sections, and in some cases find that they more readily respond to advanced teaching than some white farmers who have old set ideas to eradicate. We attend their fairs; we visit their industrial schools.

I am giving you this information that you can use if necessary to dispel such an impression if it may so exist in the minds of any of the Senators who may not be properly informed. Personally, I will not be interested in the distribution of this fund, as I am in State work and will likely continue. But we all work along together on the same line as a team working for the common good of all industrial interests, and draw no color line. The measure should remain as it came from the House, as far as the distribution of funds is concerned.

Yours, very truly,

J. F. MCKAY.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President, before the question is put I should like to say a word on this matter.

The question is one which I am willing to concede the Senators living in that section of the country understand better than we who do not live there or who are not familiar with the conditions there. At the same time, there is a presentation of the subject which I do not quite understand; and inasmuch as I shall have to vote upon the matter, I think I am entitled to know about it.

As I understand the statement of the Senator who is urging the bill, it is to the interest of the people of the South to make as good farmers as possible of the colored people; it benefits them financially, and in every other way it is to the advantage not only of the colored citizen but of the white man as well; in many cases they are tenant farmers; and yet, at the same time, after the money is in the hands of the white men, who handle it, they spend about one-fifth as much upon the purpose of educating the colored man as they do upon the white student.

It struck me that that was rather an anomalous condition; that if it was for the benefit of the white man to improve the mental condition of the black man, the negro, and by that method, through his tenant farmer, the white man may profit, it might pay him and benefit him to spend a little more money upon him and make him a still better farmer. Yet, according to the contention of the Senator who is urging the bill, that is the very thing he does not wish to do. It may be wise, but to me it does not seem exactly fair; and yet it may be the proper thing to do. I should like to have the Senator say something upon that subject, but I do not know that I shall ask for it.

I stated a while ago that there is an old colored man in some section of the South of whom I have read the statement in a number of papers that he was the most successful farmer, the man who made more off his land than any other individual in that section or in any other portion of the United States; that he had solved the problem of mulching to an extent to which it had not been carried by any other farmer in the country; and that they were taking lessons from him.

In a general way I will say that there is a thing about this bill which has attracted my attention, and that is that there is no farmer in the State from which I come who has written me a letter urging me to assist in the passage of the bill. As a matter of fact, it seems to me the bill is a measure in behalf of teachers, people who are engaged in teaching the farmer, rather than in behalf of the farmer himself. The farmer is to be taxed for his education and to pay somebody for educating him without asking that it shall be done.

I do not question the fact that great good can be done, with the proper system of education, along agricultural lines as well as any other. The farmer, however, does not need that so badly as he needs many other things. If the farmer is allowed a free market and given an opportunity to make a profit from his produce, he will till his land to the full extent that it will stand tilling, and there is where he needs help at this time. He does not need to be taxed to have some person come around and teach him how to carry on his farming in order that he may produce more, when he does not receive the full benefit from that which he now raises. In addition to that, it will not benefit the farmer to teach him how to live upon less, how to eat less, how to make it go further, or how to raise more upon his land, if he is not allowed to benefit from it; if the benefit is to go to some owner, some landlord, or to some trust or combination which handles his product before it reaches the market. He does not need some scientific person to come around and teach his wife how to stretch the beefsteak for supper in order to make it meet the demands of the family so much as he needs free access to the markets of the country and a fair price for his product after he raises it.

It rather struck me that the bill was designed for the benefit and advancement of the teacher more than for the benefit and advancement of the man who tills the soil. I have not heard any very strenuous petitions on the part of the farmer in behalf of the bill.

In regard to the amendment I will say that, as a matter of fairness, it appeals to me. I have great respect for the experience of the Senators from the South, but if the negro is to receive but one-fifth of the money, and the benefit is to go to the landlord, I do not see just where the negro is going to profit very much from it. That does not appeal to me as a fair proposition.

I think I shall vote in favor of the amendment on those grounds. While by chemical analysis the bill might be proved to be fair, as a matter of fact, on its face it does not seem so to me.

Mr. KERN. I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, February 6, 1914, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *February 5, 1914.*

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father in heaven, draw us, we pray Thee, by Thy holy influence very close to Thee, that Thy thoughts may be our thoughts, Thy justice our justice, Thy ways our ways, Thy will our will; that the issues of this day may be the fruits of love and good will to our fellow men, for when our attitude is right toward our fellow men we may be sure that we are in harmony with Thee. So may Thy kingdom come and Thy will be done in us, now and always. In His name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

RAILROADS IN ALASKA.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of Senate bill 48 in lieu of House bill 1739, on the same subject.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HOUSTON] moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of Senate bill 48 in lieu of House bill 1739, heretofore pending. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] will take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of Senate bill 48, 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 consideration of Senate bill 48 in lieu of House bill 1739, and the Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill, as follows:

S. 48. An act to authorize the President of the United States to locate, construct, and operate railroads in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, the pending bill is to authorize the construction of not exceeding 1,000 miles of railroad in the Territory of Alaska by the United States Government, between such points and over such routes and in such manner as may be determined by the President of the United States. For this purpose the United States is authorized to borrow, upon the issue of its own bonds, for the purpose of construction, $35,000,000. This money is to be repaid to the Treasury of the United States from the sale of public lands in Alaska, the value of which is supposed to be materially increased by the construction of the road.

The measure has received the earnest indorsement of the citizens of Alaska and is urged by the Delegate in Congress from that Territory. It was framed in accordance with the recommendations of the Alaskan Railway Commission, a body created by the last Congress for the express purpose of investigating and determining whether the Government of the United States should engage in the construction of railroads in the Territory, and if so, to what extent. It has been recommended to Congress by the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Lane, in his annual report filed December 19, 1913. It has been mentioned with special approval and recommended to the immediate attention of the legislative branch of the Government by President Wilson in his annual message at the opening of the present Congress. The bill is reported to the House with, I believe, but two dissenting votes. This consensus of opinion indicates that the matter has had thoughtful and careful consideration and that some vital necessity exists for the legislation.

In the minds of most people Alaska calls up only visions of snow fields and the weird light of the midnight sun. It is regarded as a land of perpetual snow, barren, rugged, inhabited only by fur-clad Eskimos, polar bears, and seals. It has been found, however, by actual exploration and scientific investigation carried on under the auspices of the Government to be a storehouse of vast treasures. It is so far from worthless that it actually possesses agricultural possibilities, both of soil and climate, exceeding those of Norway, Sweden, and Finland. It is capable of producing food for man and beast by agricultural cultivation sufficient to support a rugged and hardy population of the white race with the force and vigor of development which distinguishes the countries on the Baltic Sea. I have no knowledge, outside of what has been laid before this House, of the resources of Alaska agriculturally, and yet it is a matter of considerable interest that there is a very large element of agricultural development in certain valleys in Alaska.

Alaska is so enormous in its extent that it is easily possible for certain sections of the Territory to be valuable for agricultural purposes, while other sections of the Territory are utterly out of the range of agricultural possibilities. But if it be true, as it seems to be, on the showing made here, that there are in the Territory of Alaska some agricultural possibilities sufficient to sustain or aid in sustaining a white population in that Territory, that adds very materially to the promise of success of the proposed development of Alaska.

Alaska cost the United States $7,200,000 at the time of its purchase from Russia in 1867. Up to that time little attempt had been made to develop any of the resources of Alaska except the seal fisheries, the whale fisheries, and some rather inferior lines of bartering with the Indians. For many years after our purchase of the Territory it was regarded as practically worthless and its only prominence in national or international affairs was by reason of the fact that it contained the breeding grounds of the most valuable fur seals. It became necessary to protect these grounds by international agreement and the regulations were enforced by the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States. It was only in the closing years of the nineteenth century that the discovery of gold in the streams and beach sands of Alaska led to the rush of white adventurers. These adventurers in their eager search for wealth poured over all portions of the Territory, thus carrying on the work of exploration. They found placer gold mines in paying quantities and in widely scattered regions and sent to the United States more than $200,000,000 in gold. It was this wonderful discovery of gold in Alaska at that opportune time which made possible the success of a gold standard of currency in this country and freed us from a financial servitude to the Bank of England. The gold of Alaska poured into the lap of our Nation more rapidly than the gold of the Rand poured into that of Great Britain, and, unlike our British cousins, we were put to no war of conquest to perfect our title to the treasure. The discovery of gold-placer mining indicated in Alaska, as it did in California, the presence of quartz mining. The gold which is found in river sands and in the sands of the seashore is worn off by attrition from the quartz ledges far in the interior and carried down by streams to its place of deposit. As the placer mining gradually gives out discovery is made of the sources of supply in the quartz ledges. At the present time quartz mining is carried on very extensively and the output is almost as great as during the most active period of placer mining.

The work of the army of prospectors and adventurers who invaded the Territory during the gold rush has been supplemented by the scientific exploration and investigation of the Geological Survey of the United States. As a result not only gold-quartz mining has been established as a paying industry, but there have been discovered vast deposits of coal, copper, and oil. Some of the coal is of the very highest quality, both anthracite and bituminous. Much of it is of a low grade of lignite character, suitable for local consumption for fuel in that cold climate. The deposits of copper are exceedingly valuable and run to a very high percentage pure copper, while the wealth of oil has never been estimated.

The annual production of wealth in Alaska at the present time is astonishing to those who have made no detailed study of the situation. In 1912 the production of gold was $16,500,000; of copper, $4,904,715; gypsum, marble, and tin, $297,365; fisheries, $17,373,566; making a total of $39,075,646. Alaska produces more canned salmon annually than Oregon and Washington combined. From 1867, the year we purchased Alaska, down to and including the year 1911, Alaska had produced in natural wealth near $430,000,000, which was brought into the general volume of trade in the United States. The Territory cost us originally $7,200,000, and the Federal Government has expended on the Territory for all purposes, including the post office and the expenses of the Revenue-Cutter Service for the protection of the seals, a total of $28,616,674.25. The total cash receipts from the Internal Revenue and Postal Service in that time has been $17,117,354.79. The Federal Government therefore has paid out in governing the Territory and for the original purchase price $18,699,319.46 more than it has received. As a result, however, of this expenditure the people of the United States have profited in national wealth more than $400,000,000. It may be said that there is no other new territory acquired by the United States which has shown within the first years of its administration such a substantial return upon the investment and cost of maintenance.

As President Wilson said in his annual message to Congress, Alaska is a vast storehouse of treasure belonging to the Nation at large. We must unlock it for the benefit of all of the people of the Nation. We are confronted now with the supreme test of the entire theory of national conservation. We must choose between two possible courses: Either this national wealth must be opened up and developed for the benefit of the people of the United States, or it must be turned over entirely to the Alaska Syndicate, comprising the Morgan-Guggenheim interests, to be developed as an asset of private monopoly. I need not pause at this time to catalogue the economic and political crimes enacted by the Morgan-Guggenheim Syndicate in Alaska since the wonderful rediscovery of that Territory during the gold excitement of 1898. The story running in the sober records of the courts includes everything from the corruption and bribery of judges to the wanton attack by armed bands of assassins upon the workmen engaged in rival enterprises. It is a drama of greed and carnage unparalleled since the days of Warren Hastings. Its scenes were enacted not only upon the snow-clad plains of the Arctic Circle but in the banks of Wall Street and the counting rooms of London. It is this high-handed and lawless attempt to grab the tremendous resources of Alaska which caused the locking up of that great Territory by legislative enactment. The story of Alaska as portrayed in the newspapers, the magazines, and the current novels has crystallized the public opinion of America in favor of conservation as against unlimited exploitation by syndicates and monopolies.

Let us take a brief glance at the history of Alaska during the last few years in her relation to the Nation. The effect of the discovery of gold was to attract a large number of adventurers from all parts of the United States to the Territory of Alaska. The foundation of the wealth of the Territory was the gold placer mining, which was within the reach of any prospector who had the courage and tenacity of purpose to achieve success. Deposits of gold were found in widely scattered parts of the Territory, and the restless prospectors, in their search for gold, discovered but left undeveloped many other sources of natural wealth.

Immediately following the gold rush the United States Government, through the Geological Survey, began a scientific investigation of the resources of Alaska, with the surprising result of the discovery of vast deposits of coal, copper, tin, and other workable minerals. The Federal Government also, through the agricultural experiment station, discovered possibilities of producing in some of the fertile valleys of Alaska during its short summer a supply of certain hardy foods for man and beast. Through the schools established for the Eskimos and Indians a successful attempt was made to acclimate and breed domestic reindeer of northern Europe. These scientific efforts of the Government toward developing to the fullest extent the natural resources of Alaska were intended to make that great land available for all of the people of the United States. At once, however, the slimy tentacles of the trust began to steal around those resources. All of the dominant financial interests in Alaska, including the banking house of J. P. Morgan & Co., which was financing various industries, the great copper trust of the Guggenheims, which was interested in seizing the copper resources of the Territory, and certain British and Canadian banks, which had seized all the available passes through the mountains for railroads into the British territory of the Yukon, combined and consolidated themselves under the name of the Alaska Syndicate. The boldness and lawlessness of this syndicate startled the entire country. In 1904 Congress attempted to throw open the coal lands to private purchasers under the same law which had applied to coal deposits in the public lands of Wyoming and other Western States. That law fixed the price at $10 per acre, with certain easy terms in proving up the claim. It was assumed that it would work to the advantage of the small proprietor and permit the coal lands to be developed by individual owners. Exactly the contrary proved to be the case. Immediately large bunches of filings were made, which may have been in technical compliance with the law, but were in fraud upon the rights of the Government by the Alaska Syndicate or those under its control. So rapidly was this work carried on that in two years—to wit, in 1906—President Roosevelt, by a sweeping order, withdrew from entry all of the coal lands in Alaska.

It is claimed that this act of Roosevelt's was unauthorized by law, and that is probably true in a literal and technical sense; but the American people neither by direct action at the polls nor through their chosen Representatives in Congress have ever reversed that order. On the contrary, the greatest scandal of President Taft's administration was the alleged attempt of Secretary Ballinger to issue patents in the Cunningham coal claims. These claims, if not actually fraudulent, were so clearly in violation of the public interest that they had been the original cause of the withdrawal of the coal lands from entry and the subsequent block up of the Territory for all forms of development.

In 1910 Congress expressly ratified the withdrawal of the coal lands and provided for their segregation and appraisement. From the time of this withdrawal down to the present time the resources of Alaska, which are based upon the accessibility of coal, have been locked up from all forms of development. Even under this adverse condition of affairs, the great natural wealth of the Territory and the energy of its citizens have contributed nearly $40,000,000 annually to the national wealth. To-day the situation confronts Congress of either reversing the policy of conservation and turning Alaska back again into the hands of the Alaska Syndicate to be exploited solely in the interest of private greed and partly for the benefit of British and Canadian bankers, or else finding some means of making those resources available for the people of the Territory and for the people of the United States. It is either the Government or the Guggenheims. This proposed railway is the key to the situation, for under existing circumstances no railroad can be financed or built in Alaska by private enterprise except by the Alaska Syndicate. The roads projected by the Alaska Syndicate would be so constructed as to give them control of the coal fields, the copper deposits, the passes through the mountains, and the available harbors, without any regard primarily to the general or uniform development of the Territory. Under these circumstances I am strongly in favor of giving to the President of the United States the power, as contemplated by this bill, to construct such railroads as will open up the entire Territory, the cost of which railroads will be reimbursed out of the increased value and increased sale of public lands in Alaska.

The opponents of this bill are divided between those who favor the removal of all restrictions from private enterprise, and who insist that the Territory will be developed by private initiative if the restraints of the conservation act are removed, and those who favor some form of Government aid to a railroad short of the actual construction by the Government. Those who favor the development solely by private enterprise draw a very beautiful picture of a sturdy pioneer going into a new country with his ox team and his household furniture and establishing a humble but independnet American home. Those who favor the Government extending its aid to the construction of a railroad without actual Government ownership admit that under existing conditions proper railroad facilities can not be obtained in Alaska through any source except the Alaska Syndicate unless by the use of the Government credit. They advocate that some private corporation be aided, either by land grants or by the issue of Government bonds or by the Government indorsement and guaranty of its own bonds, to build such railroad. Both sets of opponents are wrong and their arguments not only fail to meet the needs of this situation but are contrary to the teachings of history. If Alaska were a land of generous agricultural resources like the Mississippi Valley, where the life of man and the domestic animals could be supported even in the unbroken wilderness, the sturdy pioneer might find his way in with an oxcart, and might take his family with him and establish an independent American home, but as applied to actual conditions in Alaska, where the wealth is more largely mineral than agricultural, and where transportation is the only possible basis of development, the picture of the sturdy pioneer with his oxcart is a wild dream of the imagination. In fact, the sturdy pioneer did not get very far west of the Mississippi River without the aid of Government subsidized railroads.

Mr. GOULDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. Certainly.

Mr. GOULDEN. Does not the gentleman think that when they spoke about ox teams they really meant reindeers?

Mr. BORLAND. Well, they might have meant that the sturdy pioneer could use reindeers, but the sturdy pioneer in Alaska is not going to develop the country by either ox team or reindeers, if I know anything about pioneering, and I think I do, as I am the son of a pioneer myself.

Those who contend that the Government should aid by land grants, money, or credit some private corporation to build a railroad are refuted also by the facts of history. Nearly all of the railroads west of the Mississippi River were built with Government aid or with the aid of States, counties, and townships. Some of them managed to secure all forms of aid, and the aid thus given by the people through the taxing power of the various divisions of government exceeded in a large measure the cost of construction of the roads. It is only necessary to direct our attention to the great transcontinental roads which were directly aided by the Federal Government. In 1862 the first act was passed offering a land grant to the Union Pacific Railroad. This was followed in quick succession by grants to the Central Pacific, the Southern Pacific, the Northern Pacific, the Central Branch, and the Kansas Division. Between 1862 and 1875 the United States Government contributed to these roads 155,000,000 acres of land, worth approximately $400,000,000, and $65,000,000 of Government bonds. It has been said that the railroads could not and would not have been built but for the aid of the Government in a new territory where the local business would not support the road.

Assuming this to be true, the plan adopted proved to be wasteful, extravagant, and unsatisfactory to the people of the United States and to the Government. The amount contributed by the Federal Government directly would have built the roads twice over. It encouraged a wild era of speculation and debauchery of finance which plunged the West and the entire country into a disastrous panic in 1873. The failure of the banking house of Jay Cooke & Co., which precipitated this panic was the direct result of the frenzied finance of the Union Pacific Railroad. The plan resulted in political corruption, extortion of the settlers, and fraud upon the Government, in the increase of the expenses of the Land Department, in litigations and evictions of homesteaders, and bitterness between the citizens and the corporations, which finally culminated in the granger legislation which swept the entire West about 1880. In less than 10 years after the first grant of land was made the effects of the political blunder were clearly apparent and the Government abandoned for all time the plan of subsidizing railroads by land

grants. The favorite argument on behalf of land grants was that they would facilitate the settlement of homesteads along the line of the railroad, but even this argument fails entirely in the case of Alaska, where the lands which the corporation would take are chiefly valuable for their mineral deposits. Lewis H. Haney, professor of political economy at the University of Michigan, has recently written a very valuable monograph on the "Congressional history of railways in the United States, 1850 to 1887." In discussing at length the history and operations of the land-grant railroads Prof. Haney makes this conservative statement:

Without standing for Government ownership as a general policy, the question may be raised whether in this case our Government might not have built the first Pacific railway with relative profit. As opposed to the policy of assistance which was adopted and administered it would seem simpler. Here private interests ran amuck and the tardy light of publicity only guided the historian. Economic waste and political corruption were rife, while constant litigation injured both railway credit and national dignity. In the light of history it may reasonably be maintained that the United States would have best solved the Pacific railway problem that confronted it in 1860 by constructing a national railway over the central route, leaving to private initiative, aided only by adequate rights of way and materials, the exploitation of secondary railway lines.

It may also be said in this connection that whether Government ownership of railroads will ever become an established policy of our Government is still a debatable question in the minds of many people. If there is any section of our land where Government ownership could be tried as an initial experiment with a fair promise of success and with little disturbance of our economic system, it is in Alaska. Alaska is a Territory of the United States, and the Federal Government has plenary power over it. No constitutional restrictions such as might exist in the case of a State apply to Alaska. The constitutional power of the Government to construct railroads there is full and complete. Its situation is so isolated and its economic conditions so different from those of the rest of the country that it seems that the experiment might safely be tried. If it did not prove a success in Alaska there would be less reason to try the dangerous and expensive experiment throughout the United States generally of Government ownership of railroads.

The cost of the proposed railroad in Alaska will be reimbursed from the sale of public lands in that Territory. These lands vary greatly in value. Some are totally worthless and some are of enormous value on account of their mineral deposits. The best scientific information obtainable shows that their value, properly used, will more than pay for the cost of construction of the proposed railroad, without ultimate expense to the people of the United States. Under these circumstances it would be equally bad business and bad political policy to grant these lands to a private corporation of uncertain credit as a reward for constructing a railroad when the work can probably be done at less cost, and certainly on a firmer basis of credit, by the Federal Government. The United States can borrow money at 3 per cent, but no private railroad corporation in Alaska can borrow it at less than 6 per cent, and the expense of commissions and discounts would probably make the rate of interest at least 8 or 10 per cent.

But on even broader grounds I am in favor of this bill. I am in favor of developing the resources of this vast Territory primarily for the benefit of the people who live there and for the benefit of the people of the United States, rather than for the benefit of a nonresident, partly foreign corporation. I am in favor of maintaining the spirit and principle of conservation. The best conservation is the wise use of the natural resources, so protected by law as to prevent the encroachment of private monopoly. To my mind, Government aid or the lending of Government credit to some pet corporation would be just as disastrous in the end as a return to the control of the Alaska Syndicate. Thus far conservation has meant to the Alaskan only the withdrawing of all primary resources from private ownership and private development. The aim and object of conservation is not to lock up resources, but to permit their general use. The Alaskans have borne this condition of local restraint for eight years and some reasonable answer to their demand for relief must be made. They feel that they can develop that great Territory with energy, courage, and success. They feel that they are entitled to use as an asset for that purpose the basis of credit of their public lands. In this demand they are fully in line with the advanced thought of our country on the subject of conservation. They have the hearty support of President Wilson and Secretary Lane, both of whom are conscientious, clear-headed, and conservative public officials. Under this policy I believe that the Territory of Alaska will become a great storehouse of treasure, filled with a vigorous white population, which will add to the national wealth, peace, prosperity, and happiness of the American people. [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Chairman, this is a matter that is of so great importance that I think we should have a quorum present, and I make the point that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of no quorum. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Evidently there is not a quorum. The Doorkeeper will close the doors and the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HENRY (interrupting the roll). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to withdraw the point of no quorum.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I will remind the gentleman from Texas that the Chair can not entertain such a request. The Chair has declared that there is no quorum present, and after that declaration, under the rules, nothing can be done except to ascertain the presence of a quorum. In the absence of a quorum nothing can be done except to get a quorum.

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is to call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Aiken	Doremus	Hoxworth	Palmer
Ainey	Doughton	Hughes, W. Va.	Park
Anthony	Driscoll	Hulings	Patton, Pa.
Avis	Dunn	Jones	Peters, Mass.
Bailey	Dupré	Keister	Ragsdale
Barchfeld	Eagan	Kelley, Mich.	Reilly, Conn.
Beall, Tex.	Eagle	Kelly, Pa.	Richardson
Bell, Cal.	Elder	Kennedy, Conn.	Riordan
Blackmon	Fairchild	Key, Ohio	Roberts, Nev.
Borchers	Finley	Korbly	Rucker
Bremner	Fitzgerald	Kreider	Rupley
Browne, Wis.	Floyd, Ark.	Langham	Sharp
Burgess	Fowler	Lee, Ga.	Slemp
Burke, Pa.	French	L'Engle	Sloan
Burke, S. Dak.	Gallagher	Lesher	Smith, Md.
Butler	Gardner	Lever	Smith, Minn.
Candler, Miss.	Gillett	Levy	Smith, N. Y.
Cantor	Glass	Lewis, Md.	Sparkman
Carlin	Goeke	Lewis, Pa.	Stanley
Cary	Goldfogle	Lieb	Stephens, Tex.
Clancy	Goodwin, Ark.	Loft	Stout
Clark, Fla.	Graham, Pa.	McClellan	Sutherland
Coady	Green, Iowa	McCoy	Tavenner
Connolly, Iowa	Gregg	McGillicuddy	Taylor, Colo.
Cooper	Griest	McLaughlin	Temple
Copley	Hardwick	Maher	Thomas
Covington	Hart	Manahan	Vare
Crisp	Haugen	Martin	Volstead
Curley	Hawley	Merritt	Walters
Curry	Hay	Metz	Watkins
Danforth	Helgesen	Murdock	Webb
Davis	Helm	Nelson	Wilson, N. Y.
Dixon	Hill	O'Brien	Winslow
Dooling	Hinds	Oglesby	Woods

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 S. 48, the Alaska railroad bill, and finding itself without a quorum he had directed the roll to be called, that 297 Members had answered to their names, a quorum, and he reported the names of the absentees to the House.

The SPEAKER. A quorum being present the doors will be opened. The committee will resume its sitting.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the Chair kindly inform the committee how much time is left for general debate?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that under a special rule all of to-day is to be taken up with general debate. There are some thirty-odd applications for time, and the Chair will state further that whenever the time allotted on the paper, which the Chair has, to the different Members who desire to speak is extended by the committee, that much time will be taken away from the remaining speakers.

Mr. ANSBERRY. Mr. Chairman, on behalf of my colleague, Mr. GOEKE, who is unavoidably absent, I ask unanimous consent that he may extend his remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOEKE. Mr. Chairman, the key to unlock the great storehouse of Alaska is a railroad built, owned, and operated by the people. Railroads were the keys which opened the locks of our undeveloped West, and made it possible for the people to move in and develop the lands. Alaska is a part of our great Nation, and her citizens are the same as we of the States,

and they should have the protection, the care, and the laws we have. No discrimination against the Territory or her people or added hardship in development of the resources of that country should for a moment be allowed. Her people are asking only for what our western citizens now enjoy, and have enjoyed in the past—to help in the upbuilding of their land. Many people from my State, as well as from every State within our borders, have been there, and a great number wish to return. It is but fair that we give the Territory the helping and needful hand so that the farming lands in the interior, the mineral resources, and the business of the country can meet with development that follows railroad construction, as has followed railroad construction throughout our great West.

I am not going into detail to show the valuable holdings of the country. All of the Members here are convinced, more or less, of the wealth of the land, but there are a few things I would like to call your attention to. How was it that the United States became the owner of this country? Lest we forget, I will go back to the time when the United States, stricken down with war, crippled, weak, and our bonds worth 50 cents on the dollar, and no one knew what the morrow would bring forth, threatened by a great power in Europe—now our cousins across the way—just at that time another great power, Russia, made it quite plain to our cousins that war on us meant war between those two great European nations. That is why England was stopped from jumping upon the helpless, tottering States.

If England had then been permitted by Russia to fight us, there would probably have been different history about us now. In gratitude for this brotherly act the Government at Washington wished to make a substantial return for the expenses that Russia had been obliged to assume in order to make preparation for the defense she undertook in our behalf. Russia then owned both Siberia and Alaska and looked upon both countries as a great glacial, moss-covered arctic region. Russian and Washington diplomats finally agreed upon the Alaskan purchase plan, Russia only too glad to let go of her iceberg across the Bering Straits. President Johnson expressed his reason of the purchase in his annual message in true diplomatic language, for at that time the matter was considered a very close State secret. I repeat that we owe a moral obligation to the country that was at that time our greatest friend. We also owe something to the descendants of the people Russia turned over to our care and keeping, as well as to our brothers and sisters of our States who have cast their future in that Territory.

For a moment let us see what Russia has done for the other glacial country—Siberia—similar in all respects, climatic, agricultural, mineral, timberlands, and so forth. Since the discovery was made in Siberia that her lands would produce in bountiful harvests Russia has built a great system of railroads across the country. Side branch lines, connecting at both ends with the main line, have been put in operation. Over 2,000,000 people have emigrated from southern and western Russia into the lands of Siberia. The shipping has so increased that the Government has opened up arctic ports and built railroads to connect with the arctic port of Archangel. Extensive warehouses at this port are used to store grain and other freight, and in the summer, when shipping is possible in the Arctic Ocean, steamships go to the port and load with the accumulated freight for European markets. With over 10,000 miles of main line and branches in Siberia, that Government has found that a second system of railroads across the country is now necessary. For two years that Government has been constructing this second system of railroads, which, when completed, will be 7,000 miles of trackage.

The first system of railroads is paying operating expenses and fixed charges and bringing in a large profit each year, and that Government is using the money so derived in track improvement and new lines, as well as the upbuilding of country roads and stage lines. Nearly every part of Siberia can be reached to-day by the Government owned and operated railroads or by a stage-coach operated by the Government. If we take as an example what is being done in Siberia as to what we may expect from Alaska, then there should be no fear as to the road paying or that the weather is too cold to operate the line.

There are Members here who represent districts that produce coal, timber, oils, and minerals. Alaska's development, it has been suggested, may close some of the markets now obtainable upon the Pacific coast, both with regard to sales to the Government, the public, and to foreign commerce. The great State of Ohio, and in particular the district which I have the honor to represent, may feel for a short time the marketing of the abundant resources known to exist in Alaska, but we feel that trade will adjust itself, and if we do not send to the coast one thing the upbuilding of the Territory will increase the demand for other manufactured goods, machinery, and so forth, so that in no event will we lose. And this is quite true with every other State, and why be afraid? Are you trying to keep Alaska back and her development locked up for fear that our own States may suffer? How about the 350,000 American farmers who have gone into a similar country in Canada, of whom a large majority became citizens in order to take up lands? If railroad transportation had been built across the Tanana Valley, how many of the 350,000 Americans now Canadians would have gone to the Tanana and remained at least under our flag? We all want to keep our farming class at least under the flag. The Government of Canada has given cash and bonds as guaranties and her lands to secure railroad construction across lands similar in all respects to Alaskan lands and climate. Did the people go, and have the railroads paid in this so-called frozen North? The American farmers, with their families and their friends, number over a million persons in Canada. The railroads are meeting with success. More lines are under construction. We have the example of Government ownership and operation in Siberia, Russia, and Germany, all very successfully operated railroads. In Canada we have the example of the Government unconditional guaranties, both principal and interest, and the railroads are a success.

Laws are about to be enacted by this Congress governing the issuing of railroad securities, limiting and restricting the amount of the issue to the actual investment made. This will eliminate the speculative features of railroad construction. There will be no further opportunity for so-called "melon cutting," "stock-jobbing," and "syndicate frauds," and hence the speculative railroad magnate who has been dealing in American railroads will not venture into Alaska, deprived of the opportunity of making exorbitant profits out of railroad construction. There can be no question but what the people of this country want a law of that character, and it is certain that one will be enacted. With this condition of affairs it is a foregone conclusion that no bank or banker, European or American, will undertake the financing of an Alaskan railroad unless our Government gives its unconditional guaranty of the securities. Without such Government aid the attempt to finance a railroad in Alaska would be a waste of time and energy. As the Government owns almost all the Territory, it would hesitate a long time before giving such unconditional guaranty and add thereto a part of the lands to any private corporation or railroad promoter as an inducement for railroad construction; and hence it follows that the Government must undertake the construction of a railroad itself if it would do its duty by Alaska and develop this great Territory.

The distinguished and able Secretary of the Department of the Interior, Hon. Franklin K. Lane, in a letter dated May 15, 1913, addressed to the Hon. KEY PITTMAN, chairman of the Committee on Territories of the United States Senate, in reference to the policy of the construction and ownership by the National Government of a railway system in the Territory of Alaska, says:

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 hardiest 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 out 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 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.

This statement, coming from one so fully informed on this question, ought to dispel all doubts as to the correctness of the policy advocated in the bill under consideration. But if, notwithstanding all that can and has been urged in favor of the Government constructing and owning a railroad system in Alaska, there still remains doubt in the mind of any Member on this side of the Chamber as to his duty in the premises, he might follow with absolute safety the great leader of the Democratic Party, the President of the United States, who, in his annual message to the Congress on this subject, clearly indicates in his usual convincing style what he regards ought to be done. I quote from his message:

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 it 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 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 United States of the Union; and yet the principle and object are the same, wherever 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 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.

I believe that the policy of President Wilson, just stated, is the correct and true policy for the Government to follow with respect to Alaska, and I shall therefore with great pleasure vote for the bill under consideration.

The building of a railroad in Alaska in no sense commits this Government to the policy of obtaining the ownership and operation of the railroads in the United States. That question is not involved in the measure under consideration. Neither is the country ready at this time to even seriously consider that great problem. I am confident that no party will undertake to acquire the railroads of the country and operate the same without first having that issue distinctly and definitely determined by the people of the country at a general election by proper platform declarations.

The fact is that the Government requires coal, oil, timber, and also the opening up of the Territory to settlement. The railroad is the one necessity that will accomplish the result. Alaska with the railroad will soon have a large population, and will make for us a very strong and comfortable possession, adding to our own naval and military strength, of great value to us. Alaska will serve as an insurance against war on the Pacific. Our aggressive Pacific Ocean neighbors will hesitate a long time before they make the attempt when Alaska is opened up and is peopled by that splendid citizen, the American farmer. Alaska is big enough to become a great nation herself and is rich enough to hold her own.

There is a most important matter I wish to call to your attention. We all feel proud of our Military Academy. West Point is known to you all. With pride we look upon the splendid system of work it has accomplished, and upon the perfect men it has turned out. It has been said that if a man had it in him, that the Military Academy would devolp the best parts of his make-up. We have a most excellent example in Col. George W. Goethals, the builder of the Panama Canal. It is the system of West Point brought out through this genius that has built the canal. This same system has been ably demonstrated by the Army in Alaska. The Army has been building trails, roads, attending to the care of the wounded and sick, and maintaining order in the country for 17 years. In the early days of the rush of gold seekers to Alaska—1897–98—and prior to the establishment of civil law, the Army was the means of saving thousands. Hospitals were built and care was given to the suffering. People went to that country totally unprepared, and but for the efforts of the Army there would have been many deaths to record. The men of the Army, enthused by their leader to accomplish results, have dragged hundreds of tons of telegraph wire across the valleys and mountains and constructed a good telegraph system. They have accomplished a great deal with a small force. These men have worked for small pay, and close to others who were comfortably housed and receiving ten times the salary for lighter employment. It was the system, the Military Academy leader who accomplished the result. The Panama Canal was about to be let out to contract construction when it was finally decided to have the Army do the work. The people of the United States now see the wisdom of that decision. I believe that the great majority of the people of the United States would like to see the Army put in charge of the railroad construction in Alaska. We have every faith in our President, and know that he will do the right thing at the right time, and I for one would not limit his powers, but to satisfy all of the people in this matter, and to further show our high appreciation of the men from West Point, and to encourage our young men now in the academy, to demonstrate our high appreciation of the men of the Army, I propose at the proper time to offer an amendment to the bill H. R. 1739 to the effect that the actual construction work of the Government railroads in Alaska will be under the direct charge of the Army.

I hope that this side of the Chamber will stand by the President and aid in the passage of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES].

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, the measure now under consideration for the construction of a railroad in Alaska proposes that the Government shall issue bonds bearing 3 per cent interest, and with the proceeds of the bond sale carry on the work. These bonds are to be secured, so to say, by a first mortgage upon all of the property owned by the United States in the Territory of Alaska and elsewhere. The amount of bonds to be issued, as proposed in this bill, is $35,000,000; however, the bill as passed by the Senate carried $40,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, we are at peace with the world. Our annual revenues are enormous. The interest on these bonds, amounting to more than a million dollars a year, must be paid by taxing the people. This interest payment will go on and on, like Tennyson's Brook, for we never pay Government bonds. Why pledge our property in Alaska and our resources at home? Why mortgage our future to build this railroad in the frozen gorges of this far-away land?

We are told, Mr. Chairman, that there is great demand for this bill, that we must open up Alaska and give the dwellers in the crowded cities a chance to "go out west" and grow up with the country. Now, sir, I am perfectly willing to open up Alaska and permit anyone to go there who cares to do so, but I am not willing that the Government should finance this polar expedition at the instance of interested cupidity on the one hand and credulous ignorance on the other.

Why build this railroad? I shall not at this time discuss the general question of Government ownership. I have small patience with the dreams of socialism. But grant, for the moment, that the Socialists are right and that the Government should own everything from railroads to soda fountains, why should we go railroad building in the neighborhood of the North Pole, while so many transportation additions are required in the United States, where people can live and do live?

When conditions in Alaska are generally understood the people in the United States will no longer marvel that the population of that Territory has only increased 733 souls in the past 10 years. We have owned this colossal chunk of frozen earth for more than 50 years, and with great labor and expense we have succeeded in thawing out only two or three thousand acres sufficiently for the growth of quickly maturing crops.

Mr. Chairman, Alaska is a mining proposition pure and simple. We have gold and copper and coal in Alaska. There has already been built and is now in operation a railroad to the principal copper mines. I believe it is not contended that railroads are necessary to bring away the gold we find there. True, we catch a great quantity of fish in Alaska, but they are taken from navigable waters, and I have never heard it contended that railway transportation was required for the handling of this product. We also receive from Alaska a goodly quantity of furs, but they are likewise secured in navigable waters and do not require additional means of transportation. But the coal mines of Alaska, say the advocates of this bill, can not be developed without additional railroads. And I have no doubt, Mr. Chairman, that that is true. Of course it has never been contended that Alaska coal could be shipped into many parts of the United States.

The long haul and consequent high freight rates would preclude that. But when this bill was first brought forward it was said by its sponsors that we needed Alaskan coal to use

in the Navy on the Pacific coast. That argument, I must confess, never appealed to me very strongly, but even that poor excuse has been utterly shattered. Now comes the Secretary of the Navy and informs us that his department has completely abandoned the use of coal so far as future construction is concerned, and that many of the vessels already built are being fitted with oil burners, and that oil is to be the future fuel of the Navy. Nay, more, the Secretary informs us that the Government is now conducting negotiations with a view to Government ownership of oil wells, pipe lines, and refineries.

Mr. Chairman, we appropriated $75,000 at a former session for the purpose of testing the coal produced at the Bering mines in Alaska. The Bering coal was said to be the best to be found in Alaska. We have since appropriated double that amount for the purpose of testing the product of the Matanuska field. The test for the Bering coal has already been made, and the Secretary of the Navy reports that this coal is utterly unfit for use in the Navy. The other Alaskan coal has not yet been tested, but we have nothing upon which to base the hope or belief that it will prove superior to that already tried and found wanting. These tests were made by Government agents, friendly to Alaska and to this bill. In the first place, the coal was taken from the mine by employees of the Government. Five hundred tons were secured for the purpose. A large part of this coal was used, or attempted to be used, on the U. S. S. *Maryland*, and, as I have stated, proved worthless as a coal for use in the Navy. Those who were clamoring for the Alaska appropriation were dissatisfied with the test which I have described. They contended that the coal used was negligently mined and contained a large quantity of dirt and gravel. They demanded a further test under more favorable circumstances. The entire matter was in the hands of the friends of this measure, and a further test was made with this coal at the Government testing grounds at Annapolis. Fifty tons were used in this last test. In order to try the coal under the most favorable conditions it was washed and screened. The test was then made and the Acting Secretary of the Navy reported "with regret" that this coal was "unsuitable for naval use."

I do not contend for a moment, Mr. Chairman, that Alaskan coal can not be used in Alaska successfully for many local purposes. I know from all the reports that it can. But I also know with equal assurance that it is neither possible nor necessary to bring this coal to the United States, with the possible exception of the northwestern frontier.

The Government has in its employ a great number of persons whose business it is to examine into the mineral resources of the country. The geologists have examined very carefully and repeatedly our coal supply, present and future. They report that we have enough in sight here in the United States to last us and our successors in existence something over 7,000 years. That, of course, does not include the vast coal deposits in Alaska, where, if the report of the Weather Bureau is to be credited, a goodly quantity will be required for home consumption, in the event the farmers of New York City ever decide to go homesteading in that direction.

But, Mr. Chairman, it was not ordained in nature that man should live on coal alone. The miner of coal will need meat and bread. But the farmers of Alaska, say you, will supply these articles. What will the farmer take his pay in—coal? We have owned Alaska for more than half a century. In that time there has been marketed from Alaska products of the value of $446,000,000. That is a great sum; and yet the State from which I come produces cotton worth almost that much every year. What are the Alaskan products which produced these millions? The fisheries brought $148,000,000 of the amount. As stated, the fish are secured in navigable waters, and do not require the railroad. They are caught by means of enormous seines drawn by tugboats. Comparatively few men are required to perform this labor, and practically no white men are engaged in the work. These fish canneries are owned by corporations, who send vessels up from San Francisco laden with supplies and with Japanese, Chinese, and other laborers to do the work. When the canning season is over the entire product is shipped and the crews and workmen disappear until the following year. Nothing in that to require a Government-built railroad, is there?

In the time we have owned Alaska she has contributed $73,000,000 worth of furs to the market. These furs nearly all come from Pribilof Islands. The fact is a few natives live on these islands and secure the skins of the seals for the Government lessees, who in turn sell the furs. We have passed a law to stop killing these seals to a large extent. No matter how many Government railroads we had in Alaska, none of the sealskins would be shipped by rail, for they are secured in navigable water, the cheapest transportation in the world.

In all the years we have owned Alaska that Territory has produced $168,000,000 gold, not quite enough to pay the war pensions for 12 months. But this gold does not require railroad transportation. Practically all of it is mined near the coast. The gold production in Alaska year before last was $22,000,000, and last year it had fallen to $18,000,000. Of course, this gold production is a good thing and helps to sustain the world's supply of basic money, but it costs a dollar to mine every dollar of gold that is produced in Alaska or elsewhere. The miner digs it out of the ground, hands it to the Government, the Government mints it into the form of money, hands it back to the miner, and the taxpayer who gets it has to work for it. And, of course, that same principle applies to all that we get from Alaska, whether gold, furs, fish, copper, or coal.

Mr. Chairman, the people of the United States own about 95 per cent of all the land there is in Alaska, and its area is about one-fifth of that of the United States. In recent years we have inaugurated and are now pursuing a course in Alaska which to my mind is little short of idiotic. The cry of conservation swept the American people off their feet. As in the case of a great many good reforms, we went too far, and as a result we bottled Alaskan resources up completely.

For one, I am heartily in favor of opening up Alaska as rapidly as the interests of the American people demand it. I would permit every American citizen who wanted to go to farming in Alaska to have as much land as he could use in his business. I would lease the mineral and coal lands upon such conditions as would render monopolization impossible. With the Territory thus opened up, I have no doubt that railroads and other transportation facilities would be constructed as rapidly as profitable tonnage was at hand. Under such circumstances railroads would be built in Alaska wherever they would remunerate the builders for the money spent, and at such places as railroads would not be profitable I am unwilling to issue bonds to build them at public expense. It is very probable that the greater part of Alaska is not ready for development. Much of its soil will no doubt lie in frozen virginity until time is no more. In the years to come, when our population becomes dense, it may be that our remote posterity will be driven to dare the migration to this land of glaciers, but that time, Mr. Chairman, I am happy to believe, is far remote.

The white population of Alaska is only 30,000. This bill, which has grown from $35,000,000, as first presented, to $40,000,000, as we now consider it, appropriates more than $1,000,000 for each 1,000 of the white population of Alaska. And this $40,000,000 is just a starter. No one can doubt that if we embark upon the governmental construction of railroads in Alaska it will require many hundreds of millions before we get through with it. So it was with the Panama Canal, so it has been with all Government undertakings, and so it will be with this affair. The estimates for the work in Panama was $135,000,000. We have already gone far enough to see that it will cost $500,000,000. The engineers who examined this Alaska scheme have already submitted plans and specifications for railroads up there which they admit would require an outlay of $478,000,000. What will we do with these railroads when we get them built? The Government owns the coal land, and gentlemen tell us that it will never do for the Government to lease these coal lands to private individuals. What, then, can the Government do with these coal lands after railroads are built to them? Let the Government operate the coal mines, you say. Many of the advocates of this bill are already openly advocating Government operation of the coal mines in Alaska. Of course that follows inevitably if we refuse to sell or lease the property. But if the Government had the railroads built and the coal mines open, what would we do with the coal? We have enough at home to last us 7,000 years, and the Alaska coal is not suitable for the Navy, even if the Navy wanted to use coal. Would not the Government ultimately have to go into the manufacturing business in order to use the coal?

But when you get the advocates of this bill in a tight place they fall back upon the wonderful agricultural possibilities of Alaska. Happily we are not in the dark about farming in that country. The Government has been doing a little farming in Alaska for a number of years. We have spent $298,000 of the people's money in the farming business up in Alaska, by way of experiment, and the returns up to date have been $22,000. Your Uncle Samuel is about the only farmer I know of who could stand that kind of farming very long at a time. Of course our Government farm managers in Alaska are enthusiastic over the possibilities of that country. We are paying them large salaries and they can gratify their agricultural curiosity without stint. These Government farmers in Alaska are learned men, and I have no doubt that they are thoroughly honest and patriotic. But not one of them could make a liv-

ing farming. We professional men shine as farmers as long as we have a good income on the side to help things out, but the real farmers, those who pay our salaries, have to get up and hustle to make a living even upon good land in a good farming country. I know what I am talking about, for I am supporting a farm right now. It is only a small farm, it is true, but it knocks a right sharp hole in my salary check every month to keep it going.

What do our Government farmers say of Alaska? Prof. Chubbuck, who has charge of one of the experimental farms up there, says in a recent official report:

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.

Yes; the winters are very long in Alaska. They have, in fact, eight months of very severe winter there. During those eight winter months the sun does not rise until 10 o'clock in the morning, and it sets at from 3 to half past 3 o'clock in the evening. True, in the summer months, some three or four in number, the sun shines nearly all the time, but even at that it takes an entire summer to thaw out a piece of cultivated land 2 or 3 feet below the earth's surface. The land in its natural state is covered with moss several feet thick, and will not thaw out at all in summer unless this moss is removed. It is frozen as deep down into the earth as anyone has been able to penetrate. They have gone down 200 feet into the earth and found nothing but blue ice.

The cost of clearing land in Alaska is variously estimated at from $125 to $200 per acre. It costs the Government in excess of the latter sum to clear the land required for the experimental farms, but this is accounted for by the fact that the Government pays its farm hands in Alaska $7.50 per day and that private farmers get their labor cheaper. This is the report of our expert farmers, and I am prepared to believe it, for under our very noses here in the Capitol the Government pays at least twice as much for service as is paid by private employers. Not only is that true, but when one of our employees die we bury him at Government expense and let his salary run on six months after he is dead.

What about the fertility of Alaskan soil after it is cleared and thawed out deep enough to cultivate? I will let Prof. Chubbuck answer.

As already stated, generally speaking, Alaskan soil holds 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.

Prof. Chubbuck suggests several remedies for the sterility of these Alaskan soils, and one of these remedies is to allow the land to lie out every other year. Of course I have no idea in the world how a farmer could make a living farming in Alaska; but if such a thing were possible he certainly would have an easy time of it with only three months of growing season every year and his land lying out every other year; the balance of the time he could go to bed at dark, which comes on at about 3 o'clock in the evening, and rise with the sun the next morning, which would be in the neighborhood of 10 o'clock a. m. Nothing would remain to be desired by such a farmer except for the Government to give him a pension, which, of course, it would be absolutely necessary for him to have in order to buy food and clothing.

Mr. Chairman, I have not reached the decision to vote against this measure hastily. Many of our party leaders are supporting this bill, and it appears to be meeting with favor throughout the country. Under these circumstances I have felt it to be my duty to investigate the proposition most thoroughly. I have looked at it from every angle, followed it through the tortuous maze of lengthy reports, and read many hundreds of pages for and against its enactment. In every aspect of the proposition I can only see new burdens to be borne by the taxpayers of this land.

Why, sir, only 27 per cent of the tillable land in the United States is in a state of cultivation. We have countless millions of acres yet in a state of nature awaiting but the hand of labor to bring forth abundant yields. The worst of these wild acres is a better farming proposition than the best there is in Alaska. Why, then, is 73 per cent of the tillable lands in the United States standing idle? It must either be that there is not sufficient demand for farm products, not sufficient hands to work the land, or not sufficient railroads and dirt roads to open up these wild acres and handle the product of the soil. In either case no better reason can or need be given for the folly of the proposition to build railroads in Alaska. If the Government must embark in the business of building railroads, which I oppose, why not build them here at home, where our people can use them in developing wild lands which are naturally and admirably adapted to the maintenance of a prosperous and happy citizenship? We need more railroads all over the South and West. Not only do we need railroads, but we need good country roads to intersect these railroads that we already have to enable the people to get the products of their toil to market.

In my own district in Texas we have hundreds of thousands of acres of the best farming land in the world that never had a plow in it. These lands can be purchased at from $10 to $25 per acre. They are comparatively easy to bring into a state of cultivation. We have a long growing season and mild winters. Fuel is plentiful and water is pure and abundant. Less than 10 per cent of these lands are in a state of cultivation. Railroads are needed and country roads are needed to open up this fair land. What is true of my section is true of almost the entire South and, in part, of many other sections of the United States. Under these circumstances, how can I go back to the people who sent me here and excuse myself for writing a $40,000,000 mortgage against the property of the United States for the purpose of building railroads in Alaska?

If gentlemen will turn to page 417 of the 1912 Yearbook of Agriculture, they will find a very interesting article there from the pen of Mr. Jay A. Bonsteel, scientist in the Soil Survey. They will find from this article that the best trucking soils in the United States are along the Atlantic and Gulf coasts; that there are from thirty to fifty million acres of one series of this soil known as the Norfolk series, and that not one-tenth of 1 per cent of these lands are devoted to truck farming. More than 80 per cent of these soils have never been touched by the plow. In this article you will find a picture of a piece of this land in its natural state, and under this picture you will find these words:

Worth less than $10 per acre in this condition, but capable of producing $1,000 worth of truck crops per acre in a single year.

That particular land is in eastern North Carolina, but the soil survey shows that it is almost identical with the predominant soil in eastern Texas. Now, sir, there are but two reasons why this land is lying idle to-day; one is the limited demand for the food products which they will produce in such great abundance and the other is the want of transportation facilities. With all these millions of acres lying idle at home, pray, tell me where is the logic, where the wisdom of organizing a Dr. Cook expedition to icebound Alaska in search of a place to grow potatoes?

But it is well for the country to understand that this appropriation is but an entering wedge not only as to railroad building in Alaska but as to the activity of the Government in many schemes of like import. One is not compelled to go far to find advocates in Congress and out of it for every socialistic nostrum that the nebulous intellects of the past and present have conceived.

A Senator of the United States from one of the Western States, who aided very largely in the passage of this bill through the Senate, made the purpose of the bill quite clear in the following statement, made in the course of a speech in the Senate the other day. He said:

We do not propose to build these roads simply to get coal. If that were the sole purpose, we could build a line to the Bering River fields, equip it, construct docks and terminals, and make a harbor for not exceeding $4,000,000, and have access to all the coal we need for many years to come, not only for Government purposes but to supply the needs and demands of the Pacific coast. * * * In the bill which I introduced I provided for the reservation of a certain coal area and its development by the Government.

The Senator who gave utterance to his desire for the Government to enter the coal-mining business is recorded as a Republican. On the same day, or rather in the same issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I find the speech of another Senator, who proposes a remedy for poverty. This Senator is recorded as a Democrat. His proposition is as follows:

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

A little while ago some one discovered, or thinks he did, that radium is beneficial in the treatment of cancer. Immediately a bill was introduced in Congress to have the Government take over the radium mines and pay the owners of these mines some hundred millions or so as the purchase price.

Within the past few days the Post Office Department has strongly recommended the Government ownership of the telephone lines. I have not yet had an opportunity to examine the official report, but from the press copy I find the following:

According to the best available data the capitalization of the long distance and toll lines represents approximately $200,000,000, and the

capitalization of the entire commercial network approximately $900,000,000.

I also gather from this report, Mr. Chairman, that the Government ownership of these lines would increase the number of persons employed in the Postal Service from 290,000 persons to about 500,000 persons. It is, no doubt, still fresh in the minds of many of my colleagues that less than a week ago an amendment, known as the Reilly amendment, was ingrafted upon the Post Office appropriation bill providing that the Government should furnish free life and accident insurance to about 90,000 employees of the Postal Service, including rural and city carriers and others. My effort to defeat this proposition, though vigorously made, was unavailing. It is now insistently proposed to provide pensions for all the civil-service employees of the Government. The former President of the United States recommended that they receive a pension.

A mother's-pension law has been written into the statutes of several States of the Union, and a bill is pending before Congress to give the proposition national scope.

An old-age pension bill has been pending in Congress for several years, and is being urged now with renewed vigor.

Mr. Speaker, we are being swept off our feet by a clamor which, in my judgment, does not proceed from the mind and heart of the great body of the American people. Are we ready to cast away the sober democracy of our fathers for the hybrid faith of paternalistic State socialism? Is there nothing good left in the individualism under which this Republic has grown so great? I grant you there has been enormous abuses. Corporate wealth and individual wealth has been stacked mountain high by the fraudulent flotation of fictitious stocks and bonds. The public has been saddled with burdens without a corresponding benefit. Men have reaped where they never sowed. I grant you all. But the fault has not been so much with the law as with lethargic public opinion and the men whom the people delegated to execute the law. But public opinion has been awakened with a shock. With one mind we are all determined to correct these abuses. Much has already been accomplished. We have rewritten the tariff laws in the interest of the people; we have enacted a graduated income tax; we have taken the national banking system from private hands and placed it under Government control; we have broken the oppressive monopoly of the express companies with the people's parcel-post system; and we are very shortly going to write into the statutes of this Nation a law forbidding the formation or operation of trusts and monopolies, All this and more has been done. We are marching in unbroken ranks to the realization of the people's hopes. In this state of our affairs let us not become panic-stricken or hysterical. There is both good and bad in our established laws and policies. Let us not strike with the fury of enraged blindness, smiting both good and evil with indiscriminate hand. No good reform movement was ever blasted by reactionaries. We need not fear them. They are powerless to stay the righteous hand of the people's will. But many good reforms have been destroyed by excessive zeal. There are few good things in this world that do not become evil when carried to extremes. Mr. Jefferson declared that he found it more difficult to hold back into bounds of safety the overardent friends of liberty than to bring to proper advancement those who doubted the wisdom of popular government.

Public men are just now running to and fro as if they had been awakened to a disaster at sea. In good truth, the old ship has struck some rocks, but she is yet sound in her vital parts. She has sprung a leak here and there, but these can be stanched by cool and statesmanlike wisdom. There are many barnacles clinging to her bottom and pirates swarm her decks. But she is a good ship, this constitutional democracy of ours. The world has never witnessed her equal. For more than a hundred years she has rolled in safety through every storm and risen triumphantly from every shock. Shall we jump overboard now and give up the ship because, forsooth, there are leaks in the hold and pirates on the deck? How will we improve our condition by forsaking the old ship for the frail and leaky craft of socialism? For one, I prefer to throw the pirates overboard and stay with the ship. If she needs repair, I am ready with a stout heart to begin the work; and if we have not the courage, the strength, and the patriotism to do that, how will it be with us when we are aboard this new vessel, into which we are in a fair way to embark the history, the hopes, and the destiny of the people of this great land? If we flee from pirates, will they not pursue? Will not these and other barnacles gather upon the new ship, and in greater abundance? Will not plunderers be more numerous under the new system than the old? No, Mr. Chairman; the fault is not with the form and substance of our institutions but with abuses which it lies within our power to correct. I confess that I am alarmed at the feverish haste of gentlemen to increase and extend the activities of the Federal Government. Already Government employees muster an army ten times as numerous as followed Lee or Grant. Already they are organized for more pay and shorter hours, free life and accident insurance, and a Government pension to retire upon. Already they are sufficiently numerous and strong to give the average Congressman the buck ague when their interests are involved.

What will it be when the Government enters upon the operation of coal mines, oil wells, radium mines, refineries, railroads, telephones, manufacturing plants, and other suggested Federal activities?

It is just as well that the people who do not have an opportunity to view the details of governmental operations at close range should understand the inner workings of the great and necessary but altogether clumsy machine called government. It is well to understand that whatever the Government requires must be paid for at a much more expensive rate than private persons are under the necessity of paying. For instance, the Government requires many horses in the service, and to shoe these horses costs the Government anywhere from two to ten times as much as the ordinary individual has to pay. I remember some years ago to have served upon a committee in this House called the Committee on Expenditures in the State Department. Among other things that came out I remember that the expense of keeping one horse in that department properly shod cost the Government something like $50 a year. It costs the Government $25 and sometimes more per month to board its horses. It is generally understood that the Government will pay the top price for all it buys, and be content with the bottom price for all it sells.

Nearly the entire army of Government employees are now covered into the civil service. What does that mean? Nothing short of a job for life. What will we do with these employees when they grow old and are no longer able to do the work required of them by the Government? That question can be answered by a visit to the departments here in Washington. There you will find men and women tottering with age, scarcely able to stand alone, drawing their salaries and doing nothing to earn them. But why is this? you inquire. Because many of these old men and women have neglected to provide for old age, and now that they are old the heads of the departments have not the heart to kick them out into the street. This is the meat of the argument for civil pensions.

And what will it be when we pension this army of Government employees? Here again we do not have to look about us long for examples of the way the pension system grows. The Civil War is 50 years behind us, but there are three times as many names on the pension rolls as there were 20 years after the war. They first put on the pension rolls the soldiers who needed a pension, then all the soldiers, then their wives, then their parents, and finally their children. Civil War pensions have already amounted to more than forty hundred million dollars, and we pass private pension bills every two weeks. A more recent example can be found in the case of Spanish War pensions. Only a few hundred were killed on our side in that war, and the wounded was quite a short list, and yet the annual pension roll on account of that war now amounts to something over forty-two millions. The war of 1812 is a century behind us, but we are still paying pensions on account of that war.

Will not the employees of the Government soon be strong enough to make Congress give them pensions? And once they secure their demand will not the history of war-pension legislation repeat itself in the matter of the civil list? What, then, would be the fate of a Congressman who dared to stand between the countless horde of pensioners and the Public Treasury? He would be drawn, quartered, and cremated. Yea, he would be decapitated without the benefit of clergy.

And who is to pay for all these radium mines, railways, and telephones, anyway, and how is the payment to be made? The Government of the United States never has a dollar except as it taxes it out of the pockets of the people. In fact, the Government is the people in organized form. "But bonds will be issued," say our cheerful doctors. What is a Government bond, pray tell me, except a mortgage given by the people upon all that the people own? How is money to be raised to meet the interest on these bonds twice a year? By taxing the people, of course, for the Government has no way of raising money except by taxing the people, unless bonds were issued to pay the interest; but in that case it would not be long until no one could be found who would buy a Government bond.

Mr. Chairman, socialism is the folly and the fad of the hour, and I am sad of heart to see it, not only because I know that it will convert those who come to lean upon the Government into a race of hopeless and spineless dwarfs but because I know

that it will strain every muscle and every nerve in the bodies of energetic and independent men to pay the taxes to keep a great army of Government boarders at the public table. The greater part of the parasites that will breed under socialism like insects in the sun will come from the crowded cities. Our manly and independent laborers and our sturdy and frugal farmers will have to feed this hungry horde, and, like the cask of Danaides, it will be impossible to fill them, for their mouths will be ever stretched forth in open supplication, and their clamor will sound like the rush of many waters.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not vote for these nostrums of socialism; believing as I do, I would be worse than a public enemy if I did so.

I love the people of my district. I cherish sacredly the land in which they dwell. I have lived among them since my boyhood, and I shall be buried there. Many of them are my devoted personal friends, and a great majority of them have given me proof that neither the bitter tongue of the slanderer nor the honeyed lips of the demagogue can drive them from me. These people, Mr. Chairman, have a right to expect that I will have the courage to consult the public good rather than my political safety. They have a right to expect that I will give studious application to these great public questions and that I will do my duty as that duty appears to me. I can not hope that they will always agree with me upon all great public questions. The will of the people is the all-powerful equation, and I am thankful for it. If the time should come when I am out of tune with my people, they will no doubt bestow their commission upon another more nearly in accord with their views. But in the meantime I pray for courage to sustain me in the discharge of my duty as God gives me the light to see it, for if my strength holds out I shall speak my sentiments and vote my convictions though they slay me. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, if the distinguished gentleman who has just spoken [Mr. DIES] had lived in Massachusetts in the forties of the last century and represented a constituency from that State in this body at that time, he would have raised his eloquent voice to prove how impossible it would be for a civilized people to live on the arid plains of Texas. [Applause.] And do the two distinguished gentlemen from Oklahoma who have led the fight against this bill need to be reminded that 100 years ago the United States entered into a solemn treaty providing that it never would incorporate the region they now represent, either into a State or a Territory of the United States, but turning it over to the Indians, and considering it valueless for white men? [Applause and laughter.]

Such has been the history of our country. At every step which has been made we have been told that the Constitution was strained, that self-government was at stake, and that the legislation we were about to enact would prove destructive of the principles of our Government. Even in the short space of half a generation, during which I have had the honor to occupy a place in this body, I can recall numerous instances when I have heard the same speeches in opposition to other measures that I have heard in opposition to this measure.

Mr. FERRIS. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. FERRIS. The gentleman never has heard any speeches in opposition to such a bill as this, because we have never had such a bill as this before.

Mr. MANN. Well, let us see. When Col. William P. Hepburn, a great statesman, first proposed that the Government of the United States construct the Panama Canal as a Government venture, the same dire prophecies were exploited here and elsewhere which the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma now exploits in reference to another governmental undertaking of somewhat similar character. [Applause.] We provided in the end for the construction of the Panama Canal by the Government, for the reason that we believed it would not be safe to trust it to construction by private enterprise, which could not afford to undertake it unless guaranteed great profits; and we believed it wiser for the Government to do this. Who would change it now? Where now can you find the men who then denounced it as an act of socialism?

When some years ago we proposed to provide for a new Department of Commerce and Labor, the same dire prophecies occurred about the extravagant results to the Government. When we proposed here to pass the pure-food law, gentlemen said we were destroying the Constitution, that we were ruining the principles of our Government.

When we passed the white-slave law, gentlemen said it was destructive of every principle of government. When we have extended the work of the Agricultural Department, gentlemen have said, "This is pure socialism, the Government entering into private affairs and giving private help to the citizens of the United States."

The same dire prophecies have been made every time. They will continue to be made as long as government exists.

It is well that the opposition side is presented to these propositions, because we ought to hear both sides, upon the principle that a legislative body which has not the ability to determine what to do in a specific case, but is fearful of what it may want to do in some other case, and decides not on the question before it but on the fears it has for the future, that legislative body is unworthy to exist. [Applause.] Now, what are the facts? I am not unduly impressed even with the possibilities of Alaska. I am not unduly impressed with the fertility of the soil or the value of the coal, or the amount of gold which is procured from there, or the other industries which may exist or which may be developed in the future. That is something we may argue about. No one can tell. No one knows. When I was a boy going to the public school, on the map there was the great American Desert, and I was taught to believe, as other children of my age were taught to believe at that time, that out in the West there laid a region where it was impossible for men to live, comparable only with the Desert of Sahara. And yet in my short life—and I am still a young man [applause]—I have lived to see this desert bloom and blossom. I recall that when we had before us the bill to provide for Government construction in aid of the irrigation of arid lands the same dire prophecies were made that are made now.

Mr. FERRIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. FERRIS. Does the gentleman from Illinois think that if he had plenty of time he could give any justification for the expenditure of sixty millions of money within the last year?

Mr. MANN. I could.

Mr. FERRIS. What part of it?

Mr. MANN. Oh, the gentleman has had three or four hours on this question and I have only a few minutes, and yet he expects me to go into a matter of that kind. I recall that when a distinguished gentleman of great ability in this House made a speech against the irrigation bill because he believed that the farmers of his district were so narrow minded that they wanted to keep out new lands and occupancy by settlers raising new products, I went to the gentleman, who was a friend of mine, and suggested to him that he leave that speech out of the RECORD, because it would live to plague him. He left it out of the RECORD, and the next time he was a candidate for Congress a newspaper, which had opposed him theretofore, came out one day with a broadside favoring his reelection because he had helped to pass the irrigation bill, and appealing to the farmers to stand by him, and they did. [Laughter and applause.]

Now, what is the situation? We own Alaska; it is undeveloped and its resources are unknown. If one of us owned Alaska and had the power, what would the owner do? If I owned Alaska, what would I do? Give it away? No. Sell it? No. No one would know what is its value. Handle it and develop it yourself. What would be the first step of development? What has been the first step in development anywhere in the United States within the last 50 years? To build a railroad. [Applause.] And as the owner of Alaska we propose to build a railroad as the first step of development. We must also learn the value of Alaska. We would not give it away. We would not sell it; we could not afford to do that, and if we keep it we must find out the resources which are there, and, as men of common sense, we should develop our own property by making it possible to learn the resources, and the first step is to build a railroad. [Applause.]

Gentlemen decry Government ownership of property. That question is not before us. The Government owns a great deal of property. The Government owns a great many facilities, and the Government is engaged in charge of work. When it was proposed to pass the parcel-post bill, why, gentlemen had all sorts of fits over the subject. Who is there now so brave on the floor of this House as to propose to do away with the parcel post? I yield to him to rise and show his face.

Mr. KINDEL. I do.

Mr. MANN. I am glad to know that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KINDEL] is opposed to the parcel-post law.

Mr. KINDEL. As it stands, it is a subterfuge and a fraud.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman says he is opposed to the parcel-post law, but the gentleman is really in favor of making it stronger. No; we hear these prophecies. We are engaged in more or less Government activities, but because we are engaged in one does not bind us to do all. Because we adopt one proposition does not bind us to adopt all propositions. We should consider each one on its merits, and a legislative body that can not do that is not able to worthily legislate for the people. I

believe that we ought to do fairly not only by Alaska but we ought to do fairly by our own constituencies and our own country in developing the resources which belong to them and to us. I believe that we ought to pass this bill authorizing the President to construct this railroad within the narrow limits prescribed. [Applause.]

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, for nearly half a century we have owned and controlled the great Territory of Alaska. Purchased for an insignificant sum of money, it has already added to the wealth of the Nation $470,000,000 worth of products. We have barely touched the surface. We do not know yet what treasures that great Territory, one-fifth as large as continental United States, still conceals from the world. But we do know in this progressive part of the opening of this new century that our duty to ourselves, our duty to the rest of the world, demands that we now unlock the treasures of this great section of the earth's surface. [Applause.]

We have the best of reasons for believing that the coal fields there are greater than the coal fields of Pennsylvania; that the marble possibilities are greater than those of Vermont, and we are beginning to understand from investigations made by our Agricultural Department that there are agricultural possibilities in that great Territory of ours.

Between the sixtieth and seventieth parallels of latitude in Europe lie the countries of Norway, Sweden, Finland, and the Provinces of northern Russia, and there are 11,000,000 people living there who are self-supporting. When we exported foodstuffs—when we produced more than enough for ourselves—we did not send any of it to that part of the world. Corn from the Argentine Republic is not going there now. Chilled beef from Australia is not going to this section of Europe. They are producing there all the foodstuffs that the 11,000,000 people who live there consume. They have established stable governments; they have built great cities, splendid public buildings, while from the ports of Norway sail the great fleets of black merchant ships that carry so much of the commerce of our own country. We have not been making agricultural experiments in Alaska, as stated by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], for nearly 50 years.

Only a little over six years ago in a small way our Agricultural Department commenced to make experiments there. When I want to find out something about the possibilities of Alaskan farming I do not intend to depend too much upon the advice of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], who admits that even down there in Texas, in that fertile section of the world, where the sunshine is abundant, he is a failure as a farmer. [Laughter and applause.] The gentleman from Texas reminds me of Daniel Webster. Daniel Webster was a great orator. He was a brilliant statesman, but he often made mistakes. The gentleman from Texas is not a great orator nor a brilliant statesman—he will admit that himself—but he makes mistakes oftener than Daniel Webster ever did or ever could. [Laughter.] Why, when we were talking about adding to our territory forever the great agricultural section of the Northwest, the Oregon country, that section out of which we have now carved three great States, when from the interior of the Oregon country there came from the few settlers who lived there the demand that we take care of our own, when Daniel Webster and the other statesmen of that time were intent upon protecting just a few hundreds of acres of woodland upon the Maine border—when these demands came from settlers in the Oregon country Daniel Webster made a speech with reference to that section of the country, its worthless character for agricultural purposes, its ice and its snows and its undesirability from every standpoint, that reminds me very much of the speech made this afternoon by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], and I want to read now what Daniel Webster had to say about Oregon a little over three-quarters of a century ago. Daniel Webster said:

> What do we want with this vast worthless area, this region of savages and wild beasts, of deserts, of shifting sands and whirlwinds of dust, of cactus and prairie dogs? To what use could we ever hope to put these great deserts or these endless mountain ranges, impenetrable and covered to their base with eternal snow? What can we ever hope to do with the western coast, a coast of 3,000 miles, rock-bound, cheerless, and uninviting, and not a harbor on it? What use have we for such a country? Mr. President, I will never vote one cent from the Public Treasury to place the Pacific coast one inch nearer to Boston than it is now.

Daniel Webster's claim to statesmanship does not, of course, rest upon that speech, and in the future the claims of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] to statesmanship will not rest on the speech he made here this afternoon. But, Mr. Chairman, the demand for the Oregon country continued, and finally resulted in establishing forever our claims to that great section of the world. The years passed; the British attempted settlements in Oregon. Whitman and Lovejoy undertook in the dead of winter their journey to the Capitol through the snows and the ice of the Northwest, and when they arrived here, describing the possibilities there, opinion had not changed much, apparently, because the Senators from South Carolina and other States were making just the same kind of speeches that we hear to-day against the development of Alaska. Senator McDuffie, following Senator Calhoun, of South Carolina, made a speech which reads very much like the minority report of the committee in this case, and 20 years from now the speeches made against Alaska here will sound just as amusing as the extracts from the speech of Senator McDuffie, which I propose now to read. The Senator, replying to Senator Benton, and speaking of the Oregon country, said:

> Has the Senator—
>
> He demanded of Senator Benton—
>
> examined the character of the country? As I understand it, about 700 miles this side of the Rocky Mountains is unhabitable, where rain scarcely ever falls, a barren, sandy soil. There are three successive ridges of mountains extending toward the Pacific and running nearly parallel, which mountains are totally impassable except in certain parts, where there are gaps or depressions to be reached only by going some hundreds of miles out of the direct course. Well, now, what are we to do in such a case as this? How are you going to apply steam? Have you made anything like an estimate of the cost of a railroad from here to the mouth of the Columbia? Why, the wealth of the Indies would be insufficient! You would have to tunnel through mountains 500 or 600 miles in extent.
>
> It is true they have constructed a tunnel beneath the Thames, but at a vast expenditure of capital. With a bankrupt Treasury and a depressed and suffering people, to talk about constructing a railroad to the western shore of the continent manifests a wild spirit of adventure which I never expected to hear broached in the Senate of the United States. And is the Senate of the United States to be the last intrenchment where we are to find this wild spirit of adventure which has involved the country in ruin? I believe that the farmers, the honest cultivators of the soil, look now only to God in His mercy and their own labor to relieve them from the wretchedness in which the wild and visionary schemes of adventure have involved them. * * * Why, sir, of what use will this be for agricultural purposes? I would not, for that purpose, give a pinch of snuff for the whole territory. I wish to God we did not own it! I wish it was an impassable barrier to secure us against the intrusion of others. This is the character of the country. Whom are we to send there? Do you think your honest farmers in Pennsylvania, New York, or even Ohio or Missouri will abandon their farms to go upon any such enterprise as this? God forbid! To any man who is to go to that country, under the temptation of this bill, if he was my child, if he was an honest, industrious man, I would say to him, "For God's sake, do not go there! You will not better your condition; you will exchange the comforts of home and the happiness of civilized life for the pains and perils of a precarious existence." But if I had a son whose conduct was such as made him a fit subject for Botany Bay, I would say, "In the name of God, go!" This is my estimate of the importance of the settlement.

Senator McDuffie's study of the Oregon question extended over some years. He gave to the matter much more attention and study than the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] has given to Alaska, and if his investigations led him to such conclusions as this, great God! what sort of conclusions would the gentleman from Texas have reached if he had studied the Alaskan question as long as Senator McDuffie studied the Oregon question? He continues:

> If the British had no claim to this territory, and there was nothing which impelled us to go with our military establishments and agricultural settlements, I would not consent, if there was an embankment of even 5 feet to be removed, to enable any population to go there. I do not wish to tempt the people to settlements there. I wish this to be a great empire, grown up by the natural course of civilization, and the natural extension of population. I thank God, in His mercy, for placing the Rocky Mountains there. I believe if it had not been for those mountains we would have been already in the Pacific. You can not civilize men if they have an indefinite extent of territory over which to spread their numbers; for so long as they spread their numbers, instead of becoming civilized they become semisavage. All agree that civilization can be best effected where the country is hedged in by narrow boundaries.

Now, all that we ask permission to do is to build there a pioneer railroad—a railroad connecting the open harbors of the south with the waters of the great navigable rivers of the interior of Alaska, connecting its valleys with all their possibilities, and who will say that between the sixtieth and seventieth parallels of latitude in Alaska you can not raise just as much as you can between the sixtieth and seventieth parallels of latitude in Europe, where these millions of people live in comfort and prosperity and happiness?

This bill contemplates a bond issue in order to provide the money with which to build these trunk-line railroads. We developed the great West by giving away land. We gave to the Northern Pacific Railroad at one time 43,000,000 acres of land, and in spite of the dire prophecies of Webster, and of Calhoun, and of McDuffie, the railroads were built. Great bands of steel reached the western sea, and the population in its westward movement across the continent followed them and developed those great States and brought them, in spite of Webster, very near, indeed, to Boston. [Applause.]

Canada is doing the very thing we are trying to accomplish in this bill. She is building railroads up there herself, some of them extending in the direction of the Territory of Alaska, with Government aid, Government bonds, for over 2,000 miles of railway. We are told in the daily press she has just completed a

lease for nearly 1,800 miles of railroad which she now has under construction, by the terms of which the rental to be paid for the use of that railroad will pay the interest on her entire railroad-aid bond issue. It is not too much to expect that the building of these pioneer railroads up there in Alaska will never be a charge on the people of the United States or upon the Treasury of the United States.

Webster and Calhoun and McDuffie can perhaps be pardoned for the position they took with reference to the Oregon country. Their opportunities for information as to the possibilities of that country depended merely upon reports of the few settlers who lived there. I am unable to reach the conclusion that those gentlemen who on this floor so vigorously opposed this proposition are entitled to the same consideration. Opportunities for information as to Alaska and its possibilities are ample. There are frozen rivers and long nights and high mountains covered with snow and cold winters in those sections of Europe between the sixtieth and seventieth parallels of latitude, just as there are in Alaska, and yet people live there, millions of people, happy, prosperous, contented. We have taken $470,000,000 worth of products in less than 50 years from Alaska, and to-day less than 40,000 white people live there. Without a proper system of railroads we can not expect a larger population.

Roads are a necessity for the development of every land. Roman generals at the head of Roman legions carried the Roman rule to remote sections of the known world, but back of the great crushing armies of Rome came her road builders, building hundreds of miles of good roads—the best roads the world had ever seen. Some of them exist to this day. Government aid for railroads is not an unknown thing in the United States. The pioneer western roads—the Union Pacific and the Northern Pacific—were built on account of Government aid. Enormous land grants made possible the completion of those roads and the speedy development of the western part of our continent in spite of the predictions of the legislators of that period. It is estimated by competent writers, excellent authorities on the subject, that in lands and in moneys, the States and the National Government have given in aid of railroad building in continental United States over $1,000,000,000. Competent authorities writing on the subject estimate that the donations of lands and moneys to railroads in continental United States amount, in the aggregate, to two-fifths of all the value of railroad properties in the United States to-day. We have built over 16,000 miles of railroad with Government aid.

There are only three things to do with Alaska and the time has come when we must do something. We must deliver over the Territory to the Guggenheims and the other interests who clamor for it; we must give it back to Russia, which, in my judgment, would be preferable to giving it to these interests, or the National Government must provide for its development. This is the method of developing Alaska which I stand for and which I believe the majority of the people of the United States stand for to-day. We can only develop a country by building roads, by building the best roads, roads which transport persons and property quickly, and in this age of the world railroads are the only kind of roads that answer this requirement. We aided by land grants only the Northern Pacific and the Union Pacific Railroads, but the other railroads followed without national aid and now a network of railroads covers the entire western part of this continent. Canada is building railroads and is issuing bonds in aid of railroads. Under the direction of the Canadian Government a railroad is being built now toward the great Northwest, penetrating the colder regions of the North—a railroad that will reach, when it is completed, almost to the Arctic Circle. When, under the direction of the President of the United States, the roads we are providing for in this bill are completed but a comparatively small gap will remain between the Alaskan system of railroads and the Canadian system of railroads, and it is not too much to expect that in the not too distant future an entire-rail route will exist from the great cities of our Atlantic coast to the interior of the Territory of Alaska.

Acting under the direction of the great departments of this Government, investigations have been conducted in Alaska. We know from the reports of these investigations that there is, in this great Territory, of water power as much as there is in all the Pacific Coast States. Alaska produces as much gold per annum as California, our greatest gold State. There is contained within the boundaries of this Territory more arable land than there is within the entire State of Oregon. Ten years ago we started in Alaska with a small herd of reindeer; now there are 47 great herds numbering in all 38,000 of these animals—food animals, all of them. In time, if these great herds increase in numbers as rapidly as they have increased in the last few years, much can be accomplished in Alaska toward overcoming the cattle shortage in this country. The area of Alaska is equal to the area of Norway, Sweden, Finland, England, Scotland, and Ireland. Within its boundaries there are 100,000 square miles of rich valley lands available as arable and grazing lands. It has been demonstrated that oats, barley, rye, potatoes, and all the vegetables can be successfully grown in Alaska. All the vegetables that can be raised in the Temperate Zone in America will grow as far north as the Arctic Circle and even beyond that, according to the investigations made by this Government.

It will cost the Government less to build this railroad than it would to subsidize with land grants a company to build it. Does anyone doubt the fact that if we gave away these coal fields—even a comparatively small part of them—to the Guggenheims or to other great combinations of capital in this country they would build this road and be glad to build it? The time has passed when any portion of our public domain or any part of the mineral wealth under the soil can be given away to great combinations.

This bill contemplates Government operation of the railroads to be built under it during the period of construction. The roads may then be leased, just as Canada has leased the roads she has built; and is it too much to expect that we can lease them as successfully as Canada leases her railroad properties? Is it too much to expect that we also can obtain enough rentals for these properties to pay the interest on the entire bond issue contemplated in this bill, just as Canada has done? We have in Alaska the largest and most productive fisheries in the world. That section of Europe to which I have called attention, and which supports in comfort 11,000,000 people, and which exports its products to other sections of the world, in area is only a little over one-third larger than the Territory of Alaska, but taking into consideration the possibilities of the Alaskan fisheries it is not too much to expect that in Alaska as many people can live and prosper as do live within the same parallels of latitude in Norway and Sweden and Finland and the Russian Provinces.

This is an administration measure, and the measures advocated by this administration are popular. In compliance with the suggestions of a Democratic President, carrying out progressive Democratic policies, in this bill we are taking the first steps toward unlocking the great storehouses of Alaska. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] is recognized.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, this Alaskan proposition is not an appeal to reason, and rests on no solid foundation of assured fact. We are blithely going forth, like the boy in the fable, in quest of the pot of gold at the end of the rainbow. In the minds of many, this project is invested with all the glamour that attaches to the far distant, the mysterious, the problematical, or the unknown. So far as the merits of this enterprise are concerned, the essential features are easy of ascertainment, and if this House would pause for a moment, to apply to the matter in hand, the facts that may be readily derived, not from glowing prospectuses, or rhapsodical descriptions of dreamers who are dreaming dreams of an El-Dorado in Alaska, but from the accounts of dispassionate travelers, and the reports of Government officials charged with the duty of investigating, and making report on the resources of this country, it would have no difficulty in arriving at a conclusion adverse to the recommendations of the committee.

Mankind is curiously constituted, and eternally verifying the maxim, quot homines, tot sententiæ.

Bring forward a scheme of governmental construction in some far corner of the earth, in Hawaii, in the Philippines, at Guam, and millions of dollars are voted with a lavish hand. Then submit a commonplace proposition of homely, domestic interest, one that involves no speculative, or problematical elements, but is to be prosecuted under such conditions of assured success, that the results to agriculture, commerce, and industry in every form, may be stated in terms of positive and impressive import, and at once the same people who are ready to construct a railroad into Utopia, or to run a tunnel under Bering Strait, begin to talk in a strain of unfamiliar and unwonted economy. They question whether the party platform covers such a scheme, or perchance hint that it is not within the purview, or contemplation of the Federal Constitution.

I remember that a year or two ago an ingenious gentleman presented to the public a great project, namely, one to cause a deposit upon the Grand Banks, of the sand and other sediment carried by the Labrador current, so as to create in time a great submarine embankment across the banks, thereby deflecting the cold polar current, inducing the most wonderful climatic changes in the Northern Hemisphere, cutting off the icebergs in their stately procession to the south, and dissipating the fogs on the coasts of the United States, Canada, and the British Isles. This project was referred to, if I am not mistaken, by

the Scientific American, and it was even stated that a bill to make the same effective, would be introduced by a Member of Congress. I have often wondered why this has not been done.

Mr. MADDEN. It has been so introduced.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Has it? Well, I am not surprised. I felt assured that a scheme so full of fascinating possibilities, as outlined by its friends, would find supporters in Congress. Who knows what may yet be accomplished, when this enterprise is put on its feet by a liberal appropriation from the Federal Treasury. The flowers that bloom in the spring, may cover the sunny fields of Labrador, and the orange groves of Florida may find formidable rivals in the one-time cheerless wastes of Newfoundland. Before we expend too great a sum in Alaska, we ought to reserve a nest egg for the development of this hopeful enterprise in the turbulent waters that cover the Grand Banks. What is Alaska? The answer may be briefly given: "Alaska is a land of immense distances, great natural obstacles, sparse population. It is 1,500 miles from Ketchi Rau to Bering Straits. The great fjords, arms of the sea; the immense glaciers, Malaspina, 80 miles across; the high mountains, Mount St. Elias, 18,000 feet; Mount Denali, 20,000 feet; the volcanoes, Katmai, whose ashes tinted Algerian sunsets; the wide and turbulent rivers, Copper, Kuskokwin, Yukon; the extreme cold in the interior, 70° below zero; the rainfall and snowfall, 110 inches at Juneau, all sufficiently exemplify the natural features of this great Territory. The population is about 1 to 20 square miles."

There is so much misconception about this entire situation, and so much misapprehension as to the real facts about climatic and other conditions in Alaska, that I do not deem it amiss in this connection, to refer to conditions in other countries in the older world that are found along the parallels of latitude that run through this portion of the United States. Upon a survey of these conditions, and the achievements of the people inhabiting these areas, we will be able to forecast the likely returns from our expenditure of thirty-five millions in this country. Alaska is practically between the sixtieth and seventieth parallels of latitude. A friend of mine, talking to me a day, or two ago, about this bill, said: "Do you not know that the center of Alaska is in the same latitude as Scotland, and other countries of continental Europe where a great agriculture is successfully prosecuted?" This statement, though made in good faith, is wide of the mark. Examine the globe now in the Hall, and you will find that Mount St. Elias which is in the southern part of Alaska proper, is in the same latitude as northern Labrador. I eliminate, of course, from consideration, the narrow strip which forms the panhandle constituting southeastern Alaska. Mount St. Elias is far above Scotland. The parallel running through Mount St. Elias, which is above Sitka, runs through the southern portions of Sweden and Norway, and above Stockholm. Below this parallel are the main agricultural portions of the Scandinavian peninsula.

Now look to central Alaska, Fairbanks, and the Tanana region, and see how they are situated with reference to Greenland, Iceland, and the corresponding countries of the Old World? Bear in mind that this is the region where it is supposed that the great agricultural development will take place. This portion of Alaska is clear above the northern extremity of Labrador. The sixty-fourth parallel of latitude is not a great distance above Fairbanks. This parallel runs through lower Greenland, Iceland, well above Scotland, and thence through Norway and Sweden below the Lofodens, and far above Christiania and Stockholm. Following the same parallel further, we find that it runs across the White Sea, thence by Archangel, and through the frozen portions of Siberia where the Samoyeds and other miserable and abject tribes are found.

Assuredly agriculture has never been pursued with any degree of success, or of profit, or to any considerable extent, in these subpolar areas. It is true that in all of Norway, and Sweden, and Finland, there are many people—millions of people, but comparatively few of them are pursuing lucrative agriculture, above the sixtieth parallel, much less in the latitude of Fairbanks. The inhabitants of these countries trace their history to the very beginning of recorded time, and by untold ages of painful, and protracted toil, have brought their soil to its present measure of cultivation. The existing state of agriculture in those countries is not due to any favoring conditions of soil, or climate, but to strenuous application, prosecuted through countless centuries.

These then are the facts with regard to farming in those latitudes of the Old World which correspond to the Fairbanks section of Alaska. Go to Sweden, and you will find that the chief agricultural operations of that country are in the lower portion of the peninsula. The same is true of Norway. Go to Russia, in the area about Archangel, and there is no agriculture worthy of note. Moreover this agriculture such as it is, finds its roots in prehistoric times. There is no present movement of population into these countries, but on the contrary a steady outward flow, largely into the United States. As far back as history goes, we find the pressure of local conditions inducing emigration from Scandinavia. Knowing nothing of fairer climes, fancying that all the world was as forbidding as their native land, ignorant of life under other conditions of greater opportunity than prevailed at home, their first colonies were established in the northern latitudes.

Iceland was settled from Norway. Later, as the sagas of Iceland inform us, emigrants from that country established themselves in Greenland, and maintained a flourishing colony in that forbidding environment during a long period of time. But these migrations have ceased. The colony in Greenland is only a memory. The glories of Iceland have vanished. With increasing knowledge, the flow of emigration has turned in other directions. No mileage of railroads in Greenland, or Iceland, or northern Scandinavia would attract colonists and settlers to those countries. The world is wiser now than it was in the days of the Vikings, and there is no movement of population toward Greenland, though lower Greenland is in the latitude of Fairbanks. And yet the advocates of this Alaskan proposition, with full knowledge that even an emigrant from Iceland, or Norway, or Finland, or Sweden, leaving as he would, a settled country, with homes and schools and civilization, could not hope to better his condition as an agricultural pioneer in the bleak interior of Alaska, insist that if we build railroads into that country, a great flow of emigration would set thitherward. Whence would it come? Surely there is no farmer in any State of this Union, living under conditions so untoward, or unhappy, that he would be attracted to a country where the soil is frozen everywhere to bedrock, and land selected for agriculture must be cleared for such limited crops as may be raised, at an expense of from $125 to $200 an acre.

This Alaskan project stands on two legs, coal and agriculture. How about the coal? I think it is but just to the committee to say, that if it had been able to forecast the reports that would be submitted on the coal of Alaska, the present report would not have been made. I find in the committee's report the statement that there are "quantities of naval coal on the route between San Francisco and Yokohama." What are the facts as to this coal? What are the reports from the Navy Department?

The Secretary of the Navy, speaking of coal from the Bering River field, and Dr. Brooks says that there is little to choose between the Matanuska and Bering River coal, states in a recent letter, that "the run of the mine is not fit for naval use." But this coal was submitted to an additional test. It was screened and washed, and then burned. Even under these conditions, the coal used yielded only about 75 per cent of the power secured from Pocahontas coal. Concluding his letter to Mr. Davenport, relating to this test, the Acting Secretary of the Navy wrote as follows: "The department therefore notes with regret, that the Bering River coal sample, has thus far proved unsuitable for naval use." Speaking of this same coal, Dr. Brooks, of the Geological Survey, makes the following statement: "In the physical composition it leaves much to be desired, so far as we know." He further stated that for naval purposes, it might contain too large a percentage of slack. This forecast was verified by the naval tests.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia yield to the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Certainly, I will yield to my friend.

Mr. HOUSTON. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the statement of the Secretary of the Navy in regard to this Bering River coal.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Which Secretary is that?

Mr. HOUSTON. Josephus Daniels, Secretary of the Navy. His letter is dated January 31, 1914. He says:

In reference to my previous letter to you in regard to the tests of Bering River coal I desire to invite particular attention to the fact that these tests only relate to the coal actually tested.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Of course. No one would think otherwise.

Mr. HOUSTON. The Secretary proceeds:

As stated in my letter, there is nothing to show in the tests just completed what may be expected of coal taken from greater depths on other veins.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Of course the tests can only relate to coal that is actually tested. But a test is made from a sample, and this sample is supposed to be representative of the thing sampled, otherwise what is the value of a test?

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. This coal was selected for the deliberate purpose of showing that Alaska coal was suitable for naval pur-

poses. But the result was disappointing, deeply disappointing to the advocates of this measure.

Mr. TAGGART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Certainly.

Mr. TAGGART. There is an abundance of coal in Alaska, is there not?

Mr. SAUNDERS. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. TAGGART. In case it is necessary for the fleet to operate in the Pacific Ocean, there is no coal there with which to operate, and the eastern coal is hauled there. In case of an emergency the coal in Alaska is exactly what the fleet would have to have and would have to use.

Mr. SAUNDERS. To what emergency does the gentleman refer? Is the gentleman lugging the old Japanese war scare into this debate, in order to justify an expenditure of untold millions in Alaska?

Mr. TAGGART. No. But the gentleman has not answered my question.

Mr. SAUNDERS. What is the gentleman's question?

Mr. TAGGART. Why is a fleet operating in the Pacific or in any other ocean?

Mr. SAUNDERS. The gentleman has not propounded a question that I can answer.

Mr. MADDEN. Is not the latest report of the Navy Department to the effect that the coal brought down from Alaska and tested showed only 43 per cent of the efficiency of the Pocahontas coal?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes; and having reference to efficiency, it will be far better to bring suitable coal from the coal fields of the eastern seaboard, than to send our fleet against a hostile fleet in the Pacific, with a supply of inferior and inadequate coal in its bunkers. Of course this is upon the theory that our country is to fight for the control of the Pacific, and that a great naval war in that ocean is inevitable. For one, I scout the suggestion of such a war, and regard it as too improbable for serious consideration.

Now, as to the facts about Alaskan coal and its alleged value for naval use. Mr. Secretary Daniels, with reference to the Bering River coal, has stated that a large sample of this coal was mined for the purpose of testing its value for naval purposes. The results of these tests both as to the run-of-mine coal, and the same coal after being washed and screened, have been furnished. If these tests had been satisfactory, if the coal had met the anticipations of the gentlemen who have spoken in such glowing terms of the possibilities of Alaska, the opponents of this measure would have been confronted at every turn of this debate with the official reports establishing the efficiency of Alaskan coal for naval use. But the unexpected results of these experiments have confounded the advocates of the bill, and they are now seeking to minimize the value to be attached to the official tests.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Certainly.

Mr. BOOHER. Is the gentleman familiar with the test made three years ago at Bremerton?

Mr. SAUNDERS. No. I prefer to take the latest test, for the obvious reason that this test was devised for the very purpose of ascertaining the value of Matanuska and Bering River coal for naval purposes, and to afford support for this scheme of railway construction in Alaska.

Mr. BOOHER. Was not the Bremerton test made for that purpose also?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I do not know. I am not acquainted with the results of that test.

Mr. BOOHER. Does not the gentleman know that this coal that was tested last was not mined coal at all? Does he not know that it was just coal taken off the mountain side?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Well, if that is so, such a fact is certainly a reflection upon the people who conducted this test.

Mr. BOOHER. But that is true.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Let us see if it is true. The purpose of the inquiry was to ascertain the value of Alaskan coal for naval purposes. Presumably it was conducted under such conditions that its results would be valuable either in the way of proof, or disproof, of the claims preferred for this coal.

Now you tell me that these tests are valueless, and yet we are expected to rely in other directions upon the representations of a department that is apparently incapable of making an efficient test of bituminous coal. But as a matter of fact Mr. Secretary Daniels states in his letter to Mr. Davenport that a large sample of Bering River coal was mined.

Mr. DIES. That test cost $75,000, did it not?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I do not know the figures; but surely a department which conducts an inquiry at such an expense, should not be discredited by its friends. There is no evidence to show that these tests have not been properly made under adequate conditions. I can not agree with the friends of the bill that the conclusions of this expensive inquiry are to be regarded as inconclusive and insufficient.

Mr. FERRIS. Is it not the solemn duty of a gentleman interrupting another gentleman here to present an authority more recent than the December letter from the Navy Department.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Of course it is. I am calling attention to the fact that the tests which have been recently made, are adverse to the claim that Alaskan coal is suitable for naval use. If there is any reliable evidence in its favor, it is certainly the duty of the friends of this measure to present it. We have had too much speculation, too much theory, too much loose talk about the possibilities of Alaska. Above all things, we desire facts, facts, and then more facts. We are more concerned with probabilities, than possibilities, with facts, than with fancies, or highly colored dreams. A test is intended to be an ascertainment of value, and this particular test was ordered for the very purpose of affording material support for this scheme of Alaskan development. The result has been disconcerting. It is a case of being hoisted with one's own petard, and the friends of the bill having recovered from their first astonishment, are seeking to discredit the credibility of their witness. Vain endeavor. Like the fisherman in the Arabian Nights who opened the bottle, and released the malignant genie, they are the authors of their own misfortune. Having invoked this test, they must abide by its issue, and will not be aided by their eager efforts to discredit an ascertainment of their own seeking.

The Secretary of the Navy writes that the experiment shows that the run-of-the-mine from the Bering River field is unsuitable for the use of the Navy. Coal taken from the surface would hardly be styled run-of-mine. There are two horns to this dilemma. Either the test discredits the claims preferred for this coal, or the ability of the Navy Department to make an efficient test, is discredited. Take either horn you choose.

Mr. HAMLIN. Does the gentleman insist that it makes no difference with the value of coal if it is allowed to lie on the ground exposed to the elements for years? Does the gentleman claim that makes no difference?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Oh, no. Of course I do not claim that.

Mr. HAMLIN. The gentleman has just stated that.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I do not claim that it makes no difference; but coal of proper value, does not lose that value by lying on the ground for a while.

Mr. HAMLIN. Does it not ever deteriorate?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Oh, to some extent. But I wish to ask you this question. What value do you attach to a test deliberately inaugurated, and conducted at a considerable expenditure by that particular department of the Government which is most vitally interested in the inquiry? When we invoke the results of this test as an argument against the value of Alaskan coal for naval purposes, you gentlemen who favor this bill, wave us airily aside, and in substance declare that the test is valueless, or at least inconclusive. What value is to be attached to any information afforded by a department of the Government if the result of a $75,000 experiment is to be whistled down the wind in this fashion?

If the test had stopped with the run-of-mine coal, you would have said: "Wait until we screen this coal and wash it. That is the test which will ascertain its real value." Then if the coal had responded to the screen test, you would have been jubilant, and insisted that at last the truth had been revealed. But the last test afforded no better results than the first. What does the Secretary say in relation to this coal, after both tests had been completed?

> The department therefore notes with regret, that the Bering River coal sample has thus far proved unsuitable for naval use.

Are there any more recent tests? If so produce them. Is there any more recent information, or is there any more recent scientific ascertainment reversing the former tests and showing that the Bering coal, or the Matanuska coal is suitable for naval purposes? If not, we must abide by the report of Secretary Daniels.

I wish to call the attention of the committee to another statement in the report which serves to illustrate the character of the arguments that are used to bolster up this Alaskan proposition. First we are told that we need a supply of naval coal in the Pacific. Then in order to justify the construction of railroads to haul this coal to the coast, the report proceeds to afford an estimate of the coal that may be needed in the future, to supply the fighting ships. In addition the report gives the present cost of transportation from Pocahontas to San Francisco. This cost is fixed at from $5 to $8 a ton. Proceeding to multiply the amount of coal required, by the cost of transportation, the

committee does not take the average of cost, but uses the maximum of $8, as a multiplier.

In their attempt to estimate the coal needed, they predicate a great war in the Pacific, with some unnamed enemy, presumably Japan. This war is to last 12 months. Now this last hypothesis is absurd. There is no possibility of war in the Pacific with any power, save Japan, and conceding that war with the latter, is a possibility, the United States can not afford to build railroads into Alaska, upon the theory of a 12 months' war with that country. The era of protracted naval wars has passed.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I will say to the gentleman from Virginia that that is an exact quotation from Secretary Myer.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I have no doubt that what you say is true. The Secretary was making an argument for a big Navy. His estimate provided for 200,000 tons of coal a month, for 12 months, or a total of 2,400,000 tons of coal. Multiplied by $8 a ton, this made the handsome total of $19,000,000 in round numbers, and furnished a conclusive argument, in the mind of the Secretary, for the development of Alaskan coal. This is a sample big Navy argument, and is apparently cited with approbation by the committee, as justifying the measure submitted, from a military standpoint. I reproduce this feature of the report, merely to show that in this, as in other directions, the suggestions of military necessity are used to afford an excuse for extravagant appropriations. Surely the limit of absurdity has been reached, when the excuse for developing Alaska at an enormous expense rests in large part upon a chimerical war in the Pacific, that is to last for 12 months, and require 2,400,000 tons of coal for naval purposes. The absurdity of this suggestion is made more apparent, when attention is called to the fact that the battle fleets of the future are to burn oil, and not coal.

Mr. HARDY. Is it not the duty of the Government to see if by the development of the Alaskan fields they can not obviate the necessity——

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. HARDY. Let me finish the question. Is it not the duty of the Government to see if it can obviate the necessity of hauling Pocahontas or Pennsylvania coal clear around the Horn to get it over into the Pacific?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes. I am ready to vote for a reasonable appropriation of a few millions to try out the coal fields in Alaska. But the plan submitted contemplates a system of railroads to develop the agricultural possibilities of that country. Our party platform calls for the one, it does not contemplate the other. There are no agricultural possibilities in Alaska.

Mr. HARDY. I am rather inclined to agree with the gentleman, that we can not afford to build that road just for agricultural purposes.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Then why do you support a proposition that provides for roads to develop agricultural possibilities below the Arctic Circle.

Mr. HARDY. Because there is an undeveloped wealth of mineral resources there.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Let us see as to the mineral resources. There is of course gold in Alaska, but there is no reliable information as to the amount. It is stated that $18,000,000 of gold came out of Alaska last year. How much of that gold came from Nome, how much from Treadwell, and how much came from that interior to which your railroads are heading? A railroad into interior Alaska to enable miners to prospect for gold that may, or may not be there in paying quantities, does not appeal to our business sense. The road to Fairbanks is designed to develop an agricultural country. It will be an expensive road to construct, and an expensive road to operate. From Chitina to Fairbanks the road will pass through a country that will afford practically no tonnage. Is the outlook for tonnage from the country surrounding Fairbanks any better? Apparently in the judgment of the committee it is. The Fairbanks-Tanana area is described in the report as the garden spot of Alaska. But this garden spot is not a translated Florida, or California, a land of balmy zephyrs, and perennial bloom. It is farther north than Labrador. It is in the same latitude as Iceland, Greenland, northern Scandinavia, Archangel and the White Sea. The soil is frozen to an unknown depth. I hold in my hand a report by Mr. Seth Mann, who describes himself as the representative of President Wilson on a tour through Alaska, under the auspices of the Seattle Chamber of Commerce.

Describing the agricultural lands of interior Alaska, he says that they are covered with a thick growth of birch, spruce, poplar, aspen and other small timber. As a preliminary step to farming in that country, the homesteader must cut down the small growth, get rid of the roots, and then remove a foot of moss and tundra in order to give the soil that is intended to be cultivated, the first glimpse that it has had of the sun for the ages of ages. This initial expense of preparing the ground runs from $125 to $200 an acre. "A pioneer will have invested in preparation, the total cost per acre of first-class farm land near a good market in an old country, before he will begin to raise anything to sell in this dayless night, and nightless day region."

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Will the gentleman read from Mr. Mann's statement where he has to remove a foot of moss and tundra?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I will.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. If he so states, that is not the fact.

Mr. SAUNDERS. This report of Mr. Mann was mailed to us in order to influence our votes in favor of this bill. My friend ought not to seek to discredit this witness. He is a witness for the plaintiff, and a friend of this project, though he damns it with faint praise. The following extract is taken from page 12 of Mr. Mann's report:

> Great level stretches are visible from the boat as one steams down the Yukon and the Tanana. The land is covered with a thick growth of small timber consisting of spruce, birch, poplar, cottonwood, and aspen. Owing to the freezing of the soil in the winter season, the trees in this section have very shallow roots, reaching down only about a foot or so below the surface of the soil. 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 about a foot in thickness, must be removed and the soil exposed to the summer sun.

There is a popular impression that the railroads projected under this bill will open up considerable areas of valuable timber. But there is no support of fact for this impression. There is no timber in the interior of Alaska, and comparatively little along the coast. Hence there will be no forest products to furnish tonnage for the railroads.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The Forestry Bureau believes it.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Where are these forests? I concede that there is a little timber on the coast line, but the railroads in contemplation are to run from the coast into the interior. Get away from the coast, and the timber dwindles into insignificant and worthless growths. While great possibilities have been claimed for mining and agriculture in the interior, these possibilities have not been extended to include timber.

Now Mr. Mann may be mistaken, but at least his report very clearly states that a foot of moss and tundra must be removed to expose the surface soil to the mellowing influences of the summer sun. This is the land that is presented as the future home of millions, happy in the enjoyment of mills and schools, and factories, and well-tilled farms. Whence, I ask, will these people come?

Having in mind that in any State of the Union good farms with improvements thereon, may be purchased at a price per acre far below the sum required to prepare an acre of this Alaskan land for cultivation, pray tell me why anyone should put behind him a country of civilization, of schools, of churches, of abundant opportunity, and leaving the sweet precincts of home, betake himself to the wilderness of the Tanana and the Yukon, to shiver through six months of winter and darkness, and begin life anew under the grim and forbidding conditions of this cheerless land? [Applause.] Mr. W. D. Joyce of the Saturday Blade, accompanied the Seattle excursion through Alaska in 1913, and gives the following description of the land to be farmed in that country by homesteaders and settlers: "No warmth comes from the soil, or beneath the surface. As far down as a shaft has ever been sunk, over 2,000 feet, you find ice. This ice was not made by freezing from the top down. For millions of years the country has been built up from the bottom, ice on ice that never thawed out in the summer. The moss that grows everywhere is a complete protection from the sun, and when you sink a pick through it, you think you have struck rock. Clear off this moss, other vegetation, and scrub timber, and you have the frozen earth. The sun will draw out the ice and frost about 1 foot the first year. Break this up, and the next year it thaws out deeper. After a number of years, by June 1, the frost will disappear down 2 or 3 feet."

Mr. WILLIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I will yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. WILLIS. I understood the gentleman to be quoting a few moments ago from the report of Seth Mann.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I did.

Mr. WILLIS. Will the gentleman state upon what page he was reading?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Page 12.

Mr. WILLIS. Will the gentleman object to reading from pages 13 and 14 what Mr. Mann actually said?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Does the gentleman from Ohio suggest that I have read what he did not say?

Mr. WILLIS. Oh, no; but he says a lot more.

Mr. SAUNDERS. But I am not undertaking to read the entire report.

Mr. WILLIS. What the gentleman did read gives an incorrect idea of the conclusions of Seth Mann.

Mr. SAUNDERS. In what way?

Mr. WILLIS. If the gentleman will read pages 13 and 14 he will see.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I have not undertaken to quote this report in full, though I would be more than willing to do so, if time permitted. This document emanates from a friend of this enterprise, but taken as a whole it presents a most discouraging picture of so-called agricultural Alaska.

Mr. FERRIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. FERRIS. I do not want to take up the gentleman's time, for I am interested in every word that he says. But he made a statement with reference to the ability and power of the people of the United States to purchase land in the United States. I hope that he will add that there are more than 300,000,000 acres of public lands that they can have for the asking and taking it and residing upon it here in the United States.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes; my friend is undoubtedly correct and, as I have said, if we will look at this matter in a common-sense way, we will be quick to realize that nowhere in the United States proper is there a section so barren, cheerless, and uninviting that its inhabitants with a knowledge of conditions in Alaska, as depicted by Mr. Mann, would be willing to exchange the meagre opportunities at home, for the chances of agricultural betterment in that far distant land.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman's time be extended 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia has an hour, but he was to be notified when he had used 30 minutes.

Mr. DAVENPORT. I want to say to the Chair that there will not be as many gentlemen who desire to speak in opposition to the bill as there are of those who favor the bill, and for that reason a proportionate division of the time would give those in opposition to the bill longer than those in favor of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is trying to equalize the time in that respect.

There are many applications for time, and there are only about four more Members who are to speak against the bill. The Chair is giving them more time than he is assigning to those who are to speak in favor of the bill. Under the rules of the House, the gentleman from Virginia has one hour.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, I will proceed a little further. For the benefit of my friend from Ohio, I will read from Mann's report:

> The growing of various grains is as yet largely in the experimental stage. But crops of wheat, oats, barley and rye are matured on the Government farms. The summer season is short for the maturing of wheat, but there is much less difficulty with the other grains mentioned. Some hay is cut by individual farmers.

Great possibilities in the matter of hay have been claimed for Alaska, but Mr. Mann dismisses these possibilities with the curt statement: Some hay is cut by individual farmers. To continue:

> The interior of Alaska is more favorable for agricultural purposes than the regions along the coast.

I now call the attention of my friend particularly to this sentence:

> It does not appear that Alaska will ever export the products of agriculture.

Think of the undeveloped areas of the United States proper that we are asked to disregard in favor of a region that will never under the most favorable conditions, export the products of agriculture! Why go to Alaska to expend thirty-five millions, when greater possibilities lie at our door requiring but little expenditure for their development? In this connection, I will reproduce the cautious, not to say discouraging remarks of Dr. Piper of the Agricultural Department who has been conducting some experiments in Alaska:

> 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 farming. That is, in other words, I fear that the greatest danger to the proper development of the interior of Alaska would be of holding out too roseate hopes of what can be done in the way of its agricultural development.

Prof. Chubbuck, another representative of the Agricultural Department in Alaska, gives an equally gloomy picture of prospective agriculture in that country. I quote from page 27 of Prof. Chubbuck's report:

> DIFFICULTIES THAT CONFRONT THE HOMESTEADERS.
>
> 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 the 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.
>
> 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.

Are these mucky morasses, so vividly described by Prof. Chubbuck, likely to tempt homesteaders and agricultural pioneers from the United States to take up life anew under the discouraging conditions of central Alaska? Bear in mind in connection with this talk about promoting agriculture in this sub-Arctic area that only about 27 per cent of the tillable land of this country, excluding Alaska, is now under cultivation. According to the recent figures put out by the Department of Agriculture, there are 823,000,000 acres of tillable land in the United States which have never been turned by a plow. The "back-to-the-soil" advocates can find land nearer home, under fairer skies, and more attractive surroundings than even the most enthusiastic boomers of this visionary project can claim for this land of tundra, reindeer, and frozen wastes.

I will now reply to some of the arguments of the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. RAINEY.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Certainly.

Mr. RAINEY. Will the gentleman inform us what the value of agricultural products is that the United States itself is exporting at this time?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Oh, the gentleman is a member of the Ways and Means Committee and ought to be more familiar with the figures than I am. He must know how much wheat for instance we are exporting. The figures are not at hand, but I know that we export a vast amount of agricultural products.

Mr. RAINEY. We did not raise last year enough for home consumption.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Of agricultural products?

Mr. RAINEY. No. We are bringing in corn from Argentina and oats from Canada.

Mr. SAUNDERS. What are the figures of our agricultural exports for last year?

Mr. RAINEY. I do not know how much we exported last year. We did not produce enough for home consumption.

Mr. SAUNDERS. We may have imported some food products, bananas for instance, but we exported quantities of others. The Department of Commerce gave out the following figures of agricultural exports for the month of December, 1913. It is easy to see from these figures that the aggregate value of our agricultural exports during the past 12 months has been enormous:

December, 1913.

Animals	$541,204
Breadstuffs	11,786,026
Unmanufactured cotton	81,945,936
Eggs	286,212
Fruits and nuts	3,423,916
Hay	87,237
Meat and dairy products	13,053,224
Seeds	326,939
Unmanufactured tobacco	4,837,936
Vegetables	390,927
Total	116,679,557

I believe we are importing some beef, but we are also exporting a great deal. In this connection I wish to say that the reports show that Alaska will never become a stock country. The winters there are too long, and too hard, making the cost of feeding too great, even if the necessary forage could be raised in the summer. With our knowledge of cattle raising in Iceland, and northern Scandinavia, not to speak of Greenland and other countries in the same latitude as interior Alaska, we hazard nothing when we say that the high cost of living will never be reduced by cheap meat from Alaska. In one respect, however, meat from that country would enjoy an advantage over its New Zealand or Argentina competitor—it would not require artificial congelation. The processes of nature would be sufficient. Build these railroads, and the mining and all cognate industries will import their foodstuffs. Business men will always do what it is the cheapest for them to do. They will buy in the cheapest market, and the cheapest market for foodstuffs will always be outside of Alaska.

Mr. Chairman, we are continually reminded that our forefathers were mistaken about the possibilities of the great West.

The men of that day knew nothing of the West. To them it was as much terra incognita, as the vast stretches about the South Pole, are to the men of to-day. Hence they were not in a position to make a forecast, or form an intelligent judgment. But we know the facts about Alaska, and the history of countries where conditions are similar. We are not groping in the dark for facts, but are full handed with authentic information, climatic, agricultural, and geographical.

The committee informs us that during six months of the year there is a great deal of sunshine in interior Alaska. We know that, and we also know that for six months there are long nights, and intense cold. Follow the Fairbanks parallel around the world, and at every point on that parallel will be found the same amount of sunshine. There is much sunshine in Greenland, in Arctic Lapland, even at the North Pole, but those countries have never become agricultural countries by reason of that fact. Our friend from Alaska [Mr. WICKERSHAM] speaks with apparent pride of the legions of mosquitoes in Alaska. There are mosquitoes in Greenland, mosquitoes at the North Pole, mosquitoes throughout the Arctic regions, but something more than mosquitoes are needed to attract immigrants into a new country. Some years ago I read a lively account of a trip across Arctic Lapland. We are accustomed to think of that country as a land of frozen, wind-swept wastes, inhabited by wandering Lapps eking out a precarious existence by raising reindeer. The Lapps and the reindeer are there, but in the summer the country is more like Central America, than the conventional idea of the Arctic. The travelers made their way through bogs, and morasses, across lakes, and clear flowing streams, harassed at every step by clouds of ferocious biting insects. And yet, though Arctic Lapland is at the edge of a great population in Europe, it has never attracted immigrants, and has never become an agricultural country. It is as waste, cheerless, and uninhabited to-day as it was 5,000 years ago. Despite the continuous movement of peoples throughout Europe during its entire history, no tide of emigration has ever set toward Lapland. In many respects Lapland corresponds to the descriptions that have been given of Alaska. Indeed reindeer have been imported from Lapland into Alaska on account of the similarity of conditions in the two countries.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] has cited the attitude of certain distinguished men in the early days of the Republic toward the possibilities of what was then the unknown West. Those gentlemen were groping their way. They were not possessed of the facts. Is it a fair conclusion that because our forefathers erred in respect of a matter of which they were confessedly ignorant, therefore every scheme of modern exploitation is to be justified? Does it follow that every scheme with "millions in it," is to be commended by the men of to-day, because men of another generation fell into palpable error, from lack of familiarity with the actual conditions of the territory west of the Mississippi, vaguely supposed to be a land of trackless wastes, and barren mountains, inhabited by fierce tribes of savage Indians?

But if we sin in this matter we will sin with knowledge. We know the actual conditions in Alaska through first-hand information, and if these reports are in anywise challenged, then the voice of wisdom suggests delay until the facts can be ascertained in the most definite and authoritative fashion. It is said that Alaska is a treasure house, a land of unbounded possibilities. Are there no treasure houses, no possibilities nearer home? We are told that we owe a duty to the 15,000 sojourners in the inhospitable interior of that country. Do we owe no duty to the people at home whose money will be expended with lavish hand to build these trial railroads, with which to feel out this land, and ascertain what of value is contained within its forbidding portals?

Upon what does the committee seek to rest this report? Upon the last Democratic platform? There is not a line in that platform that justifies the scheme submitted in this bill. The Baltimore platform declares that we should open up the coal lands of Alaska under such conditions as will keep them out of the hands of monopolizing corporations. This can be done with an expenditure of a few millions. I would gladly support a common-sense proposition for building a line, or lines into these coal fields. This done, and the roads opened, we could try out the value of the coal and the cost of mining and transportation to the coast. Incidentally prospectors could ascertain the presence and possibilities of other minerals. If on trial it is found that Alaskan coal can be mined and sold on the Pacific coast at a cost to meet free coal from British Columbia, then the mines may be worked to their utmost capacity. But thirty-five millions will not be needed to finance such an experiment. A very moderate appropriation will suffice for a very thorough inquiry into the value of the Alaskan coal fields.

Mr. DIES. This bill has grown to $40,000,000 since the last time we had it under consideration.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Oh, the gentleman is mistaken about that.

Mr. DIES. But the Rules Committee brought in a rule providing that we should consider the Senate bill.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Well, if that be true, we ought to hurry along. If debate lasts much longer the bill will doubtless carry fifty millions. Perhaps it would be economy to pass the Senate bill to-day, lest by another Calendar Wednesday this measure may carry an even more staggering amount than fifty millions.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Oh, both gentlemen are incorrect in their statements.

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. DAVENPORT. If we are not operating under the rule that was adopted that made it in order that general debate proceed to-day on Senate bill 48, in lieu of the House bill, then the rule is improperly worded.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Of course we are operating under the rule.

Mr. DAVENPORT. The trouble about that is——

Mr. SAUNDERS. I can bring this matter to a head in a moment, by a simple question addressed to the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. DAVENPORT. If the chairman will permit me, it may have been intended, as suggested by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT], that this morning under that rule the chairman of the committee would suggest that that rule be construed to say that it was a substitute for an amended bill reported back, but the rule does not so state.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Does the Senate bill carry $40,000,000 or not?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. It does.

Mr. HOUSTON. Will the gentleman allow me to state what the proposition is? It is to take up the Senate bill and consider that in lieu of the House bill. The Senate bill was referred to the Committee on the Territories, and that committee has reported it back to the House and recommended its passage after striking out all after the enacting clause and substituting the House bill, which carries $35,000,000 only.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Even our House committee could not stomach the Senate bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. On the point that is engaging the attention of the committee I find, on page 15 of the Senate bill, the following:

Provided, however, That the total amount authorized by this act to be appropriated shall not exceed the sum of $35,000,000, including any sum in or by this act appropriated.

It is the Senate bill.

Mr. SAUNDERS. How could the House bill strike out five millions from the Senate bill, and leave a residue of thirty millions, unless the bill carried forty millions? From what is the gentleman from Wisconsin reading?

Mr. HOUSTON. That is the Senate bill as reported back by the House Committee on the Territories?

Mr. DAVENPORT. The Senate bill carried $40,000,000 as it came to the House.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I understood the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] to say that it did not carry $40,000,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. I read the bill as it passed the Senate.

Mr. SAUNDERS. This is an illustration of the confusion that prevails as to every stage and every feature of this Alaskan proposition.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Who is mistaken, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD], or the gentleman from Virginia? I said the Senate bill carried $40,000,000 as it came to the House. Now, who is mistaken?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The gentleman is wrong.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Who is wrong?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. You are.

Mr. HOUSTON. The Senate bill originally carried $40,000,000.

Mr. SAUNDERS. That is all that I have said.

Mr. HOUSTON. It was sent to the House and referred to the Committee on the Territories, and reported back here carrying only $35,000,000.

Mr. SAUNDERS. When I made the statement that the Senate bill carried $40,000,000, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] rose to correct me, and read from printed matter before him, which he said showed that I was in error as to this statement. Who was right, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] or the gentleman from Virginia? I said that the Senate bill carried $40,000,000, and the gentleman from Tennessee said that his committee reduced it by $5,000,000.

Mr. HARDY. The whole error grew out of the statement of another gentleman, that you are now considering the Senate bill of $45,000,000.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Will the gentleman allow a suggestion, which is that he go on with his argument and let that quibble alone?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I will proceed, then, to refer to some other statements contained in the report, and in the arguments advanced by the friends of this measure. My friend from Ohio, Mr. BRUMBAUGH, in his speech of a day or two ago, undertook to establish the possibilities of agricultural development in Alaska, by the analogy of conditions in countries presumably similarly situated. He cited Denmark in that connection. I wish to say that Denmark is many a long mile south of the garden spot of Alaska. The sixtieth parallel of latitude runs above the peninsula of Denmark, and a long way south of the Tanana and Yukon Valleys. The descriptions of so-called agricultural Alaska continually remind the reader of northern Siberia. While Alaska is often compared with Siberia, the comparison only holds good with the northern portion of that immense country. A recent writer on Siberia describes it as naturally falling into three zones, running east-west.

First there is the northern zone, which is in the same latitude as Fairbanks, and is a region of eternally frozen soil, a mere veneer of which thaws enough to allow a growth of moss and lichen, in the summer. Below this zone is a belt of poplar, larch, willow, and other tree growths. Still further south, is the black-soil belt, the seat of Siberian agricultural wealth, and the home of the bulk of the population. This zone comprises the mid valleys of the great rivers, but is only one-fourteenth of the entirety of Siberia.

The third zone is hundreds of miles south of Fairbanks.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Is it not true that Greenland and Labrador present no parallel to this, because the Arctic current, carrying cold water and yielding off cold air, passes Greenland and Labrador, whereas this is influenced by a warm current from Japan?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I ask my friend whether there are any countries in the world, civilized, or uncivilized where agriculture is being successfully, much less extensively, conducted in a soil that is frozen to an unknown depth, to bedrock wherever it is found. Yet this is what is proposed to be done in the Tanana Valley. The cold facts about this region, and cold is the appropriate adjective, are that "the country is a frozen wilderness for the greater part of the year, a fly-plagued sweat bath for the balance of the time, and is otherwise just as it came from the hands of the Creator."

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I think that is a clear evasion of my question, but the question can be answered.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes, the question is easy to answer, and my question in a measure answers it.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I would like to have it answered.

Mr. SAUNDERS. The fact that this soil in Alaska is frozen to an unknown depth, shows that agriculture on any large scale will be as impossible in that country, as in Labrador, or Greenland, whatever may be the conditions in the latter countries.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Will the gentleman permit me to answer that in his time?

Mr. SAUNDERS. No. Has not the gentleman time?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Not nearly as much as you have.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I will have to proceed. It will be your task, in your time, to satisfy your colleagues who represent great States, with far-flung fields under a genial sun, States where there is social life and comforts, and opportunity, and where rich farms with complete improvements may be bought for $100 an acre, and in many cases for a less amount, that such are the possibilities of agriculture in Alaska that the men and the women of these States will turn their faces toward the aurora borealis, and under its flickering lights painfully cut down trees, grub out roots, and remove moss and tundra until at last the sun may shine upon the thin and sour soil from which thenceforward they will wring a reluctant livelihood. It is agreed that this initial expense will run from $125 to $200 an acre. At this rate the cost of preparing a farm of 300 acres for the plow, will run from $37,500, to $60,000. Great are the possibilities, likewise the disappointments that await the agricultural pioneer in Alaska!

Why the majority report quotes approvingly the statement of one gentleman to the effect that if we pass this bill, and open up Alaska there will be eventually four or five hundred million people in that country in 10 or 15 years. [Laughter.]

Mr. SLAYDEN. Five hundred what?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Five hundred thousand, I meant to say. I am so used to dealing with the figures of the Alaskan boomers that I become a little confused at times. [Laughter.]

Mr. SLAYDEN. Yes; but one is as good as the other. [Laughter.]

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes, that is true. It is just as likely that 500,000,000 people will be in Alaska in 10 years, as 500,000. Either statement is equally wide of the mark. Let me read you this, from Mr. Joslin, one of the Alaskan boomers. He says:

I think it is not unreasonable to say that if this approximately 1,000 miles of railroad was built and put in operation and the country opened up so that it could be used, its entire trade would go to at least five times its present extent, and its annual production would be five times what it is to-day. If the Territory were opened up its population, if it were to grow to five times the present population, would be about 175,000. That is scarcely a handful. There is no doubt in the world that 400,000 or 500,000 people could be readily attracted to Alaska in the next 10 or 15 years, and that its annual trade, which is now about $60,000,000, would go to $300,000,000 or $400,000,000 per year. Its gold output, which is now about $17,000,000, would increase to three or four times its present value. I believe that increase is entirely possible. Not only that, but I believe that within 10 or 15 years, assuming that the country is to be properly developed with railroads, the gold output of Alaska would equal $100,000,000 a year.

Now what would constitute this $400,000,000 a year in the way of trade? What form would it take? Of course we know that a great value of furs has come from Alaska since we bought it. But these furs would not afford any tonnage to the railroads that will be built under this bill. A few box cars will hold all the furs that will ever come out of interior Alaska. We know too that the value of the fish annually caught in Alaskan waters is very great. But these fish are caught on the coast. They will not be transported by the railroads, but will come to the States by steamships. Last year, I believe, $18,000,000 of gold came from Alaska. I do not know how much of this came from Nome, or Treadwell, but concede that all of it came from Fairbanks, and how much tonnage would it afford for the new railroad? About 12,000 pounds. The supplies needed for the men who wash this gold would be a negligible item for a great railroad. Of course it is argued that quartz mines may be opened, and placers worked on a much larger scale. All of this may be true, and doubtless to some extent will be true, but the evidence on this point is unsatisfactory.

The line from Chitina to Fairbanks will be 313 miles. It will certainly cost not less than $48,000 a mile. Some of the Alaskan roads have cost $100,000 a mile. From Chitina to Fairbanks the road will pass through a country that will afford no tonnage, a dreary, barren, unattractive waste. The initial cost of construction under such conditions, will be immense. Is there anyone with knowledge of the facts who fancies that the tonnage of machinery and supplies on this road, and the passenger fares, will ever render it self-sustaining, much less make it a dividend? If in the result it will not be self-sustaining, how long is it proposed for this road to be operated by the Government at a loss?

Dr. Brooks makes some interesting statements bearing on this Chitina-Fairbanks route. In part he says:

When we leave Chitina along this proposed route into Fairbanks, we traverse a broad upland, a gravel filled area where the rock has been buried to a depth of 300, and possibly 1,000 feet. Here there is no possibility of any mineral resources being developed. There may be some lignitic coal, under a part of this gravel, but not worthy of consideration. To the east, the gold and copper prospects seem promising, though there have been no extensive developments. To the northwest are some auriferous lodes, which might be of value, if they had transportation. These deposits are not on the main line to Fairbanks, but could be reached by a branch line.

In this connection Dr. Brooks suggested various possible branch lines or feeders.

But when you get to the mountains you strike a region somewhat mineralized, and not far from the route is the Slate Creek district, where some gold placers are found. These are about 30 miles from the main line. There is also the Valdez Creek placer district, perhaps 100 miles to the west. There are also some indications of mineralization along the main line, as soon as you reach the mountains, so that there is at least promise of some mineral development.

This is a very conservative statement of Dr. Brooks, and is in striking contrast with the glowing representations of the spokesmen for the Seattle boomers. Indications of mineralization, and a promise of some mineral development, afford but little ground of support for expensive railway projects. In this matter, we ought to have some regard at least for returns, and the considerations that are usually potent with prudent business men. The credit of the United States will not be strained to the breaking point, should it spend $35,000,000, or even $135,000,000 in railway construction in Alaska. We are rich enough to commit almost any folly. But why select Alaska as a field in which extravagance shall run riot? There are many States in the West that hold out a promise of "some mineral development," and are entitled to greater consideration than Alaska, if this House is anxious to make a record for chasing rainbows.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. LAFFERTY. What does the gentleman suppose the tonnage of provisions would amount to, going into the miners' camps, mining this $18,000,000 of gold?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Not very great. According to the friends of the bill, the farmers of Alaska will feed the miners. Alaska under the new conditions is to be self-sustaining. But the gentle-

man seems to think that the miners will be fed from the outside, and by implication he discredits the agricultural possibilities of the garden spot. In that I think that he is right. But should the United States build an expensive railroad into Alaska, in order to give miners a chance to prospect for hidden wealth? Is the Government going into the prospecting business? If the proposition is at last reduced to this basis, it would be well to equip a number of expeditions, and at a cost of half a million, if necessary, secure some authentic figures as to the gold deposits, the extent of their probable development, the number of people that they would be likely to attract, and upon the most favorable estimate, the amount of tonnage that these operations, and the industries incidental thereto, and in connection therewith, would afford to the Fairbanks Railroad. These figures, and some further figures as to the probable cost of constructing and operating the road, would give us a working basis. As it is we are making a leap in the dark. Look at this matter in a homely, common-sense way. The time is coming when we must report to our constituents, and give an account of our stewardship. They will ask us what we have done for the general uplift, for domestic development, for roads, and canals, and rural routes, and levees, and reclamation projects, and when we recite the long list of measures of popular interest that failed of passage, measures of domestic interest that have been awaited with eager expectancy, will we be able to justify ourselves by saying, Oh yes, we omitted to do these things, but as an offset, we appropriated $35,000,000 for the development of Alaska. Will our constituents be satisfied when we tell them that the imperious demands o Alaska absorbed the funds that otherwise might have been expended on domestic enterprises of transcendent interest?

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. BOOHER. What domestic enterprises does the gentleman refer to?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Well, for one, I think the development of good roads at home is of far greater importance to the people of this country than the building of railroads in Alaska.

Mr. BOOHER. Then the gentleman's idea is that it is a good idea to build railroads here, in order to uplift the people rather than let them help themselves?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes. I think we ought to build roads for our 90,000,000 people at home, rather than construct railroads for 15,000, or 20,000 people in interior Alaska. The rest of the 35,000 people of that Territory are on the coast, and will not be affected by these projected railroads.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Could not the gentleman find another avenue for the use of public funds in the drainage of swamp lands?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes; I could suggest many other and more hopeful projects for the expenditure of public funds.

Mr. SLAYDEN. You could recover the swamp lands in Virginia, for instance?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes; the Dismal Swamp if drained at an expenditure of a few millions, would afford homes for, and support more people, than will be found in Alaska in 100 years. Apply this thirty-five millions to relieve the rich lands of the lower Mississippi from overflow and you will open up to permanent settlement and cultivation, an area of inexhaustible fertility, equal to the aggregate of several present populous States of the Union. Such a work will contribute more to the sum total of human output, happiness, and national prosperity in the United States, than the utmost achievements in Alaska during a thousand years to come. [Applause.] The outcome of these domestic improvements will be positively beneficial, and capable of definite forecast. The other scheme is a chimerical quest of prosperity under positively adverse and impossible conditions.

Mr. LAFFERTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. LAFFERTY. Is it not a fact that we have expended over $100,000,000 on the Mississippi River?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Possibly, though I do not know the figures. That expenditure has been fully justified. Continued expenditures in that direction may be expected, as well as for rivers generally, harbors, and roads.

Mr. LAFFERTY. The gentleman mentioned the coal as not being fit for the Navy. Would the gentleman withhold the development of the Alaska coal fields simply because the coal was not fit for one particular purpose?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Oh, no, Mr. Chairman. I have already stated that I would gladly vote a reasonable amount for the development of the Alaskan coal fields. Such an appropriation would be in conformity with our Democratic platform, adopted at Baltimore.

Mr. LAFFERTY. We need the coal in Oregon, for instance, because it is fit for domestic use.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Should we build a railroad into the Bering River region, and one into the Matanuska coal field, we could try out the value of that coal, and determine the cost of mining, and the cost of transportation, in a word ascertain what of value is there, and whether this coal could compete on the Pacific coast with free coal from British Columbia. This would be the common-sense way to deal with this proposition, and I would vote for it.

Mr. LAFFERTY. Does not this bill leave it to the discretion of the President to build one railroad or two?

Mr. SAUNDERS. No. This bill provides for an ambitious scheme of railroads, and for prospective agricultural development, in the garden spot of Alaska.

Mr. LAFFERTY. But the discretion is left with the President.

Mr. SAUNDERS. In a measure it is left with him, but by passing this bill in its present form, we do not confine ourselves, as outlined in the Democratic platform, to opening up the coal fields. We commit ourselves to a much more comprehensive project, and indorse the report of the committee that there is a great field for agricultural development in that country. I maintain that we owe a greater duty—because it is a more obvious, and a more easily ascertainable duty, in its terms and extent—to our people at home.

Mr. LAFFERTY. Does not that agricultural development mean the incidental encouragement of agriculture?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Surely my friends on the committee are not willing for you to tone down their glowing report by the suggestion that the prosecution of agriculture in Alaska will be a mere side issue, so to say, to the development of Alaska? Will the development of the garden spot of Alaska be an incidental feature of this wonderful enterprise? Oh, assuredly not.

Mr. WILLIS. The gentleman has just referred to the opening of the coal lands. Does the gentleman think that if the coal lands of Alaska were opened, according to the plans to which he has referred, there would be a sufficient inducement in that to secure the construction of a railroad by private parties?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Where to?

Mr. WILLIS. Of course I mean the roads that would tap the coal fields.

Mr. SAUNDERS. We are to build those roads.

Mr. WILLIS. What I am asking the gentleman is this: Without any governmental action save and except the opening of the coal fields, does the gentleman think that would be a sufficient incentive to private capital to build these roads, without any action on the part of the Government?

Mr. SAUNDERS. If there is nothing in Alaska worth going after, of course private capital will not be attracted, but the construction of railroads into the coal fields will be the means of ascertaining what is there, and its value. That is what I wish to see done. Children first crawl, then walk. Let us crawl first on this proposition, and by spending three, or four, or five million dollars, afford the means of developing the coal areas. As an incident to this development, we will be able to ascertain what else of value may be found in Alaska.

Mr. WILLIS. The gentleman did not quite apprehend the point I have been trying to make. It has been said a number of times in this debate—perhaps by the gentleman; I am not sure—that if we merely open up Alaska private capital will go in there and build these roads.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Well that may be so. Build railroads to the coal fields, afford liberal leasing laws, and land laws, and wait on development by private capital. There is no need of reckless haste about this matter—Alaska will keep.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Will the gentleman allow an interruption?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Does not the gentleman believe that if there is any great mineral wealth in the Alaskan coal fields, of a kind which would offer a remunerative return to a railway corporation, if the Government opened it up, capital would go there?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Of course if there is anything of value in Alaska, and that value is once reasonably ascertained, and laws are enacted that will admit of adequate development—and such laws should be passed—private enterprise will develop Alaska as rapidly as it is necessary that it should be developed.

Mr. SLAYDEN. That is what the gentleman from Ohio wanted to know.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I object to the pursuit of the speculative, the problematical, and the possible, in preference to the definite projects of sober domestic development that are clamorously calling for our attention.

The report of the committee is very insistent that apart from other considerations, Alaskan coal must be developed for naval purposes. Of course the military element must be injected into this enterprise. Whenever arguments are lacking for an extrava-

gant expenditure, there is always a final appeal to be made in its behalf, that it is necessary as a vital feature of a proper condition of military preparedness. Unfortunately for the committee their argument in this respect has been completely refuted by the results of the naval tests. But even if this coal was suitable for naval use, why develop it at a prodigious expense for an oil-burning Navy? The Secretary of the Navy recently made the following official announcement:

The Government has definitely abandoned the use of coal in future fighting ship designs, and all destroyers, submarines and battleships are being designed for oil burners.

Plans for Government oil wells, and refineries to insure an adequate supply of fuel oil for the Navy, are rapidly taking shape. The special commission announced yesterday that hearings would begin to-day at the department. Later they will visit the Oklahoma oil centers, and make personal examinations of the fields.

So that long ere coal will be available from Alaska, the opportunity for its naval use will have disappeared. In this view, the ridiculous figures of a former Secretary of Navy, that Alaska should be opened up, because our fleet in the Pacific, might need 200,000 tons of coal a month for a war lasting 12 months, become, if possible, even more ridiculous. Another objection to this Alaskan project, if it is put on military grounds, is that it will later call for a great expenditure for troops, guns, and fortifications, duplicating our Panama experience in that respect. No estimate whatever was made in the initial estimates of the cost of the Panama Canal for fortifications and garrisons, at the terminals. The country was informed that its construction would be an economy, since it would tend to reduce the size of the Navy, by making the fleet more effective, and providing for an expeditious transfer from one ocean to another. As soon as the project was well under way, the country was advised that additional ships would be needed to protect the canal. To the same end, a demand was made for elaborate fortifications, great guns, and permanent garrisons at the Atlantic and Pacific terminals. It is perfectly obvious that if we are to have great coal depots in Alaska to supply our ships in the event of that war with Japan which looms with such portentous proportions in the mind's eye, of our jingo friends, we must protect these depots against attack. Otherwise we will provide a source of supply for our hypothetical enemy.

Already in Alaska we have wasted $800,000 or $1,000,000 on a perfectly useless fort. The friends of this measure need not think that $35,000,000 will be the limit of expenditure under this bill. The demand for fortifications, garrisons, and guns will include many additional millions.

Mr. LAFFERTY. Has the gentleman read the report of that commission that went up on the *Maryland*?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I have read the reports that have been submitted. They are authentic and convincing.

Mr. LAFFERTY. I mean, in the preparation for this presentation to the House, did the gentleman read the report of that commission?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I have not seen that particular report. I prefer to read the results of actual tests, and attach more value to them than to the speculations of wandering commissions.

Mr. LAFFERTY. Is the gentleman aware that the oil fields of Alaska are more valuable for naval purposes than the California fields?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I am not aware of it. Such a suggestion is not made in the report. Two of the pillars on which this project is supposed to rest, to wit; naval coal, and agriculture, having been overthrown. Is the gentleman seeking to erect another?

Mr. LAFFERTY. Does the gentleman know that the Alaska oil is better than the California oil for naval purposes?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I do not admit that there is any commercial oil in Alaska, but I would be willing to equip an expedition at considerable expense to try out the possibilities of oil fields in that country. No subject has been more thoroughly exploited, or caused more acute disappointments, than alleged oil fields.

Mr. LAFFERTY. They reported on the oil.

Mr. SLAYDEN. They do not transport oil by rail, anyhow.

Mr. SAUNDERS. No, the efficient modern method is by pipes, but I am afraid that this method might not be practicable in Alaska. The pipes might be frozen at the very time that war was raging, the Japs at our door, and the oil most needed.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The gentleman is mistaken about that. That oil is in a warm country.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Does it never freeze there?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. No.

Mr. SAUNDERS. This is a warm country, but we have freezing weather, all the same.

Mr. LAFFERTY. You could not freeze up that oil.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Why not, oil freezes at a low temperature. But as showing that the Navy is not looking to Alaska for oil, permit me to call your attention to the fact that at this very time, the Secretary of the Navy is making arrangements to secure a sufficient supply of oil in Oklahoma, and pipe the same to tidewater, in order to provide fuel for the future oil-burning ships.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. That might explain the objections of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. DAVENPORT. The gentleman from Oklahoma lays aside his personal and past record when he is advocating a matter of principle.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, I do not challenge the authority of the Government to build and operate these roads, nor do I anticipate any engineering difficulties, that will not be readily overcome. I have full confidence in the ability and resourcefulness of American engineers, and an even greater confidence in the length of Uncle Sam's purse. Indeed there are no engineering problems relating to railroad construction in Alaska. With the Government footing the bills, mountains may be moved, rivers bridged or tunneled, glaciers deflected, nature in her wildest forms subdued, but a successful engineering proposition, is not of necessity a successful commercial proposition. If we are trustees of the public purse, we must give an account of our stewardship. The figures cited in support of this project are misleading. Neither the fish nor the furs of Alaska will afford tonnage for the railroads. Much of the gold comes from Nome and Treadwell, which are at the water's edge. A comparatively small expediture will develop the coal, and private capital, under reasonable leasing laws will work the mines to the utmost limit of profitable operation. If they prove to be unprofitable as a commercial proposition, the Government should not undertake to operate them at a loss. The agricultural possibilities of this country are too remote to be taken into serious consideration, as a foundation for this enterprise. These possibilities are stated so cautiously, and with so much reservation by the Government agents who have conducted experiments in that region, that the statements of these agents are really warning signals, and should serve to discourage rather than encourage emigration to Alaska. Whatever may be the hopes that this country holds out to adventurous prospectors who are ready to take a gambler's chance, it affords no attractions to the agricultural pioneer. In time perchance, far down the centuries, the inexorable law of increase may fill to overflowing the countries that are blessed with a genial sun, and a generous soil. This will be Alaska's opportunity.

When the door of agricultural opportunity is closed elsewhere, reluctant pilgrims may take up the trail that leads to the frozen North. For the present, these doors are wide open. I do not question that there are brave and hardy men in Alaska. The conditions require men of that type, and to the extent of our duty, I am ready to aid them. But I submit that the expenditure proposed is in excess of that duty, and the results promised are speculative and problematical in their character. There are other obligations nearer home, where the population is greater, and the prospect of return from Government enterprises, more assured. The expenditure of this vast sum for the handful of people in interior Alaska, when a like expenditure in the United States will effect a far greater good, for a far greater number, will be a crime against humanity. This is a case of grotesque disproportion between cause and effect, between the amount to be expended, and the result that will be secured. When the mountain labors, and the product of parturition is a ridiculous mouse, it is an occasion for laughter. A lavish expenditure of millions to secure the pitiful returns likely to be afforded by the railroads in contemplation, will serve to discredit any political party that is associated with the enterprise. This enterprise calls for a thorough and painstaking inquiry, before we commit ourselves irrevocably to its prosecution. There is no occasion for haste. If Alaska is a treasure house, we may be assured that our treasure is secure. Thieves will not break through and steal. We hold the key, to be used in our own good time. The full development of Alaska will require 10,000 miles of railroad.

If limited to a cost of $48,000 a mile, this would make an aggregate of $480,000,000. I am unwilling to commit myself even partially to so gigantic a proposition. I am unwilling to go further than the requirements of our Baltimore platform, which merely requires us to open up the coal lands, so that they will not fall into the hands of monopolizing corporations. Even this plank does not commit us to the construction of railroads. The end sought may be effected by private capital under a reasonable leasing system. We are going headlong into a venture that holds out dazzling possibilities of unlimited expenditure by the Government. The same arguments that suffice to justify the present scheme, will be equally potent to induce further construction on a larger scale. If the United States owes a duty to the Tanana, and the Kuskokwim, the same obligations of duty will apply to other and more remote sections of that country.

This is said to be a new policy, calling for large expenditures. I am not afraid of a new policy, I am not afraid to expend

money. The public interests often require that money shall be freely expended. But the policy must be sound, and the expenditure judicious, to secure my support.

With the passage of this bill, I see the finish of many far more meritorious projects of domestic interest, projects to which we are committed by every consideration of duty, interest, and good faith.

Mr. Chairman, this proposition is fundamentally and radically unsound. It is not justified by our Democratic platform. It is not justified by the figures and arguments submitted in its behalf. Holding out no hopeful prospect of definite returns, within any time to which as practical legislators we should limit our contemplation, this measure is not entitled to our support. For one, I shall vote against it.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I think it is very fortunate that this great question comes before Congress unaffected by any shade of partisan feeling, and that it has been discussed entirely on its merits. It is in no sense partisan. President Taft favored the policy of the bill when he was in the White House, and so did Secretary of the Interior Fisher. President Wilson has strongly recommended it, and no clearer or more forceful words have been spoken in favor of it than by the present able and clear-seeing head of the Interior Department, Secretary Lane. While there seems to have been entire unanimity in executive circles as to the proper course to pursue, there is a difference of opinion in the Congress, and advocates and opponents are found on both sides of the main aisle at both ends of the Capitol. The friends of the measure have nothing to fear from the fullest and freest discussion of it, for it is a wise, patriotic, and truly progressive measure.

The differences of opinion in the House as shown by the discussion of the bill are very sharp. In the heat of debate there may have been some unconscious exaggeration on both sides. The climate and agricultural prospects of the Territory have been made the subject of mirth and ridicule and sarcasm by gentlemen opposed to the measure, and they have frequently relieved the tedium of the debate by brilliant sallies of wit at the expense of Alaska; but while wit often amuses it rarely convinces, and the friends of the bill are so conscious of the strength and justice of their cause that they are quite ready to enjoy these jokes of the opposition, well knowing that the good sense of the House will decide the question on its merits, not for to-day or to-morrow alone, but for the future.

Gentlemen opposing the bill, and notably my clever and genial friend from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS], took advantage of some highly colored statements for the purpose of his argument, erected a man of straw, and then proceeded to demolish him. I think that the truth lies between the extremes in this case, as in most other cases. But in my opinion no one, however bitterly opposed to the bill, will deny that Alaska has tremendous, or, as one report puts it, prodigious possibilities.

If some of the opponents of the bill are correct, Alaska is a continuous frost—a sort of false pretense, a gold brick that Russia cunningly worked off on us—and that money spent in building railroads there would be virtually wasted. They say the white population there has not increased appreciably in a decade; hence, what use to build railroads? They urge that enterprises conducted by the Government cost more than private enterprises; therefore the bill should not pass.

They say we should wait till the sturdy pioneers go there with their mule teams and ox teams and convert Alaska into a state of happy homes, and they predict that if the Government builds railroads there it will have to also go into the logging and coal-mining and gold-mining business.

I do not contend that the Valley of the Tanana rivals the Mississippi Valley or the Valley of the Nile in fertility. It is not at all necessary that it should in order to justify the vote I expect to cast for this bill. I do not claim that agriculture will follow the building of railroads in Alaska as it did in Illinois and many other States of the Union, nor do I think that Chicago will be duplicated on the Yukon or on the Tanana. It is not necessary that any of these things should happen to justify the passage of this bill. But I do contend that Alaska is a very wonderful country, full of tremendous possibilities, possessed of very great mineral wealth, and that it has agricultural land enough to furnish food for a population of many millions of people; and I see no reason why, in the course of time, the Territory would not have a population of at least 10,000,000 of brave, hardy, intelligent, freedom-loving American citizens. I do not expect that to happen right away, but I do think that in legislating for Alaska at this time we have a right to look forward to a time when it will be as populous and as prosperous as the corresponding territory in northern Europe, and that it is right and wise to make laws for it on that theory.

I do not expect that population to be wholly, or even mainly, agricultural. I do not expect many of the pioneers there to be farmers; indeed, I think agriculture will follow rather than lead; that it will be mainly incidental to the development of that country's wonderful mineral resources.

I doubt very much if many people would go to Alaska to farm for a living if that were the only attraction, but gold and silver and copper and coal and other minerals abound there; men will go there to develop this mineral wealth, and some will in due course take to agriculture to raise food products for the others.

Thus agriculture will follow mining and other industries until most of Alaska's 64,000,000 acres of agricultural land is brought into use. In the development of the Territory the mineral wealth will be the primary attraction; the development of the mineral wealth will take precedence, but the development of agriculture will follow closely on its trail.

That raises the question, What are the mineral possibilities in Alaska? I am not going to speak of the oil, although it is there. It may not cut much of a figure in railroad transportation. I will not speak of tin, because we do not know how much exists there, and it is a very scarce and valuable mineral. But as to the three leading ones—gold, copper, and coal—I say, and it seems to me too clear to be denied, that these are of tremendous, of prodigious value, and the development of them requires absolutely the building of some railroads, not so much for the gold, because gold, especially that obtained by placer mining, is of comparatively small bulk and may be carried on the person or by inferior means of transportation.

Mr. HARDY. How about the machinery to develop the gold?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I was coming to that. Many of the placer mines in the Fairbanks region are being practically abandoned, scarcely half worked out, because of the lack of machinery. Quartz mining also exists there.

But much of this mineral wealth, indeed most of it, is far inland, behind high and almost impassable mountain ranges, and little progress can be made in developing it without the means of transportation; that is, without railroads. A great storehouse of wealth lies back in the interior beyond the coastal mountain range, and, as the President has well said, railroads are the key to it. There is, and there can be, no other key to develop the mineral wealth lying in this great storehouse. Railroads are absolutely and indispensably necessary for that purpose. All agree about that.

But who will furnish the key? Who will build these railroads?

If they are built at all, they must be built either by some very rich and powerful syndicate, able to invest many millions of dollars and wait a long time for returns on the investment, or they must be built by the United States Government. Which is the safer and better course to take? [Applause.]

Mr. FERRIS. Can the gentleman conceive of any way that the Guggenheims or the Alaska Syndicate or anybody else could derive any monopoly from the leasing system?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. If they can not get a monopoly there they will not build the railroads.

Mr. FERRIS. Let me answer that.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I can not allow the gentleman to answer that in my time. The gentleman would not ask that on second thought, would he?

Mr. FERRIS. I would not. Go ahead. [Laughter.]

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. No combination of rich men, no syndicate, will undertake the work of building railroads in Alaska under all the circumstances, unless it has an assurance amounting to a guaranty that it will control the great natural wealth of the Territory. No concern would undertake so enormous an expenditure on any other condition, for the development of the Territory will, under the most favorable circumstances, be rather slow. If such a course is pursued, if we turn the wealth of the Territory over to exploiting syndicates, Alaska will inevitably fall into a far worse than medieval feudalism.

To permit the development of Alaska along monopolistic lines means an abandonment of our present national policy with reference to conservation. It would mean an abandonment of the theory that the mineral wealth in public lands shall remain the property of the American people, and adoption of the theory that such mineral wealth shall be turned over to the private syndicates and that they will then build railroads to that wealth. For I think it entirely safe to assume that no set of men with money enough or credit enough to build even the necessary trunk lines in Alaska would use their money or their credit for such a purpose without an assurance that they could control the mineral wealth of the Territory. The railroads now in existence there probably would not have been built if those who built them did not believe that they would get virtual control of the

mineral opportunities which these roads tapped. The Alaska Syndicate built its road from Cordova to the copper mines on this theory. Later, the syndicate surveyed and arranged to build a spur road from a point on this line to the Bering coal field, and this was doubtless done on the theory that they would obtain title in fee to the Cunningham coal claims and several other groups of claims constituting the cream of the Bering coal field. Under a change of administrative policy, these coal claims slipped from their grasp, and then the syndicate promptly abandoned the building of the spur road.

In this they acted wisely, for while it would doubtless be good business to build the spur if they owned the coal field, it would be a different proposition to build it when the Government owned the coal and merely leased the right to mine it.

Assuming, then, that if Alaska is to be developed at all it must have railroads, and assuming that private capital will not build them unless it is given a free hand in the exploitation of the Territory's mineral wealth, we are confronted by two alternatives—either the Government must build them, or we must abandon our present policy as to the conservation of our natural resources and hand all these vast opportunities over to private monopolies that will build them. There is no middle ground, and whether they so intend or not those who oppose the bill inevitably place themselves in opposition to the policy of true conservation.

In my opinion the American people want to give Alaska a chance, and they will not consent to abandon the policy of conservation, nor will they consent to turn over to any syndicate or to any monopoly the great stores of mineral wealth it contains.

POPULATION DECREASING.

It is contended by those opposing the bill that the population of Alaska is not increasing; that there are only 35,000 white people there; that there were as many or more people there three years ago; therefore we should not build these railroads.

It seems to me there is a lack of frankness and fairness in this objection when urged by persons familiar with the absurd laws now in force in Alaska. Under these laws the coal mines are sealed, homesteading is made practically impossible, cutting timber is a crime, and railroads struggling to live under impossible laws are taxed $100 a mile and denied the use of Alaskan coal.

Up to 1911 there was a prospect that the coal mines would be worked. But it developed that most of the coal entries were fraudulent, having been made with a view to consolidation into one huge monopolistic interest when the entrymen got title, and as a consequence nearly all of them have been canceled. The cancellation of the coal entries killed all hope of opening coal mines, and that in turn killed the railroad business and general development. Three thousand men left the Territory in 1911 and 1912 on that account alone. In addition to this many of the accessible streams which gave opportunity for placer mining are becoming exhausted, so far as the mining methods now in vogue are concerned.

Better machinery would make it profitable to work them over, but without railroads that machinery can not be had.

Valuable gold prospects in various places can not be developed for a similar reason.

Mr. FERRIS. Does not the gentleman think a lease law would remedy all of the ills of which he complains?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. No; I think a leasing law is necessary, but I think one step in the right direction is not enough. We must have leasing laws that are liberal, but before we can avail ourselves of them we must get the key, as the President said, which will open up these very valuable mineral assets.

The great cost of making surveys and the great expense of necessary traveling back and forth to Juneau prevent homesteading; and so it goes through the whole ridiculous round. Indeed, it seems as if the Territorial laws could not be made more effectual if the purpose was to prevent the development of the country. The laws in force are well calculated to drive out those who are there and offer no inducement to others to take their places. Is it candid under these well-known conditions to charge the diminishing population to a lack of natural advantages in the country? Is it frank or fair to argue that because under these wretched and disheartening conditions the population does not increase it is useless to give Alaska a chance?

It would be as logical to say that because swamp lands do not produce crops therefore they should not be drained, or to say that because few people have gone from the Atlantic to the Pacific by way of Panama, what is the use of digging a canal.

Alaska is starving for the want of railroads and for necessary legislation. Because it is starved it is not growing, and because it is not growing they say what is the use of helping it.

Does that kind of logic appeal to you? If it does, you should vote against this bill.

Such logic reminds me of a certain Oklahoma farmer. The corn crop was very short, but this gentleman had a lot of old corn in his cribs. He also had a large herd of stock hogs on hand. He was very closefisted and he grudged the hogs that 75-cent corn. He fed them very sparingly, so sparingly that they didn't get fat enough to market. They didn't even grow. He kept doling out the corn in this fashion till it was all gone, and the hogs looked as if they were being trained for a Marathon race.

Had he fed them properly—rushed them, as our farmers say—he could have sold them at a good price and had corn left.

The opponents of this bill seem to approve of his method. Like the farmer's hogs, Alaska is wasting from inanition while surrounded by marvelous opportunities for growth and development which it can not use, but they point to its emaciated condition, poke fun at it, and tell us it is growing leaner. They would have advised the farmer that his hogs were doing no good, and he should save his corn. Why throw it away by feeding it to them? The friends of this bill would have advised him to feed his hogs enough corn, to rush them, to develop them, and realize on them. Where do you stand?

Put Alaska on its feet, give its people a chance to develop its great resources, and a healthy increase in its population will soon follow, but do not cramp and harass it with bad laws and then condemn it because it does not grow. To do that is to add insult to injury.

RAILROADS PRIMARY NEED.

It is contended that even though the Government should adopt the policy of building railroads in Alaska, it should wait until the Territory is settled up, until it has a considerable population. This position is altogether untenable. In Alaska the conditions are such that the building of railroads, coupled with the enactment of liberal leasing and homestead laws, must precede any real development.

If the mines of Alaska are to be developed in any degree commensurate with the mineral resources of the Territory, efficient and proper machinery is a prerequisite. But how can such machinery be gotten to the mines without railroads? Would you transport heavy boilers and engines across the mountains and over the plains for hundreds of miles on dog sleds?

You can not get the necessary machinery to the mines nor can you get large quantities of ores from them without railroads, nor can you hope for the employment of large numbers of men in the mines without such machinery, and unless large numbers of men are employed in developing its mineral resources there will be little need for developing its agricultural resources, and the great storehouse will remain locked. What they tell us should come last must come first. Railroads in Alaska will be a cause, not a consequence. They must precede, not follow, a great growth in population. The ox team and the mule team do not and can not constitute a key to unlock that Alaskan door. There is only one key that will fit that lock, namely, railroads.

But how will the building of railroads through the Territory effect such a change? By making its great wealth easier of access. That has been the experience of the whole world. Ancient Rome did not confine its efforts in road building to the Appian Way. It made roads through the forests of Germany, it made roads in Gaul and in Britain. It could neither have utilized nor retained its hold upon these countries otherwise.

Great Britain did not wait until her possessions in Africa were populated before building the Cape to Cairo railroad. Russia built her trans-Siberian line through regions practically uninhabited. We built, at the people's expense, several transcontinental lines through territory practically uninhabited. In none of these instances were the industrial reasons for building as strong as they are in this case.

Coal, copper, and gold in great abundance lie in places now practically inaccessible, so far as economical production is concerned. Heartbreaking journeys by the most primitive methods prohibit immigration, and isolation from the outside world also tends to discourage it.

A few trunk-line railroads properly located would very largely overcome these difficulties. With such lines in operation modern machinery could be carried at reasonable cost to where it is so much needed. The journey inland, now so difficult, could then be made quickly, safely, and cheaply by rail. Mail could be delivered with reasonable frequency and regularity. The people in the interior would be connected with the outside world; they would become a part of civilization.

Under present conditions the miners at work in the mountains far away from cities have to quit the season's work in time to get back to civilization before the winter storms set in, but with railroads available they could remain at work longer in the autumn and return earlier in the spring, besides avoiding the dangers and discomforts of long journeys afoot or on dog sleds. Under these new conditions men who work in the mines and on the railroads would bring their wives and families to Alaska and establish homes. These would have to be fed and clothed and housed. The demand for food supplies would increase so that it would pay to raise such supplies there, and thus the agricultural land would be brought into actual use. All these results may be reasonably expected to follow the building of railroads and the enactment of liberal and practical laws for the utilization of both mineral and agricultural land, but they can not be expected to precede them.

This seems so plain and so clear that it is not easy to understand how there can be serious difference of opinion about it. This is the conclusion reached by almost every Government official and every disinterested person who has been face to face with the problem. President Roosevelt and President Taft, when in the White House, officially recommended the building of railroads in Alaska by the Government. Secretary of the Interior Fisher, after a trip to Alaska, said:

> What Alaska needs more than all else is a trunk-line railroad from the ocean to the great interior valleys of the Yukon and the Tanana, opening the country so that its future development may really be possible.

It was his judgment that the Government should build such a line.

President Wilson, in his message to Congress on December 2, well and wisely said:

> A duty faces us with regard to Alaska which seems to me very pressing and very imperative. * * * 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 it should itself control in the interest of all who wish to use them for the service and development of the country and its people.

Secretary of the Interior Lane says that a system of Government-built railroads in Alaska is the one way to make that country a real part of the world. It is the policy which will develop the Territory most safely and speedily, making its resources available to the whole people.

The Alaska Railroad Commission, consisting of Jay J. Morrow, major, Corps of Engineers, of the United States Army; Alfred H. Brooks, of the United States Geological Survey; Leonard M. Cox, civil engineer, of the United States Navy; and Colin M. Ingersoll, consulting engineer, after a very thorough, careful, and scientific survey of the whole field, unanimously recommended that the work of building the railroads called for by this bill should be undertaken at once and prosecuted with vigor; that the development of the Territory can not be accomplished without providing the railroads they recommend 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 also say:

> 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.

In a recent report on mining in Alaska in 1913 by the Geological Survey, the director, Mr. George Otis Smith, says that no marked progress can be expected in mining in the inland region until a system of transportation is provided.

Mr. Seth Mann, as the personal representative of President Wilson, made a tour through Alaska last June and July and reported the results of his investigation direct to the President. The information which he furnishes is so full and so recent, and his views are so sound and conservative, that I take the liberty to quote at some length from his report. He says:

> There are two primary requirements for the opening up and development of Alaska: First, the construction of railroads, roads, and trails; and, second, the opening up of the coal fields. These two projects should go forward with equal steps, since each is dependent upon the other.
>
> I am convinced that this work of the building of railroads, as well as the construction of roads and trails, should be carried forward by the Government directly. There is nothing definite or certain in regard to the building of railroads by private enterprise, either unaided or with Government assistance. The traffic to support Alaska railroads must be in large part developed by the road itself through the settlement of the country, induced by increased transportation facilities. When the Bering River and Matanuska coal fields are opened by appropriate legislation, railroads to these fields would no doubt be constructed by private enterprise. The opening of these coal fields is, however, a separate problem, and until that problem is satisfactorily solved there will not be sufficient coal traffic to induce the building of railroads to the fields. It may take some considerable time to enact legislation that will result in the satisfactory working of these great deposits. In the meanwhile, it must be assumed that railroad development by private enterprise to the coal fields would be delayed until it became apparent that the legislation would result in the immediate opening of the coal measures.
>
> Alaska needs at once one and probably two railroads. One should run from the coast to the Tanana and the Yukon, and the other from the coast in a northwesterly direction at least as far as the valley of the Kuskokwim River. I can not believe that any railroads of this length will be constructed by private enterprise for many years to come. If this be true, such development of that portion of Alaska beyond the Chugach Mountains and as far as the Yukon and the Kuskokwim Rivers must be indefinitely delayed. From the Chugach Mountains to the Yukon River is about 300 miles, and the distance to the Kuskokwim River in a general westerly direction is about the same. The country is rich in precious metals and other mineral wealth, which up to the present time have been but slightly developed. The construction of railroads through this country would at once give a sharp impetus to prospectors. The miners and prospectors of Alaska lay great stress upon the difficulties which surround prospecting in this Territory at any distance beyond 100 miles from the coast or from navigable rivers. With railroad transportation into this country the prospector could remain in the field, if not twice as long, at least two months longer than he can at the present time. He must enter the field under present conditions late in the year and return again from a month to two months earlier than would be necessary if these railroads were built, since he can not risk the severities of the Alaskan winter, which may prove fatal if he starts out too early and returns too late. The principal resources of the interior of Alaska are its mineral wealth. It is the universal opinion of all Alaskans and of the Government scientists that this wealth is prodigious. It is also evident that it can not and will not be developed until railroad transportation through the country is afforded. It is also the general opinion that the building of the road will cause this development to proceed at once. In other words, the building of a railroad must precede the mineral development of interior Alaska.

The evidence is uniform, complete, and overwhelming. No other nation would hesitate a moment, but we have been so accustomed to the very best of conditions as to soil, climate, and all that that we look with suspicion on anything not in the very first rank in all these respects. But common prudence, ordinary business foresight, and true patriotism all urge that we begin now, and begin right, to lay the foundations for a great empire State in this far northern land.

COST OF BUILDING.

It is also contended that the Government can not build these railroads as cheaply as private concerns could, and therefore the Government should not build them at all.

Even if this contention were true, it would not be anything like a sufficient reason for not building them.

But is it true? In answering this question we should consider not alone the cash outlay or first cost of building these roads; we should consider also the final or ultimate result to the American people.

Any other test would not be sound, and when this reasonable test is applied I do not hesitate to say that it will be a wise investment. The Government can build these railroads, and own them when they are built, for far less than it has heretofore given away to other roads constructed under private management and ownership. I believe the Pacific roads would have been built at less cost to the people had the Government done the work itself.

The Government has carried on many enterprises with satisfactory economy. I am inclined to believe that in some very large enterprises the Government can do the work as well, or better, than private concerns. Who will say the Panama Canal could have been constructed more successfully by private interests? Or who will say that the success achieved in that instance can not under the same or similar supervision be duplicated in Alaska?

No doubt the Government would pay its employees better wages and treat them better than private concerns would do in far-off Alaska. And it might have to pay more in some other ways than private concerns would pay. But in the matter of financing the enterprise the Government would have a tremendous advantage and could make a big saving over a private concern.

Mr. Falcon Joslin, who has done some railroad building in Alaska, and who is very familiar with conditions there, was before the Committee on Territories in July last. He said:

> One of the greatest advantages from Government ownership is the fact that the capital to construct the roads can be obtained by the Government at 3 per cent; that is, at the present time. I doubt whether it can be obtained at that rate for a long time, because the rate of interest is steadily going up. If a private concern attempted to promote such a venture, or if I myself sought to find capital for an Alaskan railroad, I should offer 6 per cent bonds, with a premium of at least 50 per cent in stock. The bonds that I did float to build the road I now have were 6 per cent bonds, and they were sold at a discount—sold for 85 cents on the dollar—and there was a premium of 75 per cent in stock. The Government would avoid that outlay.

There are other economies in various directions which would accompany and follow Government construction of these railroads and inure to the benefit of the American people.

Let us examine a little the matter of railroad building under private management and see whether the Government and the people have not been pretty heavy losers through their reliance on the alleged economy of private enterprise. In his book, The Railroads, the Trusts, and the People, Prof. Frank Parsons devotes a chapter to railroad graft and official abuse. Referring to the Pacific railroads he says:

These companies received enormous land grants and subsidies from the National Government and the States—more than enough to build and equip the whole of the lines. Yet they bonded the roads for twice what they cost, and in addition issued stock to an amount largely in excess of the actual cost. The people really paid for the roads, but the promoters took the ownership and possession, raised millions of dollars by the issue of fictitious securities, and through construction frauds and other inequitable practices put the bulk of the money into their own private pockets.

In the case of the Central and Union Pacific roads resources amounting to $260,000 a mile were put into the hands of a few men to do work costing apparently about $31,000 a mile, and the public that paid for the roads several times over got nothing but a second mortgage for part of the money they put in.

I will not attempt to quote all the facts and figures which Dr. Parsons gives concerning the building of the Central Pacific and the Union Pacific lines, as well as other lines. Indeed, the waste and grafting which he shows existed in those cases are also found in lines privately owned. Speaking of an eastern road he says:

The South Pennsylvania Road, built by Commodore Vanderbilt to compete with the Pennsylvania Road, has been shown to have cost somewhere between six and ten millions. A responsible contractor had offered to build it for $6,500,000. Yet a construction company, composed of Vanderbilt's clerks and brokers, received $15,000,000 for building it; and the syndicate of capitalists that supplied the money to do the work got $40,000,000 in securities, $20,000,000 bonds, and $20,000,000 stock. The cost of the road was less than $10,000,000, so that the whole of the stock and half of the bonds were fictitious. In the same manner, though not in the same proportion, the thing was worked all over the Union.

And he adds:

Excessive land grant and subsidy graft has not confined its ravages to the Pacific roads any more than construction frauds. In Iowa, for example, 5,000,000 acres of land were given to the railways, an area almost as great as that of the whole State of Massachusetts. And besides this the contributions in taxes, rights of way, depot sites, and gifts of money to the railways of this one State are estimated by a leading railroad attorney at $25,000,000, and by William Larrabee, ex-governor of Iowa, at $50,000,000.

To those who think the Government can have the work done more cheaply by private enterprise than it could by doing it directly under its own supervision the whole chapter from which I quote will make interesting reading, and will, I think, dissipate such ill-grounded notions. Summing up the situation Dr. Parsons says:

The total gifts of the public to railways by municipalities, States, and Nation can not be accurately stated, but it is known that the national land grants alone have aggregated more than 215,000,000 acres, an area far exceeding the whole of New England and the Middle States, much of it in the finest and most fertile regions of the United States. Since 1850 the Federal Government has granted subsidies to more than 50 railroads. Six of these companies received cash sums aggregating $65,000,000, and the Government sustained their credit by paying interest on their bonds to the extent of about $75,000,000, making a cash appropriation of about $140,000,000 to assist six railroads already enriched by empires of land. States, cities, and towns have also contributed large values to railroads in all sections of the country.

The railroad grants in Minnesota would make two States the size of Massachusetts, one of which was donated to the promoters of the Northern Pacific Railroad Co. In Kansas the railroad grants would make the two States of Connecticut and Rhode Island. In Michigan and Wisconsin also the railway pasture is nearly as large. In Montana the grants to one company would equal the whole of Maryland, New Jersey, and Massachusetts. In Washington also the grants are about equivalent to the same three States, and three States the size of New Hampshire could be carved out of the railway grants in California. The Union Pacific alone obtained 13,000,000 acres, the Kansas Pacific 12,100,100, the Northern Pacific 47,000,000, the Atlantic & Pacific 42,000,000, and the Southern Pacific 9,520,000 acres.

The total area given by act of Congress to western roads is nearly as large as the whole extent of the original thirteen States. It is larger than the German Empire and Italy combined; larger than the Austro-Hungarian Empire, Switzerland, Denmark, and the Netherlands; larger than France, Great Britain, and Belgium.

These lands are worth a good deal more than the whole cost of the railroads, to say nothing of the gifts to the companies by towns, cities, and States. If the public had kept its lands and built the railroads itself with funds raised by the issue of bonds or with money raised by progressive taxation, the rentals from the lands and the profits from the railways would long ago have cleared off the whole railway capitalization, and rates would now be down about to the cost of operation.

It is estimated that every dollar spent on railway construction in a new country adds at least $5 to adjacent land values, and much more than that in a developed country, upon the building of needed railways. This increment of land value, due to the growth of society and the expansion of business, under good means of communication, amounting in the aggregate to billions of dollars, could have been retained for the benefit of the whole people. Instead of this our Government delivered millions upon millions of land and money to private companies to build railways, not for the people, but for the promoters.

The Government owns practically 99 per cent of the wealth of Alaska, mineral and agricultural, and the building of the roads provided for in this bill will increase the value of it far beyond the expense incurred. When the roads are built undoubtedly all lines of endeavor there will be stimulated and the demand for opportunities greatly increased.

Such consequences always follow railroad development.

The grant of land to the Illinois Central Railroad was made in 1850, but the road was not completed till September, 1856. In the decade from 1850 to 1860 the population of the State more than doubled.

In 1850 land like that given the company was on sale at $1.25 an acre, with no takers. Indeed, much of it was offered through soldiers' land warrants at 70 cents an acre, and could find no purchasers, but by 1852, with a railroad in prospect, it sold readily at $5 an acre.

This has invariably been the history of new countries after the introduction of railroads, and Alaska will be no exception.

RAILROADS WILL NOT PAY.

It is also contended by the opponents of the bill that these railroads will not pay when built; therefore the Government should not build them.

I readily concede that they will not pay dividends in money at first, but I am confident they will pay dividends in the greater progress and development of Alaska from the very day they begin to operate, and I am also confident that they will eventually pay dividends in money, if that is desired. The Government has in the past very materially aided in the construction of a large number of railroads. As I have shown, it has given away hundreds of millions of acres of public land to aid in the building of some 16,000 miles of railroad. Did that investment pay a dividend? Did anybody expect it to pay a dividend in cash? It was expected that it would aid in the development of the country, that it would add to the general prosperity and render possible the establishment of additional homes for our people. True, much of that land was given away recklessly—almost criminally; but even at that the country has received dividends—large dividends—in the more rapid growth of the country and the spread of general prosperity.

Surely, the Government's activities are not to be confined to enterprises which will pay dividends in cash.

The genial and persuasive chairman of the Good Roads Committee [Mr. SHACKLEFORD] wants Congress to appropriate twenty-five millions to aid in building good roads through the States, and unless his right eye loses its cunning he will get it. When it is expended in making better post roads, do gentlemen expect the Government to collect a cash dividend on the investment? When we appropriate money for dredging and deepening navigable waters, do we expect a direct return in money? When smaller governmental units, such as counties and municipalities, tax property to open up roads and streets and keep them in repair, do they expect a money dividend from the expenditure? Of course not. In every such case the object is the general welfare. The expenditure is never put on a dividend basis, and it never should be.

Canada will soon have completed the construction of a railroad from the Atlantic to the Pacific, 3,600 miles long. Winnipeg is midway this distance. East of that city the Canadian Government undertook the work of construction itself. West of it they let the construction contract to the Grand Trunk Railroad Co., and they guaranteed that company three-fourths of the principal sum and the interest on that much of the bonds, and in addition they agreed to pay the interest on these guaranteed bonds for seven years as a pure gift. This road, for almost its entire length from near Halifax, New Brunswick, on the Atlantic coast to Prince Rupert on the Pacific coast, runs through territory which is either sparsely settled or wholly uninhabited. The building of this line will cost, not $35,000,000 but $300,000,000, and three-fourths of that amount, or $225,000,000, is guaranteed by the Canadian Government, in addition to the gratuity of seven years' interest on that amount.

What is the reason for this liberality? Is the Canadian Government looking forward to cash dividends on this investment? Not at all. The reason for its liberality is given in a preamble to the bill which provides for the building of the road. Here it is:

Whereas, by reason of the growth in population and the rapid development in productiveness and trade of Canada, and especially of the western part thereof, and with a view to the opening up of new territory available for settlement both in eastern Provinces and in the west, and the affording of transportation facilities for such territory, and for other reasons the necessity has arisen for such construction of a national transcontinental railway.

The Canadians do not ask, Will this road pay dividends? They simply say it will open up new territory to settlement; that is all. They do not claim that it will tap some of the richest mineral sections to be found anywhere, for it will not do so. Every reason they give for this enormous expenditure applies in Alaska, and there are many other reasons in support of our case that have no application in theirs; yet who will say they

are not justified in what they are doing? But if they are justified, how much more are we justified?

A government which considers great measures and adopts or rejects them on the theory that they will or will not pay dividends has outlived its usefulness. There are better things than cash dividends. The greatness of a nation can not be measured by the contents of its treasury alone.

The Acropolis and the Parthenon put no money in the treasury of Athens, but they were well worth while. The construction of the Appian Way was a drain on the treasury of Rome, but it contributed to promote the general welfare. The Washington Monument, so typical of the great character it commemorates, as a dividend-paying investment is a signal failure, but where is the man who would lower its towering apex one single inch? The question with a great government should be, not will it pay, but will it make for the general welfare; and in the case before us the answer is emphatically that it will.

WEALTH OF ALASKA.

I have assumed that Alaska is a land of great natural opportunities. Its great fisheries are conceded, but they do not materially affect the present question. This is also measurably true of its trade in furs. But it is of its mineral wealth and its agricultural possibilities I would now speak.

So much has been said on both these topics by those better informed about them than I am that I approach the subject with some hesitation. Since 1880 the Territory has produced $248,300,000 worth of mineral wealth. Of this, $228,200,000 was gold, $16,580,000 copper, $2,060,000 silver, and only $360,000 of it was coal.

The great preponderance of gold over copper is due in part to the fact that gold can be carried on the person, whereas copper is bulky and must be transported by rail.

COAL.

The coal situation has been the subject of so much discussion that little more need be said about it.

I want, however, to call attention to an error which my genial friend from Virginia was led into by my colleague from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN]. He suggested to the gentleman from Virginia that an experiment made on the *Maryland* developed the fact that Bering River coal had only 43 per cent of the fuel value of Pocahontas coal for naval purposes. I read from the speech of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] a letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DAVENPORT]:

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.

It will be seen that that is 75 per cent and not 43 per cent. This is indicative of the unconscious exaggeration to which I referred.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I do not like to, but I will yield to my colleague.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. I do not want to take up the gentleman's time.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. But the gentleman is taking up my time.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. The test on the *Maryland* was 43 per cent and the test at Annapolis was 75 per cent.

Mr, GRAHAM of Illinois. The statement of my colleague shows the perfect unreliability of these tests. One test shows the Bering coal to be only 43 per cent of the fuel value of the Pocahontas coal, and another test of the same coal shows it to be 75 per cent, an increase of 32 per cent. May I not assume that at that rate of increase the third test will show it to be 107 per cent of the Pocahontas? My friend from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] said that the exposure of coal did not materially interfere with its value as fuel. That is a mistake. When coal is exposed to the atmosphere oxidation takes place; the oxygen in the atmosphere unites with the coal, causing slow combustion, and its effectiveness is thus lowered. There is no mine in the Bering coal field.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Will the gentleman allow an interruption?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I will; but my time is very short.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I said it did affect it to some extent, and it would depend entirely upon the time which it had been exposed.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Well, this coal has been exposed for perhaps a million years.

Mr. SAUNDERS. We had no evidence before us as to how long it had been exposed.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. It has been on the surface of those coal fields for a great many years. Now, that coal was loaded into bags; it was lying there exposed for a long time before it was transported to the place where these tests were made.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Did not they have to dig into the coal bed to get 500 tons?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. They had to dig into it somewhat, I suppose.

Mr. FERRIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I can not yield; my time is too short.

Mr. FERRIS. I do not want to take up the gentleman's time.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. But the gentleman does. When one Member interrupts, and then another and another interrupts, it takes considerable time, all together.

Mr. FERRIS. I simply wanted to say that this coal was taken out of a tunnel 100 feet below the ground.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I know of no such tunnel in that coal field. If there is one, I have not heard of it. But I am not going to hang my case on the matter of coal for naval use, because the Secretary of the Navy says that in the future we will not rely on coal. We must, however, to some extent, as we now have many ships that have to rely on coal.

Some of these ships will be in the Pacific and they will need coal, and in time of peace certainly this coal would be of value to them. We might need a supply of the better quality of coal only in case of war, which I hope will not occur. Then, again, this report says that they have not tested the Matanuska field at all. The testimony is that out of the 40 square miles of coal in the Bering field and the 75 square miles of coal in the Matanuska one-half is of the highest grade of anthracite. I have heard the sworn statements of the two men best qualified to express an opinion upon this subject, from a theoretical point of view, Mr. Brooks, of the Geological Survey, and Mr. Andrew Kennedy, the mining expert of the Government in Alaska, and both of them testified it was practically equal to the Pocahontas coal, as shown by an analysis of it. What the event will prove to be I do not know. If, as opponents of the bill suggest, we are to have a railroad to reach the Matanuska field, we go a large part of the way to Fairbanks. We go far toward tapping the valley of the Tanana, and having gone that far, even on the logic of my friend from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS], it were the height of folly there to stop and not go on to the navigable waters of the Tanana and the Yukon. He concedes that we ought to go to the Matanuska. On that concession I claim that it were unwise not to go through that valley, fertile, at least, for Alaska, and reach the navigable waters of the Tanana and the Yukon. So that the gentleman concedes the wisdom of building at least one of these railroads.

Mr. SAUNDERS. But these are entirely different roads.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. No; the Matanuska field is on the proposed line from Seward to Fairbanks. The gentleman is rusty on the geography of the question he is discussing.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I am looking at it here right now.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. And even if it should prove somewhat inferior to the best Pocahontas coal it would still be very valuable. It would at least serve for naval use in time of peace, and it would be of great commercial value along the whole Pacific coast, where it has no rival.

The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] says we have coal enough in the States to last several thousand years. That is not quite the question. The real point is to get plenty of good coal near the place where it is needed, and this Alaska coal is much nearer a vast number of people who need it than any other coal of nearly equal quality.

COPPER.

Here is the situation as I see it: I do not say that we should build these railroads merely for the purpose of developing agriculture in Alaska. I say that we ought to build them primarily to develop the great mineral possibilities of that country, keeping agriculture in mind as an important incident. Let me read to you from the testimony, not a mere statement, but the sworn testimony of the man who knows more about the mineral qualities of Alaska than any man living, Prof. Albert Brooks, or Mr. Albert Brooks, as he prefers to be called. Speaking of the Bonanza copper mine, he testified:

That is an enormously rich deposit.

He further said:

In the Bonanza mine the ore runs from 20 to 30 per cent, and in some cases from 40 to 50 per cent, pure metallic copper. It is very rich ore.

In answer to a question as to how far these conditions extended, he said that they practically extended along the entire mountain range, a distance of about 150 miles.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Forty per cent of copper the whole way?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I did not intend to say that. Here are Mr. Brooks's words:

That these conditions are likely to repeat themselves in places all along the copper belt for 150 miles, but we do not know that they do. But as far as we can tell from the surface the same conditions may arise elsewhere. * * * I think there is a strong probability that other deposits will be found similar in character to the Bonanza.

And he adds that this copper has a mixture of silver running up to $5 a ton.

There are places in this mine where the copper is even 70 per cent pure, and Mr. Brooks says that where the winter and the spring eroded the mountain side, washing the lighter substances away, copper has been shoveled up that was 95 per cent pure metallic copper.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman did not think that I interrupted him for a question that was irrelevant. I understood him to say that the Bonanza mine, which I am informed belongs to the Guggenheims, runs from 40 to 50 per cent of pure copper, and I asked if that was through the whole mountain range.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Oh, no. What I read says that it does not continue all of the way, but that it repeats itself along the mountain range for 150 miles. Mr. Chairman, we are beginning to know the value of copper. The extended use of electricity makes it an exceedingly valuable product, but these deposits are hundreds of miles in the interior and can be handled only by railways. True, one railroad now taps it, and branches from that one can reach out farther, but because the coal mines are not developed the railroads are handicapped, and are of little value on account of the great expense in running them.

We must get some railroads that will enable them to reach these opportunities. I do not care how liberal your homestead law is, nobody is going there to locate on a homestead if he can not get to it and from it with reasonable convenience and expense.

Mr. FERRIS. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. If it is important, I will yield, of course. I do not like to be discourteous, but you know how quickly the minutes slip by in a case of this sort.

Mr. FERRIS. I do, indeed.

PRIVATE ENTERPRISE WILL NOT BUILD THEM.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Now, then, I assume it to be true that if Alaska is to be developed we must have railroads. If we are to unlock this door we must have a key with which to unlock it. What is the key? It is a few trunk-line railroads, as the President has said. Some gentlemen say that private enterprise will build them. I say it will not. Even syndicated wealth will not build them. The Alaskan Syndicate, the Guggenheim-Morgan syndicate, or "Morganheim," as some call it, would doubtless have gone on and built railroads in Alaska, but only on one condition, and that is the condition on which they built the railroad they constructed there—that they would have a free hand in Alaska, and they could for their own use exploit that Territory for all time. Turn the mineral wealth of Alaska over to them and they will build the necessary railroads for such exploitation, but when you do it you will develop a condition of things there for the future far worse than history can point to in the worst days of feudalism. Do we want that? Will we reject the doctrine of conservation? Will we turn all these resources away from the American people, who now own 99 per cent of them? Will we turn them over to the Guggenheims and the other syndicates that will be created? If we do, they will build the necessary trunk lines and develop the wealth that is there. But the American people will not consent to that; they will not give these mineral lands away.

AGRICULTURE.

I have said that I think agriculture in Alaska will follow the development of its mineral resources rather than precede them. This has been largely true of California, Idaho, Montana, Colorado, and other States rich in mineral wealth.

But we are told the climate and soil are leagued against the farmer in Alaska to such an extent as to render farming impracticable; that the temperature is so low and the season so short, success in maturing crops is not possible.

The average length of the crop-growing season at Fairbanks for the last five years is 105 days. I mean the summer season between killing frosts. The average season at Ellensburg, Wash., in the Kittitas Valley, is only 90 days, but in spite of its short season it is a great agricultural valley with a population of 23,000, with $6,000,000 in bank deposits. Many other agricultural regions have a crop-growing season shorter than the season at Fairbanks, and have not the advantage of long days, with almost continuous sunshine during the growing period, as the Tanana Valley has. The lowest temperature the Government has any record of at Fairbanks is 65° below zero. That temperature has been reached at Miles City, Mont., and in the Milk River country in Montana, where the Government is now spending millions on irrigation projects, and yet Montana has demonstrated that it is a great agricultural State.

The lowest temperature recorded in Florida is 2° below zero; the thermometer has never fallen even to zero on the southern coast of Alaska. Oklahoma has a record of 25° below and Missouri 29°, while 1° above zero is the lowest temperature yet recorded in Cordova.

The great valleys of the Yukon, the Tanana, and the Kuskokwim compare more than favorably in soil and climate with Norway, Sweden, and Finland, and Alaska far surpasses these countries in mineral wealth, yet Norway has a population of 2,300,000, Sweden 5,500,000, and Finland 3,000,000, or 10,800,000 in all, mainly supported by agriculture. Alaska has more territory than all three and will some time in the future have as large or even a larger population. We should now give it a good start and head it in the right direction.

There is no question that root crops, vegetables, rye, barley, and oats can be grown very successfully there, and that wheat can also be grown, but we need not expect very extensive crops of cereals so long as the Alaskans have to thrash with flails because of the lack of transportation for thrashing machines.

Mr. Seth Mann, in his report to the President, says:

The agricultural possibilities of the interior of Alaska are a revelation to one who visits the great valleys of the Yukon and Tanana for the first time.

He says—

When once the land is prepared for cultivation the long periods of sunshine during the summer months operate like intensive cultivation and bring about rapid germination and quick maturing of crops.

Mr. S. Hall Young, superintendent of the Presbyterian mission, who has lived in Alaska for 35 years, in a recent letter to the able chairman of the Committee on the Territories [Mr. HOUSTON] says:

I have successfully raised and ripened in my own garden and fields there wheat, oats, barley, potatoes, turnips, rutabagas, tomatoes, peas, radishes, lettuce, carrots, and other vegetables also. * * *

While the temperature sometimes drops very low, the winters are by no means as bad as some suppose. Mr. Young says on that subject:

My wife and I were out calling on our parishioners during the coldest weather of each year and did not suffer from cold. The children in the schools at Fairbanks lost no time from their lessons on account of the weather. The entire absence of wind during these periods of cold weather is a striking characteristic of the climate. Indeed, I have never known a wind strong enough to drift the snow in the vicinity of Fairbanks.

During most of the winter the temperature ranged from 10° above zero to 20° below. There were no sudden changes, and woodmen, lumbermen, and travelers were busily at work, the mails coming in regularly, and the population in general living without discomfort. It is a dependable climate, and you know to-day about what the weather to-morrow is likely to be.

Mining was being carried on all of this time without hindrance from the weather. There was very little snow and very little cloudy weather.

And as to the people and the general conditions there, Mr. Young says:

The population (white) of interior Alaska will compare well in intelligence, morals, physical strength, and character with any other population elsewhere. The people are contented and love the land of their adoption, and it has become a proverb in central Alaska that if any one of the people who have lived there for some years goes "outside" he must come back. For my part, I know of no land under the sun where I would rather live, work, and die than interior Alaska.

GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP.

It is useless to try to frighten folk with the cry of Government ownership of railroads. That question is not involved in this measure. This is an extraordinary case and needs an extraordinary remedy. We can not be frightened from doing the right thing in this case for fear we would be asked to do the same thing later in a different case. We must, like sensible men, cross the bridges after we reach them and not before we reach them.

If ever the question of Government ownership comes up in the States the Congress then in office will be amply able to deal with the question on its merits.

This question should be dealt with now on its merits and in view of our present light on the subject.

The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] told us the other day about the difficulty and the expense of clearing land there. It is not so serious as he would have us believe. He said $200 an acre was required to clear the land. I concede a man

could go to Alaska and spend $200 in clearing an acre of land there. You can spend a great amount of money clearing an acre of timberland in Oklahoma, too, if you go there in the spring and get it ready for a crop that year. I take from the gentleman's own speech a quotation which fully answers his objection:

Mr. MCKENZIE. 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 the 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.

There is the common sense of the situation. When men clear land ordinarily they begin by deadening the trees. After a while, when they are dead enough to burn, they burn them. If they get in a hurry, of course, they pull the stumps or blast them out. That is expensive, but if they wait a few years the stumps can be easily and cheaply disposed of. Then, too, the Alaska homesteader could use his own and his family's labor instead of hiring men at $8 a day.

REINDEER.

There is another aspect of the question which has received but little notice during the debate.

It is almost certain they can raise an ample supply of meat for home consumption and before another decade passes the people of the States may be looking Alaskaward for help in the solution of the meat question. A year and a half ago I ate with much relish reindeer steak imported from Alaska.

It was only 12 years ago that 1,280 head of reindeer were imported from Siberia. Their descendants now number 46,000, and the annual increase is 30 per cent. If this rate of increase continues, by 1920 there will be almost 300,000 head.

Experts estimate that Alaska has enough grazing ground to support from ten to twenty million head of them.

The claims of Alaska can not be answered by exhausting adjectives and epithets in a vain attempt to heap ridicule upon it.

It is no answer to say, or even to prove, that agricultural opportunities are not as good there as in some of the States. It is enough to show that they are too good to remain undeveloped.

It is no answer to say that frost may sometimes injure or even destroy the crops. That has happened in Oklahoma, in Illinois, in Florida, in California, and in almost every State in the Union. But who says we should abandon effort in those States on that account?

Nor is it an answer to say there are various difficulties in the way so long as they are not insuperable. It is the conquest of difficulties which makes men strong individually and racially, and the difficulties in Alaska can be conquered. They are not greater than they once were in Finland. But the Finns are a strong race mentally and physically. Their great national epic, the Kalevala, has a recognized place in literature and undoubtedly furnished the model for Longfellow's Hiawatha.

The champion long-distance runner of the world at this time is a Finn. In the long-distance contests in Alaska the native half-breeds win the prizes. Alaska offers as great opportunity for human development as Finland does and is bound to eventually have a population of millions of stalwart, brave, hardy, intelligent, liberty-loving citizens, worthy of the best traditions of the Republic. But it must first have means of communication with the rest of the country and with the outside world. This it can not have for ages unless the Government builds some trunk lines. The building of them will assuredly inaugurate the change. Alaska will do the rest.

Gentlemen fear that if we spend $35,000,000 or $40,000,000 now it will grow to $400,000,000 later on. That objection might have been urged with as much reason against the aid given the Pacific lines. But, as matter of fact, in the territory where some 5,000 miles of railroad were built by Government aid there are now 50,000 miles. The trunk lines have been supplemented by feeders built by private enterprise. It will be so in Alaska, too.

The time for action is here. We must prepare to unlock this storehouse. We must adopt a wise, forward-looking policy for it. We must give enterprise and industry a chance to seize and develop the opportunities awaiting them. We must provide Alaska with liberal mineral-leasing laws, with liberal and inexpensive homestead laws; but first of all we must provide access to it by giving it the railroads provided for in this bill. [Applause.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Tulley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 3439. An act appropriating funds for the purpose of the investigation, treatment, and eradication of hog cholera.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bill of the following title:

H. R. 9574. An act 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.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Secretary be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (S. 3625) 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.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the following resolution:

House resolution 8.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed for the use of the House of Representatives, to be distributed through the folding room, 50,000 copies of House Document No. 1458, Sixty-second Congress, same being "Prayers offered at the opening of the sessions of the Sixty-second Congress of the United States."

The message also announced that the President had, on February 3, 1914, approved 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.

RAILROADS IN ALASKA.

The committee resumed its session.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is recognized.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the Federal Government building and, if necessary, operating a railroad in Alaska. For more than 100 years the transportation problem has been probably more paramount than any other. It was fully recognized throughout the length and breadth of our country that the greatest handicap to advancement was the lack of ways and means for entrance into and egress from the various settlements of our Commonwealth and lack of transportation facilities for people and freight. The Federal Government showed its appreciation of that condition in 1802, when it appropriated one-twentieth of the proceeds of public-land sales in the Ohio territory to the construction of highways. Later the Government authorized the construction of the Cumberland Road or National Pike, which started from the center of population in Maryland, extended from there into the Ohio country, eventually reaching as far west as Vandalia, Ill., the Government expending thereon some $10,000,000.

This movement was followed by Government aid to various canal projects and Federal aid to rivers and harbors. The country developed under these transportation facilities to such an extent as to awaken the public mind fully to transportation advantages and to the immense disadvantage localities were subjected to which had no such blessings. This knowledge led to continuous efforts on the part of communities, States, and Territories to secure transportation facilities, and as time passed not only the Federal Government was importuned for aid to transportation facilities of various kinds, but also States, counties, and municipalities, and prior to the year 1850 by far the largest amount of paternal aid came from the latter-named agencies.

The States contributing to various railroad projects, with the amounts contributed, are, in part:

Alabama	$15,800,000
Arkansas	7,100,000
Delaware	600,000
Florida	4,000,000
Georgia	4,000,000
Illinois	12,000,000
Indiana	$1,800,000
Kentucky	200,000
Louisiana	7,700,000
Maryland	6,800,000
Massachusetts	41,000,000
Michigan	3,200,000
Minnesota	2,200,000
New York	31,700,000
North Carolina	11,400,000
Ohio	500,000
Pennsylvania	12,700,000
South Carolina	5,700,000
Tennessee	34,100,000
Texas	4,800,000
Virginia	15,400,000
A total approximating	228,500,000

This in cash.

In addition to this, the United States made land grants to States for transportation purposes, which in turn regranted to railroads, the total land grants thus made for this purpose by the States and Federal Government totaling approximately 155,000,000 acres, which if worth only an average of $2.50 per acre would amount to $387,500,000.

In addition to this, counties and municipalities bonded themselves to an amount approximating $500,000,000, making first and last various sums of governmental aid to our United States railroads approximating $1,500,000,000.

Dr. William Z. Ripley, professor of economics in Harvard University, estimates that Federal Government and various State, county, and municipal aid to railroad construction amounts to at least two-fifths of the total value of all railroads.

Our States and municipalities have not only assisted in railroad construction by subsidies, but have frequently built railroads and parts of railroads themselves. The Interstate Commerce Commission furnishes data which cover in part some of the States and the mileage they hold under State control. While it does not comprise much mileage, it does illuminate the fact that those States recognize the right and, in some cases, the expediency of Government ownership of railroads. The list is as follows:

	Miles.
Belt Railroad of San Francisco; the Belt yard is a State property under the jurisdiction of the Board of State Harbor Commissioners of California	1.34
Cincinnati Southern Railway, operated by the Cincinnati, New Orleans & Texas Pacific Railway Co.; built and owned by the city of Cincinnati	335.46
Plattsburgh & Dannemora Railroad, operated by the Delaware & Hudson Co.; property of the State of New York	16.38
Oregon State Portage Railway; owned and operated by the State of Oregon	8
Texas State Railroad; property of the State of Texas	32.56
Western & Atlantic Railroad, operated by the Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis Railway; owned by the State of Georgia	136.82

The last annual report of the North Carolina Railroad Co. to the Interstate Commerce Commission shows that the company owned 223.55 miles of road in North Carolina, which was leased to the Southern Railway Co. From unofficial sources it is understood that the State of North Carolina owns $3,000,200 of the $4,000,000 outstanding capital stock of that company.

Mr. Chairman, the States of New York and Massachusetts have each individually appropriated as much for aid of railroads as the Federal Government is asked to appropriate in this case, or nearly so—New York more than $31,000,000 and Massachusetts more than $41,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the people of the United States have furnished more than $1,000,000,000 for building transportation lines in the past, I do not think that they will criticize or blame the American Congress for making this comparatively small appropriation for construction of a railroad through their own great country, Alaska, with more than 95 per cent of its total resources yet within the direct control of the people, the Government of the United States.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] and the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. WICKERSHAM] quoted freely from the testimony of John E. Ballaine, of Seattle and Alaska, before the House and Senate Committees on the Territories, in which Mr. Ballaine told of his negotiations with the firm of J. P. Morgan & Co., through G. W. Perkins, in an effort to induce them to finance a narrow-gauge railroad from the southern coast of Alaska to the Tanana River, and of the refusal of the Morgans to finance the enterprise because the Guggenheim brothers objected. That testimony by Mr. Ballaine entered largely also in the Senate debates on this bill, and has afforded convincing reasons why it is necessary for the United States to build a system of railroads in Alaska.

Let me call your attention particularly to the fact that strenuous efforts have been made to get a denial from Mr. Perkins, and that all such efforts have failed. Not only have they failed, but Senator LIPPITT in the Senate admitted the correctness of Mr. Ballaine's statements. Those of us who know Mr. Ballaine knew that his statements were correct, but it is doubly important to have an admission from the opponents of this bill that he stated the exact facts.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened with great interest to the various speeches made by gentlemen on this bill, both for and against it, and with no little amusement at some of the suggestions made by the speakers and also by gentlemen commenting on the bill individually. I have heard men protest that they could not vote for this measure because it was establishing a precedent for paternalism and committing the Government to a policy so far-reaching in its effects that it might in time practically bankrupt the Government. Some of these gentlemen have been for years voting for river and harbor improvements, just as paternal in character, aggregating millions of dollars, taken from the Federal Treasury without a thought of any impropriety. Many of these sums have been applied to streams of very doubtful navigation value, and many of the appropriations made for rivers and harbors that were more local than national in character. These appropriations have been made annually for many years and at times have been criticized unmercifully, charges of fraud and scandal being freely made. But in spite of criticism and abuses, the public at large has acquiesced in the expenditures and the Government and our people have prospered. I have heard gentlemen get up here and talk against the expenditure of the people's money in the most virtuous and self-sacrificing manner who would not hesitate a minute to vote $35,000,000 or $50,000,000 for building levees along the Mississippi River, although one-half of our people have no direct benefit from it and only a negative indirect benefit, yet we all recognize the necessity of Federal aid in these matters and extend paternal help.

The honorable gentleman from the City of Brotherly Love, Mr. MOORE, would not hesitate to ask for $1,000,000 for the benefit of the Delaware River, and would take a suggestion that it should not be made from the Federal Treasury because, forsooth, the Mississippi Valley and the Pacific coast get no benefits from it as a very narrow viewpoint, unworthy of Representatives of a people like ours. I heard one gentleman remark to another that the Washington delegation was in favor of this measure because a large part of the $35,000,000 would be spent there and it was like getting an appropriation for our own State. The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] in his speech on this question said practically the same thing. Mr. Chairman, the State of Washington is so situated geographically that it is the nearest United States point to Alaska, and the State of Washington will attempt to compete for Alaska business, just as every other State in the Union would do if favorably situated; yet I hardly think any Member here would vote against this bill simply because his State was not favorably situated to secure this business. I hope votes on this bill will be controlled by higher motives.

Mr. Chairman, I would be pleased to think that my State could get the lion's share of the expenditures made for a railroad in Alaska, for I am only human and wish my State well; but the assertion is so preposterous and shows so little knowledge of present conditions and the possibilities of my State to furnish the materials and elements necessary to use in railroad construction, that I can hardly think the remark serious. I should judge that possibly the great State of Pennsylvania would get more of the actual cost of the enterprise than any one State, because of its supremacy in the manufacture of iron and steel, also locomotives and rolling stock, although many States would be competitors, and no doubt the money used for railroad building in Alaska would be widely distributed, going to many different States. My own State being as yet only a pioneer, is not prepared even to seriously consider supplying to the Government many of the constituent elements necessary. Our rolling mills are few and our manufacturing establishments in embryo. No; the Members from the State of Washington have no hopes of being the largest direct beneficiaries from the enterprise; but we do know that Alaska is a factor in our prosperity and that it will be a greater factor in future years, if the Territory can be properly developed.

I listened with much interest to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY]. He is always interesting and has a great fund of statistical knowledge, and no one knows better than he how to handle statistics to advantage. He gave the cost of railroad building from the census of 1910, and would have us believe that a criterion to go by in figuring railroad building in Alaska. The argument was specious and interesting, but not particularly illuminating to one groping for knowledge, and is in no way applicable to railroad costs in Alaska. We all know that railroad building, like any other construction work, has a definite minimum, but an indefinite maximum, only to be measured by the judgment and bank roll of the builder. A railroad can be constructed in Alaska if properly and honestly managed, capable of handling the heavy traffic and developing the resources of that great country at a minimum of probably $30,000 the mile, adequately equipped.

In reply to a letter of inquiry regarding cost of railroad construction in Alaska directed to Mr. J. E. Ballaine, of Seattle, Wash., president of the Tanana Construction Co., who built the first 20 miles of the Alaska Central Railroad, starting at Seward, Alaska, with a prospective terminus at the Tanana River, I received the following:

SEATTLE, WASH., *December 24, 1913.*

Hon. W. L. LA FOLLETTE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. LA FOLLETTE: I have your inquiry as to the cost of building and equipping the Alaska Central Railroad, now the Alaska Northern, and as to the difference between the cost of railroad building

in Alaska and in the States. I can answer your question definitely for only the first 20 miles of the Alaska Central, which I, as president and owner of the Tanana Construction Co., built and equipped, and all of the funds for which I procured on notes of the construction company indorsed by me.

The first 20 miles of the Alaska Central starts from Seward, at the head of Resurrection Bay, and extends through a heavily timbered valley for 7 miles. From mile 8 to mile 14, inclusive, the road is on a timbered hillside, with several rock cuts from 20 to 100 feet long, several fills from 10 to 15 feet deep, and about 20 bridges made of native timber, mostly 1 and 2 decks and 3 to 6 bents.

The road as I built it is standard gauge, of 60-pound steel, and has 2,800 ties to the mile. The ties are 10-inch face, of native spruce and hemlock.

The equipment of this first 20 miles consisted of a wharf at Seward which cost $30,000, two Baldwin locomotives each of 60 tons, five standard flat cars, a sawmill of 10,000 feet daily capacity, 15 horses and harness, and machinery to the value of $11,000.

The total cash cost of the completed railroad thus constructed and equipped was exactly $325,000, or $16,250 per mile.

After I sold the construction company, and thereby control of the Alaska Central Railroad, to Frost & Osborne in 1904, they added $46,500 to betterments on miles 8, 9, and 10, but not another dollar to any other portion. The total cost of the first 20 miles is therefore $371,500, or slightly more than $18,000 per mile for the completed railroad and its equipment as it stands to-day. It has been in continuous use for eight years, with trains making 20 to 25 miles an hour over this portion of the track, without a single accident.

I have been told by some people who have seen the railroad that surely I must be mistaken—that it could not be built for such an amount. Nevertheless, that is the exact cash cost.

I should say that railroad building in the southern part of Alaska, and from the southern coast northward, need not exceed the cost of like construction in the States by more than 15 per cent, the most of which is for added freight charges by ocean from Seattle or San Francisco to the southern coast of Alaska. There is native timber in abundance for all ordinary construction material, and labor in this part of Alaska is but slightly higher than the scales paid in Washington, Oregon, and California.

It should be borne in mind that with the starting of construction on a Government railroad in Alaska prospectors and miners will go to the country by the thousands. Most of them will work on the railroad at periods for grubstakes to help them in their prospecting. This source of labor supply, in addition to the regular station forces, will always serve to keep the cost of labor at a reasonable basis.

Very truly, yours,

JOHN E. BALLAINE.

No doubt 100 years from now, when Alaska is developed and has a population of more millions than she now has thousands, and this railroad needs extensive betterments, with double trackage and including many times the equipment of the initial construction, Mr. FORDNEY'S figures of $76,000 the mile might apply. If the Government does build this road, and it is honestly and efficiently built, I am satisfied it will be illuminating to the people of the United States and to some of the owners of stocks and bonds of railroads who were not on the inside and ground floor when construction of their roads were under way or going on. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] says he is willing to lend money for roads or guarantee bonds for roads, but is not willing to have the Government build them. Oh, no; they would cost too much. We lent the Union Pacific and Central Pacific money enough to build those roads, in addition to giving them land grants, and we gave likewise land grants to the Northern and Southern Pacific. The scandals and frauds perpetrated on the stockholders and the bondholders of those roads, as well as the people, especially in the State of California, is still a stench and a byword. I would ask those gentlemen representing the great State of California if they think California could have fared any worse at the hands of the Government than it did at the hands of the pirates who for years throttled and debauched it? True, some of the unholy millions wrested from Government aid and land grants was philanthropically left in your State, yet I question if it was even a moiety of your losses by their usurpations and highhanded debauching in county, State, and municipalities. Oh, yes; advance money, guarantee bonds. It does not make any difference if the Guggenheims or the Weyerhausers, the Morgans or the Rockefellers, or the successors to the Stanfords or the Huntingtons, or any other great manipulators of big business, do clean up a few more millions they do not need. Milk the Government first and the people afterwards; it will not do for the Government to go into the railroad business. Why? Because it might lead to Government ownership. If this is going to be such a bad thing for the Government, why stand in the way. You can not experiment any place else so satisfactorily as in Alaska; and if it should prove so calamitous as suggested by some, would not it go a long way toward quieting the cry for Government ownership, and at a comparatively cheap price?

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] argued that because the engineers who were advised with by the Interior Department regarding the irrigation works of the West underestimated their cost these railroad estimates are likely to be erroneous. In this connection I desire to say that railroad building is no new thing in this country, while large irrigation works are new. While underestimates on the latter may be excusable, there would be little excuse for mistakes as to railroads. Further than this, if the Government did have to pay more for irrigation construction, the extra cost became a charge against the land reclaimed, which in most all cases was ample security, so no Member need allow the pessimistic view of my friend from Michigan to cloud his perspective with a vision of loss to the Nation.

If the irrigation works cost more than anticipated, we know that the money was expended among many and not turned over to the enrichment of a few, as were the subsidized, bond-guaranteed congressional enactments for private ownership.

Mr. Chairman, we hear a great cry made against the Government going into the railroad business and building a road through its own property, Alaska. The Government built a telegraph line up there, and I have not heard any claims of graft either in its building or operation. If it owns its own telegraph line in Alaska, why not its own railroads?

Some of the gentlemen who will vote and are talking against this bill voted for the Panama Canal. They did not see any danger to the Government in that transaction, which was purely a speculative one. We paid $7,200,000 to Russia for Alaska and have had in return to the United States fiftyfold what we paid for it over and above any expense it has ever been to us.

We paid $10,000,000 to the illegitimate Republic of Panama for a canal concession, and we have put far and beyond $350,000,000 into it, for what? I pause for reply. I suppose that the gentleman from Michigan was willing that the Government of the United States should pay $400,000,000 to build a ditch across the Isthmus of Panama, for what? We have no merchant marine, we have no coastwise fleet, eligible to use the canal. If we ever use the canal we have to create the fleets to float through it. I want to say to you gentlemen who are making the argument against helping Alaska that unscratched Alaska is better developed proportionately to-day than is your proud United States merchant shipping to use a canal costing us nearly $400,000,000. It is inconsistent and unwise to help long-suffering Alaska by building some experimental Government railroads, but it was wise, patriotic, and expedient to build the canal on the plea that it was a military necessity. Oh, you guardians of the people's interests, they should rise up and call you blessed. Now, I am in favor of the Panama Canal. I think it is wise to have it, even though it will not probably pay as an investment for a hundred years to come, but I do consider that any man who could stand for the Panama Canal and justify that position and oppose construction of this railroad in Alaska is inconsistency personified.

Mr. Chairman, Alaska was purchased from Russia by the United States in 1867 for $7,200,000. The name is derived from the Indian word Al-ay-eska, meaning the great country, and it is well named. It contains 590,884 square miles. It was first settled by three Russian priests or saints in 1784 and was in the continuous control of their country until 1867, when it was transferred to the United States. Its chief productions are gold, copper, silver, tin, lead, coal, seals; also salmon, halibut, and other fish. It also has great agricultural and grazing possibilities. Alaska is second only to Colorado in the production of gold. In copper, iron, and coal its possibilities are only to be demonstrated by the development of transportation, but it is well known that all indications point to immense tonnage and great value.

Alaska imported from 1879 to and including 1910: From the United States, $203,566,500 in merchandise; total from other countries, $941,358. It will be seen that less than $1,000,000 of this trade was with other countries. Our investment of $7,200,000 gave us a market for our products amounting, in round numbers, to $204,000,000 in the 31 years, starting with $317,000 in 1879 and amounting to $18,670,339 in 1910.

Since 1904, which was the first year for which the Census Bureau has had available statistics, Alaska has sent into the United States gold as follows: 1904, $6,347,742; 1905, $9,059,023; 1906, $12,638,608; 1907, $18,564,228; 1908, $11,490,777; 1909, $17,782,493; 1910, $18,393,128; a total for the 7 years of $94,275,999. If this were all the gold we had received from Alaska, it would be a good return on our $7,200,000 investment, but it is only for 7 years, and it is estimated that it is not more than 25 to 30 per cent of the total we have received from that country since we acquired it.

This is only one of the elements of wealth pouring into this country, but probably has been the largest single product in value. I am not going to burden the committee with further figures only to say that the Statistical Abstract of the United States says that in 1908 Alaska furnished $11,536,926 worth of fish and sea-animal products, not including cod and halibut, these two items for some cause being credited to Pacific-coast products, but not segregated as to Alaska. In 1908 there was

received $11,500,000 from this source, or $4,000,000 more that one year than we paid for the country in 1867. Alaska has been a great contributor to the wealth of the United States and has received, indeed, but little in return. The United States has never made any other investment that has paid proportionately as this one has, and I verily believe that if we will adopt other than a dog-in-the-manger policy with it it will continue to pay larger returns on the money we will spend there than any other possession or asset we have. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN] is recognized.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like now, while I think of it, to ask the privilege of extending my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN] asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to this debate to-day, as I have on previous days since it began, and I heartily agree with one observation made by my friend from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM], and that is that a great deal of what he calls "unconscious exaggeration" has been indulged in, and, he adds in a spirit of prudence, "possibly by both sides," in the discussion of this question.

It may be unconscious exaggeration; but few people, I fancy, who have taken the pains to go into the official records will doubt that it is gross exaggeration. Indeed, Mr. Chairman, everything that I have heard said, everything that I have read, in support of this proposition suggests to my mind in a very vivid way that peculiar type of publication which, out in the West, we call "boom literature."

Now, real estate dealers who are undertaking to sell banana plantations in Alaska, or gold mines where minerals do not exist, or town lots in an unbuilt city, may not be deliberately and maliciously falsifying, but it can not be denied by anyone who has ever been in one of these boom communities that when they come to painting pictures that they mean to attract settlers with they do indulge lavishly in high colors.

Now, that is the case, I take it, in this instance. A climate which we know to be frigid, a country which is on and so near the Arctic Circle that one needs nothing more than a knowledge of that general geographical fact to realize it is a cold country—is a place so cold that people who contemplate engaging in agriculture in it should have their sanity investigated—is held up to us as a sort of paradise in prospect. I have gone over a good many of these agricultural reports and I find nothing in them, or substantially nothing—and I do not want to get into that "unconscious exaggeration" referred to by my friend from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM]—I can find, I say, substantially nothing in them which will encourage any man to believe that it is possible or ever will be possible to develop agriculture in Alaska.

That Alaska has a vast amount of mineral wealth is a matter of very general common knowledge. Even those of us who have never had the good fortune to visit that part of the world know, as we know that Julius Cæsar or Napoleon Bonaparte lived, or any other incident that ever occurred with which we had no personal contact, that in the mountains of that country there is mineral wealth, and because of its peculiar geological formation we are inclined to believe that still greater deposits of mineral wealth will hereafter be found there. But, Mr. Chairman, I was strongly impressed with the reasonableness of the suggestion put forward by my friend from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS]—indeed, by my two friends from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS and Mr. DAVENPORT], if I may be permitted to correct myself—that if we want to unlock these treasures in Alaska, all we have to do is to make reasonable laws, the making of which is in our control; provide opportunities to American citizens to go in there and engage in American enterprises for the gain which will come from them.

That is the best inspiration for commercial endeavor. We go into business not for our health, not to develop the commonwealth at all, but to develop personal, individual wealth. Now, make your reasonable leasing laws so that the American business man can have an opportunity of a fair return for invested energy and capital; and if the wealth is there, I have no doubt that they will go, and go fast enough, and that they will build railways—electric railways, steam railways, railways run by the oil that may be there, run by the coal that probably is there—and if the values are there to the extent that my friend from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM] suggests, in a rather florid flight of fancy, they will even establish, if it be necessary, lines of airships to bring that wealth out. [Laughter and applause.]

There is no obstacle in the way of business success that makes the American business man hesitate. All that he wants to know, all that he requires to know, in order to invest his energy and capital is that there is a reasonable prospect of a return.

My friend from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM] says that the copper mines in Alaska—the Bonanza mine, I believe, he specifically referred to—has not been doing very well because the coal is "tied up." I use his precise phrase in that instance: "The coal is tied up." Now, my answer to that sort of argument is that if the tying up of the coal has prevented the development of other mining operations in Alaska, then untie the coal. Untie it according to the plan indicated by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] the other day—make a reasonable leasing law.

Having had a little experience—mostly disastrous—in mining, I was tremendously impressed with what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM] said about the great wealth, the almost unparalleled mineral wealth, of those mountains, and I felt for a moment, while I was under the influence of his eloquence, a stir of the old fever which more than once in my life has taken me away from home and comfortable surroundings and carried me to the atmosphere of mining camps, where I have undergone personal discomfort and had associations which, to say the least of them, were not altogether attractive. I felt for a moment, I say, the old fever return, and I wondered if I could wait until that beautiful, balmy springtime to which he looks forward so hopefully in Alaska shall have unlocked the avenues of communication so that I may get up into Alaska.

But I want to say to my friend that copper mines yielding 30 and 40 per cent copper to the ton are very infrequent occurrences on this globe of ours. In the course of my life I have seen bits of gold which ran $50,000, $75,000, $100,000, and $200,000 to the ton, and occasionally they have been made very remunerative, but the circumstances under which they became remunerative were developed when the sharper who had the bit of gold ore running so high in value came in contact with a sucker from the East who was easily taken in by such enterprises. [Applause.] The yield of a gold mine and the yield of a copper mine, permit me to say, is not indicated by these pieces of ore of exceptional value, or by copper returns of 30 or 40 per cent to the ton; and if the gentleman is investing money in copper with the expectation that he is going to get 600 or 800 pounds of merchantable copper from a ton of ore, I am afraid he is heading for a disappointment.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I want to get into the RECORD the statement that there is not a bit of danger of that.

Mr. SLAYDEN. The gentleman made another statement which I found of unusual interest. I hope I can quote the gentleman correctly. He said that Morgan and Guggenheim, or "Morganheim," as the combination had sometimes been called, had offered or suggested that they would build roads and open Alaska if given a "free hand"—now I know I am right in quoting those words "free hand" in the exploitation of that country.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. May I correct my friend?

Mr. SLAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I did not say, or at least certainly did not intend to say, that they had offered or suggested.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I think when the gentleman looks at the stenographic report of his speech he will find that he said that.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I believe they would be willing to do it.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I made my note at the time, and I understood the gentleman to say that if they were given a "free hand" in the exploitation of the country they would build the railroads that were needed in Alaska. I would like to have the gentleman tell us when Morgan or Guggenheim, or the amalgam "Morganheim," ever had the audacity to say to the people of this country that they would develop Alaska if they were given a "free hand" to exploit the common property for their personal gain.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. May I tell the gentleman where he can find much information on the subject?

Mr. SLAYDEN. Oh, I can find lots of information in all directions, but I am asking about this specific information.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. It is all sworn testimony, some of it by the agents of that concern, in the Ballinger inquiry of 1911. These facts were brought out there.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Is the gentleman certain that that is not some of the unconscious exaggeration of statement that has characterized the debate, as he says?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I can not speak for the witnesses. I am only speaking for myself.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not want to take up too much time. I had a speech prepared of which I hope I

will have time to get in a few paragraphs; but before undertaking that I want to answer a question propounded by my friend from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] as to tonnage for this proposed railroad. When the gentleman was having that rather interesting controversy with the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. WICKERSHAM] and one or two other gentlemen as to the possible tonnage, I believe it was the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. LAFFERTY] who suggested that there might be a tonnage available in hauling in the supplies for these prospectors and miners. The other day I was shown a private letter from a citizen of Seattle, which is the particular place to benefit by this wasteful expenditure of the public money. I was told that the gentleman who wrote it had spent seven years in Alaska; that he was a man of high character, a capable business man, qualified to observe, sufficiently well equipped in a mental way to draw a fair, proper, and reasonable conclusion from the facts which he had observed, and here is what he said. I commend this to the attention of my friend from Virginia.

Mr. BRYAN. Will it be possible to give the name of that gentleman?

Mr. SLAYDEN. I can not, because I got it in a private letter; but I have another letter, and I will give the gentleman the name of the author of that other letter. I can not give the name of the writer of the first one, because it was a private communication and I was not authorized to make it public.

Mr. BRYAN. I understand.

Mr. SLAYDEN. If the writer is willing, I shall be glad to do it. He says:

I would suggest that if you are interested in seeing the bill go through, you might point out the possibility of a vast industry that could be created. If the railroad system was broad enough, and horse manure in quantities could be secured, the railroad could spread it all over Alaska about 2 feet thick, which would provide an unlimited inland haul, and then a gigantic mushroom factory could be started and a back haul provided.

[Laughter.]

The fact that there is not a world's market for over 50 per cent of this product need not be pointed out and ought not to cut any figure in an enterprise like this. I can not conceive of anything else that could be grown commercially unless it be lettuce, which would have all of the characteristics of a Virginia creeper. You might put a value on Alaska, and you might possibly induce buyers there, but outside of the fish and the mineral possibilities, practically along the coast only, I would not give 25 cents for the whole damn Territory.

[Laughter.]

Mr. TAGGART. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. SLAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. TAGGART. Is the writer of that letter from Seattle?

Mr. SLAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. TAGGART. The gentleman does not wish to give his name?

Mr. SLAYDEN. No.

Mr. TAGGART. Is not the gentleman entitled to a Carnegie medal for saving the life of the writer of that letter? [Laughter.]

Mr. SLAYDEN. I will read you the other letter that I got yesterday morning addressed to me. From that letter I will now quote:

Everybody out here is jubilant over the Senate having passed the Alaska railroad bill. Also they are against Government ownership, and condemn Mr. Bryan for his famous Madison Square Garden speech and scoff at the principles he then advocated. No one I have spoken to attempts to reconcile the two positions except to vaguely say "this is different." As a matter of fact, unless one is in favor of Government ownership, he must consider the Alaska bill as a step in the wrong direction. However, like the others, I am selfishly glad of its fine prospect of becoming a law.

There you are, Mr. Chairman. The interest of Seattle in it is explained. The taxpayers of Texas and New York—of the whole country, in fact—foot the bill and Seattle and a few miners get the benefits.

Please note the inconsistency. They were pleased at the passage of the Senate bill, but they are all against Government ownership.

Mr. BRYAN. The gentleman is going to give the name of the writer of that letter?

Mr. SLAYDEN. I do not mind giving the gentleman that name. I have known the writer from boyhood. In fact, he is a first cousin of mine and I vouch for him. If my vouching will do any good, his reputation is established.

Mr. BRYAN. That being the case, would the gentleman——

Mr. SLAYDEN. I have only about four minutes left and I want to lay a predicate for the publication of my real speech.

Mr. Chairman, the peculiar political position in all this matter makes a special appeal to me. If I understand the writings and doctrines of Thomas Jefferson, he held that governments should confine their activities to the preservation of law and order, and should not interfere with the habits or innocent actions of citizens, but should leave them free to regulate their own pursuits. I might elaborate on that with many quotations from the writings of the first great Democratic President, but I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, that it will no longer make an appeal, and therefore I shall forbear quoting from the discarded prophet. Samuel J. Tilden, one of the greatest modern, and I begin to fear the last disciple of Thomas Jefferson, said—and I do not pretend to quote his language precisely, but substantially—that the cardinal animating and economic principle of the Democratic Party is that no work shall be done, no function performed by the State that can be as well or better done by the individual, and that the Federal Government should engage in no enterprise that can be as well or better done by the State or individual.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLAYDEN. If the gentleman will be very quick about it. I have only a little time left.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. I want to suggest whether he does not find in the writings of Thomas Jefferson that he was in favor of the public building roads and canals?

Mr. SLAYDEN. I think he did. I am not questioning the right of the United States to build things, I am questioning the wisdom of the policy, because I fear it is socialism, and I am a Democrat, not a Socialist.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. But he was in favor of building roads and canals.

Mr. SLAYDEN. That was 100 years ago.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Is it not true that the Military Committee, of which the gentleman is an honored member, have expended $2,000,000 in building wagon roads in Alaska with his approval?

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I will have to publish my speech, as I see that I am not going to get an opportunity to read any of it.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The gentleman can answer that question by yes or no.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I will answer it as I please in my time. The Committee on Military Affairs has recommended the construction and, under the appropriations which it suggested in this House, has built a good many miles of trails and roads in Alaska. Just what they have cost I do not know. I think they ought to do it. It was a military matter, a military necessity, and no one questions the right of the Government to do that. But I will say to the gentleman that honest, capable men, as familiar with the conditions in Alaska as he or anyone is, not influenced by the hope of political or personal gain, say that it is immeasurably better for the people in Alaska, immeasurably better for the future development of that country, that trails should be built through Alaska in order that the people may get in and out, and that they are needed infinitely more than are railroads. [Applause.]

Never in the history of business in this country has capital lacked enterprise or the disposition to engage itself, where there appeared any hope or reasonable expectation of even a moderate return for the risk assumed. On the contrary, it has sometimes been charged against our business men that they lacked the conservatism of their fellows in Europe; that, in fact, they had a little too much of the gambler's spirit. If they have refused to prosecute business enterprises in Alaska, it may be accepted as a fact that conditions there are not promising. It may also be accepted as a fact that where men of business can not see a profit in commercial enterprises only disaster can follow the efforts of Government in that particular field.

The business organizations of the Government are never conducted with the same careful scrutiny of the expense account; their wage scales are always higher, except in the more important technical and scientific places, hours shorter, and the control less exacting. In fact—and this is notorious—the Government can not compete in skill and economy in business organization or business management with individuals or private corporations. It is an axiom that whatever the Government does, unless executed without regard to cost, is less well and more expensively done than when conducted by individuals or private corporations.

In the building of railways there is the widest possible opportunity for waste and extravagance, and such opportunities are rarely, if ever, overlooked by the agents of Government.

Conditions in Alaska are such as to make it certain that the maximum of cost in every enterprise will be reached. Half of each year must be spent in comparative idleness. The climate compels it, for an act of Congress can not repeal the laws of nature. The thermometer usually goes down so far below zero that work can not be done from November to April.

We are advised that the minimum pay of the most ordinary labor is $3 a day, and even at that price the laborer's life is not

attractive and his savings can not possibly put him on the list of income-tax payers.

I can not think of any country where the conditions are so certain to entail the maximum cost of any undertaking.

As a business investment of the taxpayers' money the construction of a railway in Alaska appeals to me as the extreme of folly. If it were not so, private capital would long ago have found a way to unlock the supposed treasures of that country.

It is contended, Mr. Chairman, that this appropriation is necessary to open Alaska to the people of the United States and to develop the country. Alaska is a very large part of the earth's surface, and if it is intended to develop it by building railways to the various sections of that country which will be asked for by the few and widely scattered settlers, the American people will be in for an expenditure which will make the Panama Canal, to this time our largest investment, look like a trifle from a bargain counter. Thirty-five million dollars will not do it, nor three hundred and fifty million dollars. For years we will be sending good money after bad, and will finally wake up to the fact that we have wasted half a billion dollars from the people's contributions to the Government.

Mr. Chairman, it is well to consider the advice of the people who know about conditions in Alaska and who have no interest whatever in coal mines, gold mines, or the mythical meadows that have been dangled before our eyes for a month or more.

The Board of Road Commissioners for Alaska, created by an act of Congress approved January 27, 1905, which consists of Army officers, whose only interest in Alaska is to do the work assigned them and submit the facts to Congress, in the report for 1913 say:

Our board specifically disavows any intent to set forth views in opposition or discouragement to railroad construction in the Territory under proper limitations, but after several years of careful observation and study of the land-transportation conditions and of the natural inducements to development and to settlement which exist, is convinced that no rapid or general development will follow the construction of trunk lines of railroad to the interior unless preceded or accompanied by the construction of numerous wagon roads and trails as feeders, and even then the development will be slow.

In making this statement our board may incur the suspicion of wishing to give undue importance to its own work, but the railroad commission itself recognized this fact, and no one acquainted with the true situation can fail to do likewise.

Unlike the great West in another respect, Alaska has a wonderful system of waterways, both coastal and interior, and while the interior system is open only about five months of the year, during this open period supplies can be distributed to almost every part of the Territory by means of its various ramifications.

There are about 475 miles of railways already constructed in Alaska, of which only 356 miles are now being operated for the carriage of freight and passengers. And these, I am told, are not overprosperous. Surely the other mileage was not constructed without the belief that tonnage would be offered in quantities to justify the cost of construction. Somebody was mistaken. Some capitalists spent money to build railways to make more money and the investment has not been a good one, and I suspect that some of them want to unload on the people. Now, if business men, alert to make dividends and much more capable in the discernment of these opportunities than any mere salaried agent of the Government will ever be, make such mistakes, who can believe that this will be a profitable enterprise for the taxpayers? Who can think that Congress will make money where keen, practical business men have failed?

The total value of Alaskan production from 1868 to 1911, as published, is $429,523,630, of which the coastal region gave $337,386,352, or more than 75 per cent. Fifty per cent of this great wealth came from the fisheries, which, of course, are on the seacoast, where railways are not really needed and would be of little value if built. Outside of the gold production, which has been and can be handled without a railway, the yield from the interior of Alaska is negligible and certainly does not justify this revolutionary move and enormous outlay.

Much stress has been laid on the coal deposits of Alaska, which are, no doubt, of very great potential value and ultimately will become an active asset of the American people. It has been claimed that the coal is needed for the Navy. But the tests made at the engineering experiment station, Annapolis, Md., show that it is unsuited for naval purposes. The Assistant Secretary of the Navy so stated in his letter to Mr. DAVENPORT, written December 27 last.

But, Mr. Chairman, the great and at this time the only desirable fuel for the Navy is oil. The nature of this admittedly superior fuel is having an influence on naval construction. It is driving Governments to the purchase of oil fields and has even provoked international correspondence and ill feeling. The country which occupies a position of advantage with reference to the supply of fuel oil is envied by other Governments not so fortunate. Our country is blessed in that respect. In California, Texas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and other States we have extensive oil fields, the product of which can be purchased or, if need be, condemned by the Federal Government.

The cry that we need Alaskan coal for the Navy is ill timed or insincere. Experiments by scientific officers of the Government have demonstrated its inefficiency. In the letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy to Mr. DAVENPORT, of Oklahoma, the statement is plainly made that it is unsuitable for the purposes of the Navy. It is less valuable for steaming by 25 per cent than the West Virginia coal. So that argument fails.

A STEP TOWARD SOCIALISM.

But, Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to all forms of socialism. I believe in the greatest possible liberty of action for the individual and the narrowest possible field of activity for the Government.

When government provides equal opportunities under the law for all citizens and punishes transgressions on the rights of person and property of any citizen by another it has, in my humble democratic judgment, done all, or substantially all, it should do. That may be old-fashioned, but it is my faith, and I shall stand by it. I can not do otherwise and be true to the principles and traditions of my party or retain my self-respect.

This is the beginning on a large scale of Government ownership of railways. The situation at Panama is exceptional. That railway was bought and has been maintained as an adjunct of the canal work—a mere tool used in construction. If it is not necessary to keep it as a part of the machinery of the canal, I hope it will be sold and that the Federal Government will go entirely out of the railway business as quickly as possible.

I think it would be a serious blunder for this Government to go into the transportation business. It would mean an ultimate extension of the roll of public servants to such a degree that they would make a resistless body of compact, organized officials, with an unsatisfied and unsatisfiable appetite for larger pay, shorter hours, and pensions. If, as happened in France, they went on a strike, we would be confronted with rebellion as much more serious than the French situation as our railway mileage exceeds that of France. The French Government settled the strike by calling all reserves to the colors, and the habit of soldiering, persevered in for generations, caused the strikers to rally to the support of government. Could we handle such a situation in that way? I do not believe we could.

Our railway corporations complain now that on account of increased wages and the high cost of material they can not earn enough to pay dividends to the owners of the property. Shippers protest against an increase of rates which the roads say they must have to keep out of the bankruptcy court. If private corporations can not earn on the basis of existing rates, it is absolutely certain that the Government could not, and that year by year the deficit would be made up out of the Federal Treasury.

I have traveled on a good many government-owned roads, and on none of them have I seen a service equal to that we have in this country. The equipment of the trains in this country is superior and the speed greater, and, quality of service considered, our ordinary passenger fare is less, as a rule, than the second-class rates on the Continent of Europe.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that the reports of departmental experts show most conclusively that the talk of the development of agriculture in Alaska is preposterous. I will submit and print in the RECORD a few citations from these reports, as well as an excerpt or two from the Senate hearings.

On pages 548, 550, 552, and 556 Prof. Charles V. Piper says:

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. At the first two of these interior stations—Rampart and Fairbanks—spring-sown oats and spring-sown barley have yielded good crops practically every year they have been tested. Fall-sown rye and fall-sown wheat mature, but there is usually considerable winter killing, especially in the wheat, due to too thin snow protection from the severe cold. At both of these stations a large amount of time has been spent in the endeavor to breed up hardier varieties of all these grains better suited to the conditions in Alaska. There can be little doubt that varieties of these cereals will be developed better adapted to the region than any we now possess. However, among the numerous varieties tested, a good many varieties of oats and barley have succeeded, as I have stated. The ryes have done very well, and some fall-sown wheats have given very good results. Spring-sown wheats, I think, in no case have matured. At Copper Center the results have not been as favorable. During the six years that the station was conducted spring-sown grains—that is, oats and barley—matured perfectly only one season.

Crops that mature perfectly in only one season out of six will neither reduce the cost of living nor make the farmers opulent.

This extract from the testimony of Mr. MacKenzie and Prof. Piper is illuminating as to conditions in Alaska. Particular attention is invited to the statement of the latter that the pioneer is "attracted to public land that he can homestead, even if it cost $200 an acre to clear." Better land, in a good climate, on railways, and near markets are not so attractive to him as the appearance of getting public lands at a song, or for nothing.

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. Chubbuck, on the basis of his reconnoissance in Alaska, has given expression to conservative views regarding the future possibilities of grain raising in the interior of Alaska very much, I think, like the ideas I have presented.

Senator WALSH. Who is Mr. Chubbuck?

Prof. PIPER. Mr. Chubbuck is a member of the Bureau of Plant Industry, and spent the years 1909 and 1910 making an agricultural reconnoissance of Alaska. His report has not yet been published, but will be shortly. Mr. Chubbuck really should have appeared before this committee, because he personally has gone over these lands in the interior of Alaska, and my knowledge is secondhand.

Senator JONES. Where is Mr. Chubbuck?

Prof. PIPER. He is out west at the present time.

In another part of his testimony Prof. Piper said that if the railway were built plenty of "literature of the boom type" would be published to lure the hopeful and ignorant from better conditions at home to the hardships and disappointments of Alaska.

I will quote his testimony as given in the Senate hearings:

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 roseate hopes of what can be done in the way of its agricultural development.

Here is what Mr. Boyce, of Chicago, I believe a newspaper publisher, has to say about agriculture in Alaska:

FARMING IN ALASKA.

TILLING THE SOIL OVER FROST.

"Gold is where it is found," is an old and true saying. Finding it does not, however, depend on climate, soil, elevation, or favorable natural conditions. This is not true of farming. Agricultural products require congenial surroundings, although through the development of seed and intelligent handling of soil and crop we are now growing grains, fruits, and vegetables in many parts of the world heretofore unthought of. Man can not eat gold, timber, or coal. He must have foodstuff, plenty of it, and cheap.

Before I went to Alaska I knew about the gold and fishing and furs and shooting, but was ignorant as to the agricultural possibilities and products. After covering thousands of miles and seeing nearly every developed spot where anything that grows to eat is at its best, I am satisfied that it is a poor country for a farmer, and always will be. Should you succeed in getting a small patch cleared up at a place where there was a "boom on" you could get fancy prices for one or two years until the boom was over. Except for the long summers and nightless days in Alaska, it would be impossible to grow anything. No warmth comes from the soil or beneath the surface. As far down as a shaft has ever been sunk, over 2,000 feet, you find ice. This ice was not made by freezing from the top down. For millions of years the country has been built up from the bottom, ice on ice that never thawed out in the summer. The moss that grows nearly everywhere is a complete protection from the sun, and when you sink a pick through it you think you have struck rock. Clear off this moss, other vegetation, or scrub timber, and you have the frozen earth. The sun will draw out the ice and frost about 1 foot the first year. Break this up and the next year it thaws out deeper, until after a number of years the frost, on account of the long days, will disappear by June 1 down 2 or 3 feet.

Where alfalfa has been tried it turns yellow as soon as the roots strike the ice. Of course, with the frost always coming out of the ground you can raise crops where you have only a few inches of rainfall in the summer. Interior and northwest Alaska is very dry in the summer. Only where the Japan current comes close to the southeast coast and the islands do you have much rain.

In Norway, Sweden, Finland, and Russian Siberia farming has been fairly successful in a latitude as far north as most of Alaska, and this has given hope to the wish that we might make an agricultural country out of our far-north possession. For many centuries these countries have been thickly settled, and labor has been very cheap. An acre could be cleared for little cost, but that is not the case in Alaska, where common labor, employed only for a few months in the year, receives from $3 to $6 per day of eight hours. It costs from $125 to $150 to prepare an acre for the plow. You have invested the total cost per acre of first-class farm land near a good market in an old country before you begin raising anything to sell in this dayless-night and nightless-day region.

What Mr. Boyce has to say about the impossibility of serving the 32,000 people in Alaska, except at a cost so staggering that all prudent men revolt at the suggestion, is marked by such common sense and frankness that I will also quote it:

ALASKA'S RAILROADS.

PRESENT AND FUTURE POLICIES.

Alaska, like all new countries, has her share of boomers and failures. The failures and Government employees all want the Government to spend a lot of money in Alaska building railroads, wagon roads, bridges, and winter trails, and in dredging harbors, etc. In fact, I heard it suggested that if Canada would permit, it would be a good scheme to pump the Japan Current into the source of the Yukon River, and from thence let it flow west down that stream, making a perpetual warm country out of the Valley of the Yukon.

This, of course, was objected to by the Alaskans living on the Pacific waters, as it would favor the Yukon Valley and Bering Sea, and leave their part of the country frozen 8 months out of the 12. So you see how impossible it is to please or serve more than 3,000 or 4,000 people in Alaska at less than a cost of several billion dollars without disappointing the other 28,000.

Seriously speaking, the 32,000 white people in Alaska are scattered over a territory one-fifth the size of the United States. The winters except for a small strip of country along the southeast coast—affected by the warm Japan Current—extend over eight months of the year. Nevertheless, Alaska is a wonderful country in many ways, and I have never met with a braver, stronger lot of men—two-thirds of the population are men—any place in the world. They come from everywhere, but especially from the Pacific coast and gold-producing States; some from Australia, Canada, and the cold countries of Europe.

Keep in mind all the time, however, that it is over 1,500 miles from Ketchikan, the southeast corner of Alaska, to Cape Prince of Wales, on Bering Strait, northwest of Nome. And, again, it is over 1,500 miles from Unalaska and Dutch Harbor, in the southwest corner of Alaska, to the Arctic Ocean north of Fort Yukon.

While Alaska is not equal to a country 1,500 miles square, it is just as difficult to serve from a transportation standpoint, and nearly all of its service must be by rail, as compared with water, except a few fishing towns and ports on the south and southwest coasts, as the rivers, as well as the Bering Sea and Arctic Ocean, are frozen for eight months and sometimes more each year.

I traveled over 8,000 miles in Alaska, and found the population of 32,000 whites pretty evenly divided between the inland and coast, and was impressed with the impossibility of our Government acting fairly toward the whole of Alaska, undertaking the question of transportation, to say nothing about the enormous expense and loss if attempted. As near as I can calculate, it would cost $200,000,000 to serve 20,000 of the 32,000 Alaskans with railroads, at an annual loss of $30,000,000 a year, or equal to $1,500 a year pension for each man, woman, and child brought within the transportation belt.

As an alternative, the suggestion of Mr. Boyce that it will be cheaper to pension all the people of Alaska at the rate of $1,500 a year offers the less expensive way of meeting the demands of these hungry folks, and if they had that income out of the Common Treasury they could live in Seattle and spend it there and perhaps also satisfy that city, which appears to be behind this absurd measure.

Mr. Chairman, reasons might be multiplied indefinitely to show why this bill should not pass, but they have been so fully and ably set out by the two gentlemen from Oklahoma and others that I will not consume any more time.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I want to address myself especially to the argument made against this bill based upon the idea that it commits the Government as a general proposition to the public ownership of railroads wherever located, railroads already in existence and operation, like the Pennsylvania, the Baltimore & Ohio, and like railroads. I do not accept any such proposition. My genial friend from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL], in answer to a direct inquiry, said that he did regard the passage of this bill as committing the Government to the policy of general railroad ownership. I do not think so, and I want to show you why I do not think it does. We have done many such things in the past.

What is transportation? It is moving persons or property from one point to another. Is not that true? It is moving persons and property from one State to another or from one nation to another. Every highway in the country, every dirt road, is a transportation facility; it is a means of transportation of persons and property.

Now, we have private dirt roads operated and owned by gentlemen on their farms, but all common highways are owned by the community, by the State, or by the country; they perform a public function; they are public facilities and owned by the people. Does that commit anybody irrevocably to the policy that the Government should own every other means of transportation of persons and property?

Why, it will not do to claim that the owning of a special means of transportation for a special purpose will have such relation to the general proposition as to commit us to Government ownership of railroads in general.

The Government owns this District. It owns this Capitol. When this Capitol was built elevators had not come into use, so stair steps were built all around and in it. Afterwards elevators came into use. An elevator is a means of transportation of persons from one portion of a building to another; it is a facility of transportation. The Government owned this building, and was it committed to the transportation of persons and property in general because it built an elevator in its own building? The Washington Monument was built by the Government, and is 555 feet high, with circular stair steps for ascension. When elevators came into use the Government, owning the Monument and the grounds upon which it stood, built an elevator for passengers to go up and down in the Monument, thereby performing the service of transportation in the Monument.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMS. Yes.

Mr. HARDY. I want to say to the gentleman that our State gave 16 sections, 12,000 acres, to get other people to build the roads, and in that way escaped Government ownership. Would the gentleman prefer that process to owning the road after they have given that amount to build it?

Mr. SIMS. That is for the gentleman from Texas to state after they lost the land. I am not discussing the merits of public ownership. I am only trying to point out that the passage of this bill does not commit anyone to the policy of the Government owning railroads, any more than did the building of an elevator in the Capitol Building or putting one into the Washington Monument.

A few years ago I introduced a bill, which I think was reported to the House and passed the House, to build a spur track from the Pennsylvania Railroad to the navy yard. My lovable friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] opposed it bitterly upon the idea that it committed the Government to the policy of Government ownership of railroads. It was to be about 1,000 feet in length, and to be built as a special plant facility. The Government owned the navy yard, and it seemed to me that it might own a track to connect with the Pennsylvania Railroad, and that any other road should have the right to build a connection with the track and use it on the same terms.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMS. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. Is it not a fact that in that matter it was stated it would not pay the Pennsylvania Co. to build that spur, and it was a very expensive operation for the Government?

Mr. SIMS. Oh, it is not the question of what the Pennsylvania Railroad had to say about it. What I am talking about is the fact of the gentleman having made a serious argument that to do such a thing committed the United States Government to the policy of the ownership of all railroads.

Mr. MOORE. Yes; I did make that argument.

Mr. SIMS. Yes; which was about of the force of the argument in this case in opposition to this bill, based on the same objection, according to my honest opinion. What is Alaska? It is a Government-owned piece of land. I do not care whether it is good farming land or not. The question is, Are all of its resources, agricultural, mineral, and everything else combined, worth developing? Will Alaska, with a railroad be worth the price of the railroad more than it is now? If so, where is the principle that denies us not only the power but the wisdom of the policy of building an elevator, as it were, into Alaska? I am leaving all questions as to the productions and resources of Alaska and what it will be worth to the United States to the committee that have investigated it. My two good friends, Mr. FERRIS and Mr. DAVENPORT, have each made speeches here. I did not hear all of the speech of Mr. DAVENPORT, but I did hear all of his colleague's [Mr. FERRIS], and I never heard a better or abler speech in this House on any subject. [Applause.] I give to him and all others the right to exercise their own judgment as they may see fit, without any thought of impugning anyone's motives; but my theory is that here is a piece of land and it is not worth to the people of this country, who own it, as much without a railroad as it will be with a railroad, and that by the Government owning the railroad it can prevent the evils of private monopolistic ownership of the resources of Alaska that may grow out of private ownership. I do not care whether the road, as an investment, pays or not. I do not care whether, regarding it as an independent enterprise, the freight and passenger traffic maintains it; but if opening up the whole of Alaska, being Government-owned property, is benefited to the extent of the value of the railroad and its maintenance, then it is good business to do it, is it not? We afford by this railroad the means of developing whatever is there, and if there is not anything worth developing let us sell the Territory as quickly as we can. If we are going to develop it, let us treat it like a private individual would treat his own private property—make the best of it, and furnish the facilities necessary to make the best of it. Would a man having a forest at the back of his farm, with a swamp in front of it, stand back and refuse to build a road to his timber that could not otherwise be developed?

The timber is worth nothing as it stands, but it would be worth a great deal with the road constructed, although the road itself might be merely an expense. My friends ought to remember for a moment that there is nothing new in the ownership of a mere plant facility, and that is all this railroad will be. Alaska is a great Territory. This is a mere branch line connecting the interior of Alaska with the ocean, like the line from the navy yard up to the Pennsylvania Railroad. It is a mere connecting link that private enterprise will not build without all of the benefits that accrue to private enterprise. We have a Government-owned railroad at Panama, and have had it for a number of years. It has not only been operated to perform service for the Government, but it is performing service for the public. It has carried freight, many millions of dollars worth, across the Isthmus for others than the Government. That railroad has been rebuilt, every mile of it, at an enormous expense, and why? We have just dug at the expense of approximately $400,000,000, a canal, another transportation facility, and one in which the benefits of transportation will accrue more to the world at large than to the United States. Why have we relocated and constructed a new railroad at an immense cost right along by the side of that canal? Is it to compete with the canal, the Government owning both? Not at all. It is a land transportation facility, built right alongside of a water transportation facility as an aid to the water transportation facility, a mere equipment for maintenance purposes, and to be used in case of accident to the canal.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMS. Yes.

Mr. BRYAN. And then there is the further fact that we own three or four large ships that sail the ocean in connection with this same proposition.

Mr. SIMS. That is true; but that is a temporary ownership, as I understand, while the railroad is permament. The point I am making is not the Government ownership of the railroad at Panama for general transportation purposes, but as a mere facility to enable the Government to operate its waterway. That does not commit the Government to the public ownership of railroads any more than if there was no railroad there.

What have we done in the Philippines? I tried to see some member of the Committee on Insular Affairs to ascertain whether or not my information was correct, but was unable to do so; but I am advised that because of the difficulty of constructing railroads in the Philippines, necessary for their development, the Government of the Philippines and the Government of the United States guaranteed the bonds of the railroad.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, the facts are that the bonds were authorized by the United States Congress, but they were issued by the Philippine Government, which is responsible for the payment of the interest only, and there is a deficiency in the operation now.

Mr. SIMS. But the United States Government is responsible?

Mr. MOORE. Not directly responsible; only moraly.

Mr. COX. We guaranteed the interest.

Mr. MOORE. No; I beg the gentleman's pardon. The Philippine Government is responsible for the interest.

Mr. SIMS. Does the Philippine Government own the railroad?

Mr. MOORE. No; Congress authorized the Philippine Government to authorize contracts for the construction of railroads. The railroads have been built under contract, and the contractors or the railroads have undertaken to operate and pay the interest on the bonds.

Mr. SIMS. Are the railroads owned by private corporations?

Mr. MOORE. They are owned by corporations and the bonds are guaranteed to the extent of the payment of interest by the Philippine Government.

Mr. SIMS. And the Government of the United States as to all of them?

Mr. MOORE. The Government of the United States is not responsible, except morally.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMS. Yes. The gentleman is a member of the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the situation with reference to the Philippine railroad is this: Congress passed an act authorizing the Philippine Government to enter into contracts for the construction of railways and to guarantee—that is, the Philippine Government—4 per cent on the railroad bonds.

Mr. SIMS. Is the Government of the United States responsible for those bonds?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The Government of the United States is not responsible for those bonds. I would not concede that under any circumstances.

Mr. SIMS. But the Philippine Government is? That is what I wanted to know.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The Philippine Government is responsible.

Mr. SIMS. For both bonds and interest?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Four per cent for 30 years.

Mr. SIMS. I was not sure that I had the facts; but if the Philippine Government had not done what it did and the United States Government had not done what it did there would have been no railroads built in the Philippines. I am only trying to point out that we should not fail to develop a territory we own because some men, forsooth, may say that it binds us or commits us to the policy of general Government ownership of railroads.

So far as my section of our country is concerned, and that is all I know much about, the majority of our people are opposed to the Government ownership of railroads. They have always been and they are still opposed to it, so far as I am informed.

Now, the mere favoring of these things, the mere advocacy of Government ownership as a matter of theory and academic policy, will never bring it, and the passage of a thousand bills like this will not bring it, and the defeat of a thousand like this will not prevent it.

Mr. FERRIS. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. SIMS. Yes.

Mr. FERRIS. Now, if we build this railroad along the lines of this bill and issue the bonds and make the appropriation in Alaska, what will you be heard to say when 300,000 Indians come, as wards of the Government, and state that their lands are underlain with coal and that a railroad will develop their resources? I ask you if this is not setting a precedent that will make it extremely hard for you or anybody else to turn them away?

Mr. SIMS. I believe the gentleman is a member of the Committee on Indian Affairs?

Mr. FERRIS. Not now, but I have been.

Mr. SIMS. I thought you were. I am sorry for the committee if you are not. When it comes from the committee with a favorable report, with information from the Committee on Indian Affairs, I will act with reference to the merits of that single proposition without reference to the policy of the country upon any other measure that may follow it just as I am acting on this bill.

Defeat this bill and you will keep Alaska where it has been for many years. My friend from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] has a bill to cut down the period of cold storage of food products. Alaska's products have been in cold storage for thousands of years. Is it not time to open up and let the people of the country use them?

Mr. DAVENPORT. I want to suggest to the gentleman that Alaska's products have been in cold storage since the beginning of time.

Mr. SIMS. This bill provides facilities for making accessible hundreds of millions of dollars in value of products which have existed since the beginning of time.

Mr. MANN. I think they have been there long enough.

Mr. SIMS. So do I think.

Now, my friend from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN] who has just taken his seat talked about overadvertising. I went to Texas once and stopped in his good town. I had read the advertisements of southwest Texas, and I went all the way from Tennessee to San Antonio to see for myself. And I want to say right now that, so far as I could see, it had not been overadvertised; it, in fact, had been underadvertised. It was beautiful beyond description. Birds of paradise were flitting through the air [laughter] and flowers were everywhere. It is a beautiful and glorious land. About 5 or 6 o'clock in the afternoon I saw 15 or 20 young gentlemen and ladies passing out of the plaza on ponies at a swift gallop. Such personal liberty in the middle of a town I never saw before, and I admired those who were exercising it. The only thing I saw that had been overadvertised was the San Pedro Springs, but perhaps I am wrong even about that. They had been advertised as beautiful springs, and they were beautiful. I was hot, tired, and thirsty, and in the old-fashioned way I lay down and drew up a mouthful of water. It went back immediately. It was hot. [Laughter.] It was not boiling water, but as I expected it would be cold from the way it looked, and from the way it had been advertised, it possibly appeared much warmer than it really was.

But that part of Texas had not been overadvertised, so far as description of its beauties was concerned.

I do not know whether Alaska has been overadvertised or not. I am leaving all that to the committee.

As a number of gentlemen who have taken part in this debate have expressed fears that the passage of this bill will commit Congress to the policy of Government ownership of railroads in general, I think it will not be out of place to discuss for a short time some things that may result in forcing Government ownership of railroads in some form on the country, possibly before it is prepared to undertake so great and so tremendous a responsibility upon itself.

Mr. Chairman, I have always advocated the regulation of railroads and have always opposed Government ownership and operation. I have for years believed that one or the other must prevail. Either the Government must fully and effectively control the railroads, so as to give the whole country and every part of it the best possible service under private ownership, or it must own and operate them in the general public interest.

With the hope that regulation was feasible and possible, I have believed that with broad, general powers conferred upon the Interstate Commerce Commission, with the very best and ablest men that the country affords as members of that commission, that Government ownership might be rendered unnecessary. I have hoped that the owners and operators of our railroads would prefer private ownership with public regulation and supervision rather than public ownership. But I am not so hopeful of the cooperation of the railroads as I have been heretofore. It seems that it is the policy of the railroads to treat every act of Congress looking to regulation and control as a criminal statute—to be obeyed only after every legal test of the validity of the law has been resorted to through all the courts of the country. The lower Federal courts seem to construe such acts of Congress with great strictness, so as to narrow the remedial features of all such legislation, often holding acts and parts of acts invalid, and thus making it necessary to have every doubtful point as to the validity of a statute passed on by the Supreme Court of the United States before even a grudging obedience is had on the part of the common carriers.

Since the acts of 1906 and 1910 were passed, increasing the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission, it has performed the greatest possible public service, and at this time there is no branch of the Government in which the people have greater and more implicit confidence than in the Interstate Commerce Commission. To this day that commission has never in all its years of useful service made one single order affecting the rates and practices of the railroads that has been held confiscatory by any court, high or low. But notwithstanding this record of the commission, nearly every one of its important orders is attacked in the courts by the carriers and fought to the bitter end. Mr. Chairman, if the common carriers would only cooperate with the commission and give aid and advice in the almost impossible task that the commission must perform, my hope for successful and satisfactory regulation and control of the railroads would be greatly strengthened; or if the inferior Federal courts would only give the acts of Congress a broad and liberal construction, so as to reach the end Congress evidently intended to reach in its efforts at regulation and control, that would give additional grounds for hope of success with private ownership.

Under present conditions, Mr. Chairman, it is no longer a question of how to bring about Government ownership of railroads, but the real, burning question for our present consideration is, What can we do to prevent it?

I do not believe there are a great number of our people who really desire that the Government shall assume the ownership and operation of the railroads of our country. They have been and will continue to be patient as long as there is a peg on which to hang a hope. The people are slow to anger, but when once aroused they never quit the fight until victory perches on their banner.

The owners of railroads have many real difficulties to face and overcome in which they need and will have the considerate sympathy of every fair-minded man and woman in our country, and if they will only convince the people that they will in the future so conduct their business as to give the best possible service for the lowest possible charge Government ownership can be avoided; but the people are in no temper to submit to further exploitation schemes on the part of railroad owners and operators. A mere promise to be good will not be sufficient.

Mr. Chairman, we have 48 States possessed with absolute sovereign power over the regulation and control of railroad rates and practices as to all business of a purely intrastate character, although done by an interstate carrier. So far as I have been able to look up the decisions of the courts, there can be no question as to the correctness of this statement. So Congress is without power to in any way interfere with State regulation and control of all purely intrastate business. Each of the 48 States may have differing laws and regulations as to the field in which it has jurisdiction. So one interstate railroad may do some intrastate business in 20 or more States, in each of which it must comply with the laws and regulations of these States and State commissions, regardless of the cost and expenses incurred, so long as the State law is not void under the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

In addition to being subject to all the valid laws and regulations of the 48 States, or so many of same as the railroad in question may enter, all railroads doing an interstate business are subject to all valid laws of Congress and all valid rules and regulations of the Interstate Commerce Commission as to all interstate business. The value of the interstate business of our railroads is many times greater than the intrastate business; but in fixing and adjusting rates and charges both sources of revenue must necessarily be considered. So, Mr. Chairman, even if the railroads cooperate with the Interstate Commerce Commission, and in all good faith attempt to live up to and abide by all valid State laws and regulations, rate making will remain a complex and difficult thing to do so as to give a fair, full, just, nondiscriminating service to all sections of the country.

The recent case heard by the Supreme Court of the United States, commonly called the Shreveport case, involving an order of the Interstate Commerce Commission as to a discrimination alleged to have been made by interstate carriers against Shreveport, La., and in favor of Dallas and Houston, Tex., raises a very interesting question as to the conflicting powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the powers of the several States and State commissions, which, when finally decided by the Supreme Court, may have a very great effect on the exercise of the power of Congress through the Interstate Commerce Commission to successfully prevent rate discriminations by interstate carriers, as between localities, although brought about in obedience to the order of a State commission, made within its powers as conferred by the valid laws of a sovereign State as to intrastate commerce.

Mr. Chairman, it will be interesting and enlightening to give a few extracts from the report of the majority of the commission in that case, as also the position taken by the Texas commission, and the legal questions arising out of the complicated and opposing interests involved.

Commissioner Lane, speaking for a majority of the Interstate Commerce Commission, in part says:

"This proceeding places in issue the right of interstate carriers to discriminate in favor of State traffic and against interstate traffic. The gravamen of the complaint is that the carriers defendant make rates out of Dallas and other Texas points into eastern Texas which are much lower than those which they extend into Texas from Shreveport, La. A rate of 60 cents carries first-class traffic to the eastward from Dallas a distance of 160 miles, while the same rate of 60 cents will carry the same class of traffic but 55 miles into Texas from Shreveport.

"The railroad commission of Louisiana has brought this proceeding under direction of the legislature of that State for two purposes: (1) To secure an adjustment of rates that will be just and reasonable from Shreveport into Texas, and (2) to end, if possible, the alleged unjust discrimination practiced by these interstate railroads in favor of Texas State traffic and against similar traffic between Louisiana and Texas.

"There appears to be little question as to the policy of the Texas commission. It is frankly one of protection to its own industries and communities. We find in the early reports of that commission, which are quoted at length in the record, evidences that the Texas commission believed that the interstate carriers operating from the north and the east into Texas were pursuing a policy hostile to the development of that State. The Texas commission was conscious that it was within the power of these interstate carriers to so adjust rates as to make Texas entirely or largely dependent upon other States and thus restrict the growth of her cities and fix the nature of her industries, the employments of her people, and the character of her civilization so far as these depend on economic and industrial conditions. With this thought in mind the Texas commission sought to establish a Texas policy and to make the railroads within that State contribute in the manner believed by her own people to best subserve their own interests. Accordingly we find in the fifth annual report of that commission (p. 5) the following:

"'To Texas as a whole it is of the most vital concern that there should be within her limits at proper places jobbing and manufacturing establishments. Besides adding to the citizenship of the State a desirable population and furnishing employment to persons already in our midst and enhancing the taxable values of the State, and, as a consequence, under wisely administered government, aiding in ultimately reducing the rate of taxation, and besides the home market they afford to the tiller of the soil and other producers, including manufacturers, for their products, if men, in Texas, having the capital to engage in a wholesale business or in a manufacturing enterprise, for the success of which natural conditions are favorable, they have as much right to invest their means in such business or enterprise as a man in Illinois or Missouri has to embark in such business or enterprise in his State. Some of the Texas lines of railway, constituting parts of interstate systems of railway interested in long hauls, appear to be hostile to a policy which would foster Texas jobbing and manufacturing interests, while other lines manifestly favor such a policy. Outside cities bring to bear every pressure they can to coerce all Texas lines into a course favorable to their interests and adverse to the interests of Texas cities with respect to jobbing and manufacturing. * * * This commission has always had in mind the securing of relatively just State and interstate rates with a view of enabling Texas merchants and manufacturers to do business in competition with outsiders.'

"Passing, then, to the question of discrimination, has this commission the power to say that whatever rates an interstate carrier makes between points in Texas shall not be exceeded for the same distance under like conditions between Shreveport and Texas points? In other words, may a carrier engaged in interstate commerce discriminate against a city beyond the border of a State by imposing upon that city's traffic rates which deny its shippers access upon equal terms to the communities of an adjoining State?

"This is an appeal to the powers lodged in this commission under the third section of the act—that provision which is aimed at the destruction of undue preference and advantage. We thus meet directly the most delicate problem arising under our dual system of government. Congress asserts its exclusive dominion over interstate commerce; the State asserts its absolute control over State commerce. The State for its own purposes establishes rates designed to protect its own communities and promote the development of its own industries. These rates are adopted by the interstate carriers upon State traffic, but are not adopted upon interstate traffic. Thus arises a discrimination in favor of communities within the State, and interstate commerce suffers a corresponding disadvantage. May this commission end such discrimination by saying to the interstate carrier, 'You may not distinguish between State and interstate traffic transported under similar conditions; if the rates prescribed for you by State authority are not compensatory upon this specific traffic as to which discrimination is found, the burden rests upon you, irrespective of your obligation to the State, to so adjust your rates that justice will be done between communities regardless of the invisible State line which divides them'? To which we are compelled to answer that the effective exercise of its power regarding interstate commerce makes necessary the assertion of the supreme authority of the National Government, and that the Congress has appropriately exercised this power in the provisions of the act to regulate commerce touching discrimination.

"Congress has prohibited carriers of interstate commerce from giving undue preference or advantage to one community over another. To say that this prohibition permits such carriers to exclude a city within the State of Louisiana from doing business upon equal terms with the cities in Texas is to distort the plain meaning of the act and make the regulation of interstate commerce farcically ineffective. To say that interstate carriers may so discriminate because of the orders of a State commission is to admit that a State may limit and prescribe the flow of commerce between the States.

"And if one State may exercise its power of fixing rates so as to prefer its own communities all States may do so. There

would thus arise a commercial condition more absurd and unbearable than that which obtained prior to the Constitution when each State sought to devise methods by which its commerce could be localized.

"An interstate carrier must respect the Federal law, and if it is also subjected to State law it must respect that in so far as it can without doing violence to its obligations under the national authority. Before us are carriers which undeniably discriminate directly against interstate traffic. To this charge they plead that all they have done was to obey the orders of a State commission, as against which they were helpless."

In opposition to the views set forth by Mr. Commissioner Lane, speaking for the majority of the commission, Mr. Commissioner McChord says, in part:

"To say that interstate carriers might discriminate because of such order would be an equal admission that this commission might limit and prescribe the flow of commerce between points in a State. In response to the suggestion that the Federal commerce power extended to all the affairs of a railroad if any part of its business was interstate, Mr. Chief Justice White, in Howard *v.* Illinois Central Railroad Co. (207 U. S., 463), said:

"'It assumes that because one engages in interstate commerce, he thereby endows Congress with power not delegated to it by the Constitution; in other words, with the right to legislate concerning matters of purely State concern. * * * It is apparent that if the contention were well founded, it would extend the power of Congress to every conceivable subject, however inherently local; would obliterate all the limitations of power imposed by the Constitution, and would destroy the authority of the States as to all conceivable matters, which from the beginning have been and must continue to be under their control as long as the Constitution endures.'

"It has been repeatedly held by the Supreme Court that the power of the State over intrastate commerce is as full and complete as is the power of Congress over interstate commerce. In Sands *v.* Manistee River Improvement Co. (123 U. S., 288), the court, by Mr. Justice Field, said:

"'Internal commerce of a State—that is, the commerce which is wholly confined within its limits—is as much under its control as foreign or interstate commerce is under the control of the General Government.'

"Of course, if in this instance we fix interstate rates by the Texas yardstick, we must fix other interstate rates by other State yardsticks, and may find ourselves encumbered with some 48 different rate meters, which will doubtless create a condition 'more absurd and unbearable' than that which the majority opines would arise if the States remain unmolested in the exercise of their legitimate powers. But aside from this chaos, the Supreme Court has said that the function which the majority would delegate to the State of Texas can not by a State be constitutionally exercised, because:

"'The fact which vitiates the provision is that it compels the carrier to regulate, adjust, or fix his interstate rates with some reference at least to his rates within the State. (L. & N. R. R. Co. *v.* Eubank, 184 U. S., 41.)'"

The carriers against which the order of the Interstate Commerce Commission was made, in reply to the position taken by the commission, say:

First. If the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission be conceded, the discrimination is not voluntary or illegal.

Second. The transportation affected is wholly within the State of Texas, constitutes no part of an interstate transit, and under the provision to section 1 of the act to regulate commerce the Interstate Commerce Commission has no jurisdiction to regulate the same.

Third. Has Congress the unlimited power to regulate intrastate commerce because conducted by interstate carriers, as asserted by the Interstate Commission?

Mr. Chairman, I have given the position of the majority and the minority of the commission and the position of the railroad companies affected by the order, in order to show that there is great conflict between the very highest and most eminent authorities in our Nation on the questions involved in the Shreveport case, as also the position of the railroads to be affected. After having heard both sides to the contention, so as to understand the nature of the inevitable conflict between National and State authority in relation to the attempt to regulate interstate and intrastate rates and charges of the railroads, I want to ask in all candor if there is a Member of this House that would invest a dollar in a railroad to be constructed from some point in Arkansas, Louisiana, or Oklahoma, to and into the State of Texas, with equal mileage in both States?

What one State can do as to intrastate commerce all States can equally do, and with unlimited power in the States to regulate all purely intrastate commerce and with unlimited national power to regulate all interstate commerce, never-ending conflict and litigation must ensue. It will be claimed in almost every case where an order of a State commission is made against an interstate carrier that the order has so intimate a connection with its functions as an interstate carrier as to materially affect its revenues and to thus in effect regulate its interstate business, and resort will be had by the carriers to the Federal courts, challenging the authority of the State to make the rate or regulation in almost every case of any considerable importance. With the tendency of the inferior Federal courts to take jurisdiction of every question in which a Federal element is alleged to arise, it will be practically impossible to have ready acquiescence in and obedience to the orders of State commissions touching orders affecting the intrastate business of interstate carriers to any considerable extent.

Mr. Chairman, whether or not Government ownership is to be forced upon this country depends almost entirely upon the owners and operators of our railroads doing interstate business. If we are to judge the future by the past, or even by current events, there is little on which to base a hope that Government ownership can be much longer deferred.

As further evidence of the trend of public sentiment as to the future control of transportation facilities, I now read a clipping from an eastern newspaper, as follows:

"TOO MUCH WASTED ON RAILROADS—NEW ENGLAND TIRED OF MISMANAGEMENT, SAYS ANDERSON.

"Full protection for the investor in public-service corporations, as well as the rate-paying public, and wide open publicity as to the business of the public-service commission, was the sentiment expressed by Public Service Commissioner George W. Anderson in his address yesterday afternoon before Boston University Law School Association at the monthly dinner in the American House.

"In the matter of railroad regulation we don't deal with a small company, one locally controlled. The entire question is one with many ramifications, covering many other fields, and running into the so-called Money Trust. Our railroad organizations to-day are absolutely different in management and personnel than the locally owned gas companies were.

"It is not a question of what is going to happen to the New Haven or the Boston & Maine. It is a question of what two or three banking houses are going to do.

"Unless some intelligent cooperation between State commissions and the Interstate Commission can be worked out, it is only a matter of time when our entire transportation will be controlled from Washington and owned by the Federal Government.

"New England, without natural resources except its seacoast and east wind, must depend on transportation for its development. If the gross mismanagement continues in the future as in the past, the investing public, as much as the rate-paying public, will be affected. The railroads will not be able to find another generation which will put up money to see it wasted, as it has been in the past, by mismanagement. In the common parlance of the street, 'suckers' won't put up any more money in railroads in the next few years."

Mr. Chairman, I am convinced that unless the private owners and operators of our railroads hastily retrace their steps, face about, and by undoing the wrongs they have done and in the future refrain from all like practices without asking a wronged and outraged public by way of increased freight charges to assume the losses brought on themselves that the demand for Government ownership and operation of our interstate carriers will become irresistible long before we have sufficient time to properly consider and prepare for so great an undertaking.

Mr. Chairman, I think it may be well said of our railroad owners and operators that none are so blind as those who can but will not see.

In order to show just how private ownership of transportation lines has worked in this country when in the control and management of the most noted and strongest of our banking houses, I read from an article in Harper's Weekly, January 10, 1914, by Mr. Louis D. Brandeis, under the title of "A curse of bigness":

"THE NEW HAVEN MONOPOLY.

"The rise of the New Haven monopoly presents another striking example of combination as a developer of financial concentration, and it illustrates also the use to which 'large security issues' are put.

"In 1892, when Mr. Morgan entered the New Haven directorate, it was a very prosperous little railroad, with capital liabilities of $25,000,000, paying 10 per cent dividends, and operating 508 miles of line. By 1899 the capitalization had grown to $80,477,600, but the aggregate mileage had also grown (mainly through merger or leases of other lines) to 2,017. Fourteen years later, in 1913, when Mr. Morgan died and Mr. Mellen resigned, the mileage was 1,997, just 20 miles less than in 1899, but the capital liabilities had increased to $425,935,000. Of course the business of the railroad had grown largely in those 14 years; the roadbed was improved, bridges built, additional tracks added, and much equipment purchased; and for all this new capital issues were needed; and additional issues were needed also because the company paid out in dividends more than it earned. But of the capital increase over $200,000,000 was expended in the acquisition of the stock or other securities of some 121 other railroads, steamships, street-railway, electric-light, gas, and water companies. It was these outside properties which made necessary the much-discussed $67,000,000 6 per cent bond issue, as well as other large and expensive security issues, for in these 14 years the improvements on the railroad, including new equipment, have cost, on the average, only $10,000,000 a year.

"THE BANKERS.

"Few, if any, of those 121 companies which the New Haven acquired had, prior to their absorption by it, been financed by J. P. Morgan & Co. The needs of the Boston & Maine and Maine Central—the largest group—had, for generations, been met mainly through their own stockholders or through Boston banking houses. No investment banker had been a member of the board of directors of either of those companies. The New York, Ontario & Western—the next largest of the acquired railroads—had been financed in New York, but by persons apparently entirely independent of the Morgan alliance. The smaller Connecticut railroads, now combined in the Central New England, had been financed mainly in Connecticut or by independent New York bankers. The financing of the street railway companies had been done largely by individual financiers or by small and independent bankers in the States or cities where companies operate. Some of the steamship companies had been financed by their owners, some through independent bankers. As the result of the absorption of these 121 companies into the New Haven system, the financing of all these railroads, steamship companies, street railways, and other corporations were made tributary to J. P. Morgan & Co., and the independent bankers were eliminated or became satellites. And this financial concentration was proceeded with, although practically every one of these 121 companies was acquired by the New Haven in violation either of the State or Federal law, or of both. Enforcement of the Sherman Act will doubtless result in dissolving this unwieldy illegal combination.

"OTHER RAILROAD COMBINATIONS.

"The cases of the Union Pacific and of the New Haven are typical, not exceptional. Our railroad history presents numerous instances of large security issues made wholly or mainly to effect combinations. Some of these combinations have been proper as a means of securing natural feeders or extensions of main lines. But far more of them have been dictated by the desire to suppress active or potential competition or by personal ambition or greed or by the mistaken belief that efficiency grows with size.

"Thus the monstrous combination of the Rock Island and the St. Louis & San Francisco with about 16,000 miles of line is recognized now to have been obviously inefficient. It was severed voluntarily, but had it not been, must have crumbled soon from inherent defects if not as a result of proceedings under the Sherman law. Both systems are suffering now from the effects of this unwise combination; the Frisco, itself greatly overcombined, has paid the penalty in receivership. The Rock Island—a name once expressive of railroad efficiency and stability—has, through its excessive recapitalization and combinations, become a football of speculators and a source of great apprehension to confiding investors. The combination of the Cincinnati, Hamilton & Dayton and the Pere Marquette led to several receiverships.

"There are, of course, other combinations which have not been disastrous to the owners of the railroads. But the fact that a railroad combination has not been disastrous does not necessarily justify it. The evil of the concentration of power is obvious; and as combination necessarily involves such concentration of power, the burden of justifying a combination should be placed upon those who seek to effect it."

Mr. Chairman, all the populistic and socialistic arguments that have ever been made in favor of Government ownership and management of our railroads pale into utter insignificance in weight and force when compared with the simple, unpainted, unexaggerated statement of the facts as to how some of our greatest systems of railroads have been built up and capitalized.

As an illustration of how one of the greatest railway systems of the country has been financed, I now read from the report of the Interstate Commerce Commission in the advanced rates investigation in official classification territory, decided February, 1911:

"The New York Central & Hudson River Railroad Co. came into existence in 1869 by a consolidation of the New York Central Railroad Co. and the Hudson River Railroad Co. The evidence before us fairly shows that the capital stock of the New York Central Co. contained $9,000,000 which had been issued without the payment of any present consideration, and that the stock of the Hudson River Co. had been increased in like manner by something over $3,000,000. At the time of the consolidation the capital stock of the two companies was further increased without the payment of any present consideration by the amount of substantially $45,000,000, issued in proportions agreed upon to the stockholders of the new company. Since that date all issues of the capital stock of this company have been for cash at par or above par, but the capital stock contains $57,000,000 par value for which nothing was ever paid.

"The dividends paid upon this capital stock for the last 40 years will probably average 6 per cent. During that time there has been actually paid in dividends to the holders of this $57,000,000 of stock at least $120,000,000. Had the New York Central & Hudson River Co., instead of paying these amounts to its stockholders, invested them in its property, the funded debt of that company might have been reduced by $120,000,000, not having reference to interest. If account be taken of interest, the amount would be much larger.

"This company has, therefore, as a result of this transaction a capital stock $57,000,000 in excess of what it would be and either a funded debt or a capital stock at least $120,000,000 greater than would be the case if the original issues of stock had never been made."

Here was an instance of where the stockholders of two railroad companies, in consolidating their lines, issued stock to themselves in the enormous sum of $57,000,000 for which not one cent was ever paid in money, property, or services—pure water, and nothing more—upon which the freight and passenger paying public have since paid in dividends more than $120,000,000, making in all, since the date of the consolidation of these two roads in 1869, the appalling sum of more than $179,000,000 which has been added to the wealth of their owners without any legal, equitable, or moral consideration of any kind. At this hour this guilty corporation is pleading before the Interstate Commerce Commission to be permitted to increase its freight rates 5 per cent in order to continue to further reward the holders of this spurious stock issue by a continuance of an unjust and unholy dividend payment on same. Such an act would put to shame all the robber barons of the Middle Ages.

This is a sample of private ownership and management of the greatest railroad property in this country. Many people ask, Could Government ownership and management be worse?

Mr. Chairman, in a statement made by Charles A. Prouty, of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the members of the public service commissions of Massachusetts, Vermont, New Hampshire, and Maine, bearing on the present condition of the Boston & Maine Railroad Co., dated Boston, November 24, 1913, the following appears:

"The Boston & Maine has outstanding $27,000,000 of short-time paper, which it will carry for the current year at a charge of about 7½ per cent, as compared with 5¼ per cent for the preceding year. Of this short-time paper, $20,000,000 was used to purchase stocks which the Boston & Maine now owns."

Is not this an astonishing revelation in view of the fact that this is one of the railroad companies asking an increase in freight rates on account of an increase in wages?

While making such a plea it is actually carrying a debt of $27,000,000 borrowed money at loan-shark cutthroat rates of interest, incurred in order to purchase the stocks of another railroad company. All this unjust and usurious rate of interest must be paid by the consumers of the country. Is it any wonder that they are beginning to sit up and take notice and ask themselves, Can public ownership be any worse?

In another place in the same report the following statement appears:

"In our opinion, the salaries paid the chief executives and frequently the other chief officials of the principal railroad

systems of the United States, ranging as they do from $50,000 to $100,000 annually in case of the chief executive, are utterly extravagant. These positions are not properly private places, to which the corporations may attach any compensation which its stockholders ratify; they are quasi public in their character, and the reasonableness of the amount paid may properly be inquired into, especially where the corporation is asking to impose an additional transportation tax."

Such compensation of railroad officials to be paid by the public in the nature of a tax upon transportation is nothing less than plain, undisguised robbery.

The justices of the Supreme Court of the United States receive only $14,000 in salary annually. The President of the United States only $75,000. The members of the Interstate Commerce Commission, a body of great transportation experts, who have supervision and control of all the interstate railroad rates in the whole country, receive only $10,000 per annum in salary.

Is it any surprise that the people who are taxed to pay these outrageous salaries are beginning to think that there is no justification for longer submitting to the banker-controlled and banker-financed roads under private ownership, when as Government officials the same men would perform all the legitimate and necessary functions they now perform for perhaps less than one-fourth of what they now receive?

If Government ownership of our railroads ever comes in this country, it will be brought on by the demonstrated failure of private ownership to give to the people the service they are entitled to and will have.

As I have just said, the passage of a thousand Alaskan railroad bills like the one now pending will not bring it on, and the defeat of a thousand such bills will not prevent it.

Mr. Chairman, there is no way to prevent Government ownership of all the railroads in this country except through the friendly, cordial, and active cooperation of all the railroads, and all the State railroad commissions, with the Interstate Commerce Commission, in a sincere and honest joint effort to give the whole people the best possible service for the lowest possible charge.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to prefer a similar request.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] also asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be able to bring myself to believe that Alaska can become an agricultural possibility, for I would like to realize that continental America has close to its border such a vast area of land that could be turned into utilization.

But I have not been able to convince myself of such a possibility, and I regret it. We have had five agricultural experiment stations in Alaska for a long time. One of these stations has recently been abandoned, and four of them still remain. They have been endeavoring to do agricultural experimental work. In the course of their efforts to do that they have expended $298,000, and they have been able to produce as the result of their labors products valued at the sum of only $22,000 in return for that expenditure.

Information obtained from the weather stations shows that frost occurs in Alaska every month in the year, and it is said by those who know more about it than I do that all of Alaska is frozen, so far as it can freeze, to the bedrock. How we can hope to develop agriculture in such a country is more than I can understand.

Wheat, as everybody will agree, never matures there. Those who attempt to raise it have to cut it when it is green and use it for fodder, and there is not very much fodder at that. They tell me—these experts who have been there on the part of the Government investigating the possibilities of Alaska—that if we hope to raise any agricultural products there the land must be fertilized every year and crops attempted to be raised only every other year.

There are only 163 homesteaders there. This is the total number of people who have patented homesteads, although our homestead laws have been in force and are still in force. If agriculture is such an easy thing in Alaska, I would like to understand why it is that in all the years of our ownership of this vast Territory only 163 people have patented homesteads. It does not seem to have attracted the men and women who believe in agriculture, and this indictment of the Territory as an agricultural region forces me to the conclusion that we ought not to expend the vast sum of $35,000,000 in the construction of a railroad there.

Mr. LAFFERTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I regret I have only 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. MADDEN. It is said by those who know that the cost of clearing an acre of land up there amounts to from $125 to $150 per acre—nearly as much money as it would cost to buy the best acre of land in the State of Illinois. Surely there can be no comparison between the opportunities for agriculture in a country like Alaska and in a State like Illinois, whose every acre of land is richer than any acre of land in the Valley of the Nile or in any other place on the earth; and I invite the critical consideration of what agriculture can be developed in Alaska if it costs $125 or $150 per acre to clear the land before you begin your attempt at agriculture, and when the fact is taken into consideration that after the land is cleared no crops can be raised the question may well be asked, "What is the land worth?"

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Surely.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman let me observe there that of the 178,000,000 acres of farm lands along the Atlantic coast, east of the Appalachian chain, in the territory of the Eastern States, there is still left 78,000,000 acres of land now?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; and there are 300,000,000 acres of public lands in continental America, owned by the Government of the United States, onto which any person may go for the asking.

One of the arguments for the appropriation of this $35,000,000 is that $18,000,000 of gold is produced in Alaska annually. Everybody knows that $18,000,000 of gold would not furnish any freight. Any ordinary box car, hauled in an ordinary freight train, would carry all the gold that is produced in Alaska every year, so that that would not be much of an inducement for the investment of $35,000,000 in the construction of a railroad, would it? It does not appeal to me, at any rate.

All of the freight in and out of Alaska last year amounted to less than 35,000 tons, and most of this was by boat. It will be readily seen that 35,000 tons of freight would amount to not more than 10 ordinary trainloads.

The principal industries of Alaska at present are fish and furs. It is not necessary to build a railroad to carry the furs. They do not furnish any tonnage. The fish are all produced from the sea and surely a railroad is not necessary to transport them. What inducement there can be for the construction of a railroad at Government expense or for granting authority to the President to buy the railroads already there is more than I can see. The fur business will not be disturbed because of lack of rail transportation. There will be no less furs than now. The fisheries industry will not be in anywise curtailed. It will move forward with the same degree of activity as at present, railroad or no railroad. Then what is the inducement for the expenditure of this vast sum of money? Why are we jumping headlong into such extravagance?

I am opposed to Government ownership of railroads, but whether I were opposed to that or not I would be opposed to the expenditure of this vast sum of money under the circumstances.

The Bering coal fields are only 25 miles from the coast line, and all the arguments thus far made give as an excuse for the expenditure of this $35,000,000 the development of the Bering coal fields.

If one million dollars will do the job, why spend thirty-five? But can the proposed railroad be constructed for $35,000,000? I am persuaded not. Nobody knows what the cost will be. Everyone knows for certain that Government undertakings are concluded at a much larger outlay, as a rule, than the original estimate, and it will not surprise me to learn, if I shall be so fortunate as to see the consummation of this project, that $100,000,000 has been taken from the Public Treasury for this purpose.

By all means common sense should be used, and the common sense of this situation is that if a railroad is to be constructed at all to build the road from the coast line to the Bering coal fields. If the experiment of operating such a line should prove to be successful and the Bering River coal proves to be of anything like the value suggested by other speakers, and if it turns out later that the development of the Matanuska coal fields is necessary, the road can be extended; but to authorize a road now without any well-defined plan as to where it shall go, or what it will do, or where the tonnage to maintain it is to come from, is a utopian dream which ought not to be indulged in by the Congress at the expense of the American people.

Many men on the floor of the House are prompted to vote for the pending bill because they believe the administration wants it; not because they believe in it; not because they think

it wise; not because they think the expenditure will yield returns or develop Alaska; but because of their desire to please the powers that be; in other words, because they believe it to be politically expedient.

Politics should not enter into the expenditure of such a vast sum of money. This is a business proposition. It ought to be treated as such. The same sagacity should be exercised that a wise business man would exercise in laying the foundation for a successful enterprise.

I hope this will be a success if the plan is carried into execution, but I have my doubts. My doubts are justified by all the facts, and I shall be obliged, in the performance of what I believe to be my conscientious duty, to vote against the bill in its present form.

There are only 35,000 white people in Alaska. In response to a question asked by me of Mr. WICKERSHAM, the Delegate from Alaska, as to what proportion of that population would be served by the construction of all the railroad mileage authorized by this bill, he said he thought about one-half. But I have information which leads me to conclude that not more than 10 per cent of the 35,000 people there would be served by the construction of the seven hundred and thirty odd miles of railroad proposed by this bill.

Now, if nobody is to be accommodated by the construction of the railroad, why build it? But it is said we have coal fields in Alaska. It is true we have. But the coal fields, as I have said before, that have been exploited or partially developed, from which the coal has been tested, are close to the sea, not more than 25 miles away from the shore. These coal fields need no railroad for their development, or if they do, they can not possibly need more than 25 miles of railroad, and I would be willing to build 25 miles of railroad if perchance these coal fields could be developed for the advantage of the American people.

But why spend $35,000,000 in building seven hundred and odd miles of railroad from nowhere to nowhere if 25 miles of road at the outside, at the expense of a million dollars, will do the thing that the advocates of this bill claim they want to do? No wise business man would do what they are undertaking to do. It is putting the cart before the horse.

The Navy says that they have tested this coal, and I am told upon reliable authority that the coal which was tested was taken from a depth of 100 feet from the surface. The tests show that the coal has only 43 per cent of the value of Pocahontas coal and is unfit for naval use, and the information that I have in my possession leads me to conclude that Pocahontas coal is the class of coal that must be used for the Navy. But the Navy says that we are building our ships for the purpose of using oil as fuel in the future; and if we are, we need no coal.

There are nine railroads in Alaska now, all bankrupt. I have heard it stated on the floor of this House that the men who own these railroads are crooks.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. I wonder whether this bill is being pressed for the purpose of buying out what they have? If it is, it ought to be defeated. If they are crooks, they ought to be prosecuted by the Government of the United States instead of the Government of the United States, through the Congress, enacting laws to relieve them from the losses which they have made by the construction of those bankrupt railroads.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the committee on reporting this bill. Against an almost instinctive prejudice, against an organized and powerful opposition, to have done so exhibited courage and a fine example of devotion to convictions of duty, rather than an easy yielding to pressure and a complacent acquiescence in existing conditions. [Applause.]

While I approve the general purpose of the bill, I do not agree that all its provisions should be retained, and I shall endeavor to convince the committee and the House that some modifications of its terms should be made.

Preliminary to the consideration of the changes which I shall propose, I will briefly refer to some of the objections urged against the bill, none of which, in my judgment, are sufficient to justify its defeat, if it shall be properly amended.

OBJECTIONS CONSIDERED.

First. It is urged as an objection to the bill that building a railroad will not solve the problems of Alaskan development; that what is needed is either a reversal of the Executive orders that have tied up her resources, or a revision of the laws affecting them, so that they may be opened to private capital and enterprise.

I am in entire agreement with the statement of Mr. Secretary Lane that—

> There is but one way to make any country a real part of the world—by the construction of railroads into it. That 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.

It may be added that this is the policy by which Canada has built up with such marvelous celerity the Canadian Northwest. It is not a new policy. Rome bound the Provinces to the Imperial Government by her great system of highways. It can hardly be said that a Territory is annexed that is not made accessible.

The testimony is overwhelming that there can be no development of Alaskan resources without the aid of railways. This is admitted by both the friends and foes of the bill. The latter seem to believe that the necessary railroads can be secured by opening the resources of Alaska to private exploitation. That is only partially true. If the coal fields were opened to private interests, railroads would unquestionably be built to them; but it is generally believed that the price to be paid by the adoption of this plan would be altogether too much. It is now apparent that the American people will not permit exploitation through private ownership. The Government has the title and will hold it. A leasing or royalty system is the only possible manner in which Alaskan coal resources can be made available. That being true, the interest which the Government must have in coal transportation is much more intimate. If ownership or leasing in commanding proportion to individual interests is to be prevented, then the primary incentive to private railway building is removed. Granted that neither private ownership nor monopolistic control will be permitted, it follows that no railroads will be built by private interests even to the coal fields.

On the other hand, it must be apparent that if the Government builds railroads to the coal fields, it must open them to the people, not to be exploited by large corporations, but to smaller, competitive companies, with equal privileges and a fair field. That this is the better course would seem almost self-evident.

But even if it should be admitted that private enterprise might build railroads to the coal fields, that would still leave the problem unsolved of how to bring railroads into the interior. The best coal fields are near the coast. Mountain ranges separate the great interior valleys from the open sea. Any development of the great interior, with its thousands of miles of river transportation and its millions of acres with undeveloped agricultural and mineral resources, is dependent on railways to the sea.

The report of the United States Geological Survey for January, 1914, says:

> While the coastal region is developing at a rate which bids fair to overshadow all mining operations in the interior, no marked progress can be expected in the inland region until a transportation system is provided. * * * Therefore, railway construction is of first importance to Alaska.

It is evident, from a careful examination of the evidence before both the House and Senate committees, that there never has been any real good-faith expectation or endeavor on the part of private enterprise to build a railroad to the interior. Promises have been made as an inducement to promote special interests and particular projects, but, these purposes secured, extensions to the interior would have been abandoned. I am satisfied that the Government is not only justified but is required by its obligations and its duty to secure at least one railroad from the coast to the interior. If it can not induce such enterprise, if it can not subsidize it, it should itself build and control it.

Second. It is urged that it is unfair to grant $35,000,000 to 35,000 white people in Alaska when our own people need the money so much.

This objection is based upon a misconception—all too generally indulged—that an appropriation is a special favor, a gratuity to be handed around. Certainly argument is not needed against such a theory. If there were no people in Alaska, conditions might well justify building a railroad there. And if there were 10,000,000 instead of 35,000 people, the Government should not build a foot of railroad unless conditions justified it. If we are wise and regardful of our obligations, we will not attempt to distribute gratuities or equalize special privileges.

But Alaska, from even the most materialistic and selfish standpoint, is entitled to our respectful consideration.

It may be of interest to know what was thought regarding the wisdom of our course in spending $7,200,000 for the purchase of Alaska in 1868. It is probable the motives which induced action were political rather than economic. There was scant

knowledge of the territory, and its acquisition occasioned surprise rather than approval. There was a minority report of the committee, a majority of which reported the bill for acquisition. This minority report declared that Alaska had "no capacity as an agricultural country; that, so far as known, it has no value as a mineral country"; that "its fur trade is of insignificant value"; that "the fisheries are of doubtful value"; that "the right to govern a nation or nations of savages in a climate unfit for the habitation of civilized men was not worthy of purchase."

But merely as an investment the purchase is amply justified. Alaska cost us $7,200,000. It has already returned to us in revenue paid into the United States Treasury $17,117,000.

The minority report objecting to its acquisition declared Alaska had no value as a mineral country. Since then we have taken from it in mineral products $206,813,000.

Its fur trade was reported as of "insignificant value." It has produced over $62,681,000 in furs.

"The fisheries are of doubtful value." We have derived already from the Alaska fisheries $147,953,000.

Altogether the known value of these products exceeds $429,523,000.

It has been estimated that Alaska has more coal than Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and Ohio combined; more copper than Michigan and Arizona; more gold than California and Colorado; and more fish than all the other American waters combined. For her population Alaska produces far more than any State in the Nation.

Regarding the amount of appropriation asked for I shall be able to convince the committee, I hope, that the amount carried in the bill may be greatly reduced—almost cut in two.

But gentlemen should remember that only $1,000,000 is actually appropriated under the terms of this bill. The remainder to be expended will be derived from the sale of bonds for the payment of which a redemption fund is provided. Into this fund shall be paid one-half of the proceeds derived from the sale, or from rentals and royalties of all public, coal, or mineral lands in Alaska, as well as proceeds from the sale of timber lands. The net earnings of the railroad shall also be paid into the fund to pay the interest and principal of the construction bonds. It is my judgment the Government will never be called upon to make an appropriation to pay these bonds. In order to increase the probabilities of such desirable result, I shall introduce an amendment to make the payments 90 per cent instead of 50 per cent, which I hope will commend itself to the committee.

Third. It is urged that if the building of railroads in Alaska will not pay as a private investment it will not pay as a Government project.

The statement sounds logical and seems reasonable. But a careful consideration of existing conditions will show that it is neither. It is quite evident that no railroads, merely as such, will be built in Alaska. If the Government will surrender the coal fields to investors and exploiters, undoubtedly they will build railroads from these fields to coast harbors and markets. But no private corporation without special privileges granted will build to the interior. No projector has in mind the building of a railroad to develop the country, to bring in settlers, to stimulate agriculture, to encourage stock raising.

If private corporations were granted the coal fields, they would immediately and gladly build railroads to develop them. If private individuals were able to secure title to the lands they would be only too willing to build railroads to make them available and salable. That which would be good policy on the part of private interests, if they owned these resources, can not be bad policy on the part of the Government which does own them.

But the Government has a much greater and higher interest in Alaskan development than mere profit on an investment. It is a nation builder. It is not limited to an inquiry as to how much per acre it can sell its land, or how much per bushel it can obtain as rental or royalty for its coal. It realizes that it holds these resources in trust for its people; primarily for those of its citizens who shall locate in the particular Territory, and secondarily for the people of the Nation, who must protect it and develop it as a part of the Nation's domain. Whatever shall further these larger interests is justified and a duty.

Fourth. It is strongly and repeatedly urged that to construct a railroad in Alaska commits the Government to the policy of Government ownership and operation of railroads everywhere within our territory.

This is an old and oft-repeated objection to Government action, as absurd as it is popular. Government action should always be governed by the requirements of the occasion which necessitates such action. The Government must act within its constitutional limitations, and those are its only restraints. It can act in one case and refuse to act in another. It may determine arbitrarily just how far it will go in any line of action. It has no master and submits to no control except that which is self-imposed.

It certainly does not follow that because the United States owns and operates a railroad in Panama that such action means a departure from our established policy, and that the Government means to buy and operate all the railroads. It by no means follows that because the Government in the Canal Zone built churches and furnished preachers, gave dances and organized clubs, built schoolhouses and hired teachers, ran hotels, barber shops, and ice-cream parlors, it thereby has adopted a socialistic policy and expects to do the same all over the land.

The Government has aided some railroads, but it has not aided all. The Government has aided railroads in cases where existing conditions warranted such action. It has refused to aid railroads where aid was not warranted. It may and will build or purchase or operate railroads where conditions warrant or require such action, and it will refuse to do so when such action is not warranted. Having the undoubted constitutional right, we ought to determine each proposition as it arises on its merits and act accordingly.

I have no fear that by building a railroad in Alaska we will thereby commit ourselves to a general policy of Government ownership of railroads. There will doubtless be in the future instances where the Government will be called upon to consider whether it is advantageous or necessary to build or purchase a railroad. Whenever such individual instance shall arise we shall be free as we are now to judge and pass upon it on its merits and for the best interests of the Nation.

Fifth. It is urged that Alaska is a bleak and barren region where agriculture and stock raising is impossible and is not worth developing.

With infinite delight gentlemen have selected all the derogatory statements that could be found concerning Alaska, and have asked us to accept such statements as faithfully descriptive of that portion of our country.

Alaska has an area of over 590,000 square miles. It is an empire in dimensions. Over 100,000 square miles—an area nearly as large as Iowa and Illinois combined—is subject to cultivation. Thirty thousand square miles, or nearly 20,000,000 acres, can be made available for tillage. All Government experts, and there have been many, unite in placing the agricultural resources of Alaska and the possibilities of their development at a very high standard.

George H. Eldridge, of the Geological Survey, says of the Susitna Valley—one only of the many susceptible of agricultural development, in itself a region 150 miles long by 125 miles wide:

> It gives promise of an agricultural value little short, it is believed, of many of the most prosperous regions of the United States. * * * The soils of the valley are rich in loam and decayed vegetation, extending to depths of from 4 to 10 feet.

Prof. Georgeson, in charge of the agricultural experiment stations in Alaska, after years of experiment and experience, says:

> That Alaska has agricultural possibilities of a sufficiently high order to make it self-supporting is no longer open to dispute. * * * At these various stations all the hardy vegetables have been grown successfully every year. * * * We have never failed to mature barley and oats in the most unfavorable seasons, and in normal years we have also matured winter wheat and winter rye, spring wheat, spring rye, and buckwheat. * * * Moreover these results can be bettered. * * * We shall in the near future, by selection and breeding, be able to develop varieties which shall be better suited to Alaska than anything we now have, and it is therefore certain that the results will be improved upon.

As against the violent denunciations we have heard may be set the calm and deliberate conclusions of Mr. Secretary Lane, which he gives as the result of the most careful and painstaking investigation:

> 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 hardiest and most wholesome of the race.

That is a statement made from high authority both from an official and political standpoint.

But I shall quote a still higher authority. President Wilson, in his annual message delivered to this House last December, in the strongest terms recommended action such as is contemplated in this bill. He said:

AN ADMINISTRATION POLICY.

> 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 railroads. These the Government should itself build and administer, and the ports and terminals it should itself con-

trol in the interest of all who wish to use them for the service and development of the country and its people.

In the repeated assaults made by Democrats against this determined and declared policy of the administration it is said that no action is necessary. The President says that not only is such action a duty, but that it is a duty which is "very pressing and very imperative." These gentlemen declare that the storehouse of Alaskan resources is empty, but that, if it contains anything, the way is open and anybody can help themselves. The President says the storehouse is locked and that one of the keys is a system of railroads. The opponents of this bill say that under no circumstances should the Government engage in railway building in Alaska. The President says the Government should not only build, but should "administer," and that the Government should control the ports and terminals.

It will be found, I believe, that almost anyone coming without bias to an examination of existing conditions in Alaska will reach the conclusion that the Government is not only justified but required to take some action such as is contemplated by this bill.

We, the people of the United States, own in Alaska a vast undeveloped, unimproved estate. More than one-half of the unsold public domain lies there. We should make it available. We should take steps to place these lands on the market and under cultivation. We should make it possible to develop its resources—to dig the coal, to mine the gold and copper, to enlarge our fisheries, to increase our revenues and strengthen our outposts. And the question has a humanitarian side as well. We would thus legislate to make homes for a great people; we would provide an extension of the fields of enterprise and opportunity; we would enlarge the scope of human endeavor. Every such enlargement brings hope and the promise of happiness to American citizenship, and a glow of exultation that these blessings are to be found under our flag, and that our ambitious and energetic youth will not be required to expatriate themselves, and seek fields of enterprise in foreign lands.

SOME DESIRABLE CHANGES.

But while I am in favor of the legislation and desire to see action taken which will secure the results desired, I do not approve of the bill reported by the committee in its present form. With some changes which will both improve the bill and reduce the appropriation I believe it should pass.

In the first place, the bill does not carry out the first of its declared objects, which is "to connect the interior with the open sea."

The bill is based on the report and recommendations of the Alaska Railroad Commission. The commission recommends building two systems with a total mileage of 733 miles and a total cost estimated at $35,611,000. One of these systems has two branches which do not connect with each other—one extending from Chitina to Fairbanks, a distance of 313 miles, known as the Copper River line, the estimated cost of which is $13,971,000; the other, a branch line, leaving the main line of the present Copper River & Northwestern Railway at a point 38 miles north of its southern terminus, Cordova, and extending eastward via Lake Charlotte to the Bering coal fields, a distance of 38 miles, the estimated cost of which is $2,054,000.

It will be noted that Chitina is the present northern terminus of the Copper River & Northwestern Railway, known in this discussion as the Guggenheim line. Chitina is 132 miles from Cordova on the coast, and the proposed line from Fairbanks to Chitina will not extend from the interior to the coast, as is desired and proposed, but will leave the Government railway hung up at a mountain village 132 miles from a seaport. Shipments can not be made from the seaboard to the interior nor from the interior to an open port without accepting the rates, terms, and service of the Guggenheim line for 132 miles. The only alternative to this will be the purchase of the Guggenheim line, with their terminals, by the Government, which would involve an additional cost of $20,000,000.

It should be further noted that the Bering coal branch does not reach a market, but is to be built from the coal fields to the Guggenheim line, 38 miles from Cordova. Neither the Government nor private parties who may develop the Bering coal fields can under this arrangement market their coal without accepting the terms and accommodations of the Guggenheim line for 38 miles.

To build these proposed patches and parts of lines, dependent for their efficacy on the good offices or the purchase or condemnation of the Guggenheim line, is, in my judgment, an utterly impracticable and indefensible proposal.

The other proposed system consists of three divisions—one extending from Kern Creek to the Susitna Valley, a distance of 115 miles, the estimated cost of which is $5,209,500; another, the Matanuska coal branch, extending from the main line to the coal fields, a distance of 38 miles, the estimated cost of which is $1,616,000; the third extending from the Susitna Valley to the Kuskokwim, a distance of 229 miles, the estimated cost of which is $12,760,500.

Kern Creek is the northern terminus of the Alaska Northern Railroad and is 72 miles from Seward, its southern seaport terminus. So that this system, like the other, is hung up in the interior and must either depend on the good graces of the Alaska Northern Railway Co. or purchase the line, which its owners say cost $5,000,000. The Kuskokwim extension at this time is absurd. The valley of the Kuskokwim has hardly been touched by settlement. It is estimated that there are barely 500 people in the valley, except the gold miners. There has never been any general demand or expectation of a railroad there, and the proposition to expend nearly $13,000,000 now on a railroad extension into this region ought not to be seriously considered.

The committee report says:

> The commission has recommended the construction of two branch lines to reach coal fields that do not lie directly on the trunk lines, and these are needed at once, in order to connect the main lines with the coal fields.

It is here assumed that this means the trunk lines which the Government will build or acquire. Yet the branch from the Matanuska coal fields would have to connect with a railroad now owned and controlled by a private corporation, with which the Government would have to make traffic arrangements over 72 miles of its line or purchase the line, and no such purchase is contemplated in the bill, nor will the amount appropriated include such purchase.

The branch from the Bering coal fields would connect not with the Government line, but with the Guggenheim line, with whom the Government would have to go into partnership or purchase their line. This would doubtless please the Guggenheims, but, unfortunately, we would have no means, under the provisions of this bill, even to do that.

But the committee says in its report the bill does not bind the President to these plans. He may use his discretion. He may build one or more lines, as he shall determine, provided he shall carry out the general plan. The committee would not even bind the President as to the number of lines or systems. He may build a "line or lines." The report says:

> One may be sufficient, and one would be of incalculable benefit, and we are entirely content to leave this matter to the wisdom and judgment of the President.

But why the President? We ought to legislate, and not the President. We are to determine, and not the President. We are guilty of an abandonment of our obligations to say to him, "We believe they need railroads in Alaska, but we do not know how many they should have or where they should be located." How shall the President know better than we? How ridiculous it makes us appear to confess that we do not know enough to determine and to say to the President, "Now you guess."

We did not so act in building the Panama Canal. Suppose we should have said to the President, "We can not determine between Panama, Nicaragua, or Tehuantepec; you decide for us."

Gentlemen who modestly profess their lack of knowledge of which route should be chosen should understand that if their lack of knowledge extends to a want of ability to determine between lines, it would of necessity be such as to prevent their determination upon any line. How shall it be possible for us to determine the necessity of any, if we can not determine between one or many or the location of even one?

When we authorize a river or harbor improvement or authorize a bridge or build a building, we determine where it should be located. We do not "leave the matter to the wisdom and judgment of the President." We also do not shirk our duty and throw the responsibility on the President. If we shall send this bill to him in its present form, he would be entirely justified in believing that we desired to have him carry out the recommendation of the commission, as that is the basis on which the bill is formed. And yet, not one, even, of the committee desires that to be done. How silly it would make us appear to vote this large sum of the people's money to build roads that begin nowhere, that run nowhere, and that end nowhere.

And yet, we know what we want and what is needed. The objects of the bill are clearly and well stated. We are not ignorant of the facts, nor of the needs to be supplied, nor of the means to supply them. We have a wealth of material upon which to form a judgment. Our commission, an able and impartial one, has gone there and reported. Are we to have another? If so, let us provide for one and have its report before we act. We have had numerous official reports and extensive hearings. When the President is called upon to act, he can have no better means of arriving at a conclusion than we have. He can not act on his own knowledge; he must be advised. Who

can we trust to advise him better than ourselves, upon whom rest the responsibility of legislation?

All this is entirely unnecessary. We can, by providing one line, accomplish all the purposes desired and specified in the bill. A few things are well established and will furnish an unfailing guide to our action. We should abandon the Cordova-Chitina-Fairbanks-Bering project entirely. First, because it would be consummate folly to build Government railroads or parts of railroads which must be dependent on the good will, administration, or possible action of a private corporation. We can under no circumstances justify a partnership or traffic arrangement or any possible connection with the Guggenheims. That eliminates the proposed line from Chitina to Fairbanks and the branch to the Bering fields entirely.

At this time we should build one system, not two. We can by building one system carry out the declared purpose of this bill and greatly reduce the cost. We can connect an open Pacific harbor on the southern coast with the navigable waters in the interior of Alaska. We can reach coal fields, both for naval use and for fuel for the interior. We can reach the best agricultural and mineral regions in Alaska. We can thus aid in the development of its resources. This line will have for its northern terminus Fairbanks and the Tanana Valley, thus reaching the great interior river system of Alaska. There the resources of the great Yukon and its subsidiary tributaries can be transshipped to the sea coast and to the world's markets, and their machinery and supplies can be transported over a line which shall be Government owned and Government controlled.

The southern terminus should be Seward, on Resurrection Bay, or Portage Bay, or both. Resurrection Bay is without doubt the best harbor on the Alaskan coast and one of the best harbors in the world. It is spacious, its waters are deep enough to float our largest battleships, it is landlocked, and ice-free the year round. To reach Seward on Resurrection Bay would necessitate the purchase of the Alaska Northern Railroad. The advantages which would accrue would well warrant that, and the cost would not be excessive.

This purchase may be avoided and 63 miles of railway saved by making the southern terminus Portage Bay, which opens into Prince Williams Sound, and is, while smaller, a deep, landlocked, and ice-free harbor.

A branch from the main line, 38 miles in length, would reach the Matanuska coal fields, which are admittedly the largest and best in Alaska.

The main line would also pass through the Nenana coal fields, the largest and best interior supply in Alaska.

The total length of the line from Portage Bay to Fairbanks, with the Matanuska extension, would be 441 miles, and its probable cost $17,640,000. To Seward the line would be 493 miles long, and the cost about $20,000,000. It is thought by Government experts that the line could include both terminals for the latter amount.

This will make a complete system, entirely independent of any connection with private interests. It will reduce the cost nearly one-half. It will accomplish all we ought at this time to do. It will reach the desired termini by the best route. The Tenana and Susitna Valleys are the best and most promising agricultural regions in Alaska. If they can not be developed, none can. This line will reach the best and largest coal field for naval use and coastal traffic, the Matanuska. It will reach and pierce the Nenana coal fields, which embrace a territory of 165 square miles, or over 100,000 acres; the coal in which the Geological Survey estimates at 10,000,000,000 tons, an inexhaustible supply for fuel for interior Alaska. It will furnish a means of transportation for machinery and supplies to the interior, and for ores and furs and other products from the interior to the coast and a market.

All these desirable and necessary advantages can be secured by building this one line. No other proposed line can secure them. Why, then, should we hesitate? Let us, if we have courage enough to act at all, have courage to act definitely, and as our best judgment dictates. [Applause.]

Mr. LONERGAN. Mr. Chairman, the question before us is not the Government ownership of railways, nor is it altogether a question of the advisability of Government construction of railways in Alaska. It is a question as to how the resources of that treasure land shall be developed. Of course, the resources of Alaska must pay for their own development. The question is, Shall the people of the United States, who own the natural resources of Alaska, give a big portion of those resources to private capital for their development or shall we develop those resources ourselves and mortgage them, as it were, to pay for the facilities for their development?

The argument as to whether railway construction in Alaska will be profitable all merges in the admission that such railways will be built by private capital if the Government will give a land grant similar to that given to the Northern Pacific. We are told that private capital will gladly build a railroad from the Pacific coast of Alaska to the interior waterways if given one-half of the land for a distance of 40 miles on each side of the road. Now, if it be profitable for a private corporation to build the railways for one-half of the land in a 40-mile strip, why is it not a good business proposition for the Government to build a railway, as proposed, when it owns practically all of the land, not only for 40 miles along the proposed route but throughout all of Alaska?

This argument justifies railway construction in Alaska by the Government independent of the question as to whether such railroad will be profitable immediately or for many years to come. The road will be a profitable investment if it develops the land and makes available the resources of the Territory. Railroads are necessary for that purpose. It is perhaps true that 10,000 miles of railway will be necessary for the ultimate development of the Territory of Alaska, but it does not follow that the Government must build all of it. Our Government has assisted in building 5,500 miles of the Union Pacific, Central Pacific, and Northern Pacific in a region where there are now 55,000 miles of railway, all the rest of which was built without any assistance of the Government whatever. The same will be true in Alaska. Within five years after a Government railway is built to the Tanana River it is said there will be 50,000 people in the Tanana Valley. That will justify private capital in building railways along other routes, into the interior of Alaska, in the same way as railways were built in the region between the Great Lakes and Puget Sound, where four transcontinental railways were operating within 25 years after the first one was built, and only that first one, the Northern Pacific, received Government aid. So it will be in Alaska. I repeat, it is not a question of Government ownership of railways, not even in Alaska. It is a question of how best to provide facilities to develop the resources of that Territory. It is a question of whether we shall surrender a large portion of those resources to secure such railways, as was done in the Western States, or whether we shall build the railways ourselves to facilitate development. Then, when such railways are built and the development of the interior of Alaska assured, we can settle the Government railway question there on the same basis as in the States. I contend it will be immensely profitable for the Government to build the railways in Alaska just to secure the development of that Territory, just to make available the great natural resources of that Territory; and after we have done this we might, if so disposed, give the railways away and still profit immensely by the transaction in the light of our experience in the development of the great West.

THE VALUE OF ALASKA TO THE UNITED STATES.

Alaska is a land whose area is equal to one-fifth of the United States, or twelve times that of the State of New York. Its production of gold for the year 1912 was $17,398,943; that of our gold State, California, whose population is thirty-seven 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 oil 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.

Such is Alaska, a frontier land not only of vast resources, but a land also of scenic beauty and grandeur not excelled by any of those sought annually by the thousands who take their summer recreation abroad.

On an investment of $7,200,000, Alaska has given us in return, since 1867 (and by far the greater portion since 1899, or only 14 years), as shown in the reports of the United States Geological Survey, Director of the Mint, and other official documents:

Gold, final estimate	$212,765,727
Silver	1,841,202
Copper	13,570,225
Coal	347,389
Other minerals	982,554
Fisheries and furs	240,820,168
Total	470,337,265
Produced in 1912, as per final estimates:	
Gold, silver, and copper	22,285,821
Other minerals	252,000
Fish and furs	18,120,132
Miscellaneous	394,046
Total	41,051,999
Commerce of Alaska in 1912:	
Imports	22,917,795
Exports	42,278,546
Total	65,196,341

Foreign gold and silver:	
Imports	3,840,546
Exports	3,704,173
Total	72,741,060

This foreign gold and silver was practically all received at Skagway and thence exported.

With a population in 1910 of only 64,356, about equally divided between natives and whites, these figures show commerce per capita for entire population, $1,013; commerce per capita for white population, $2,026. No other country in the world can make such a showing.

These results have been obtained at a cost to the Government of about $25,000,000 over and above the revenues collected in 45 years, showing a profit to the Nation of practically $438,000,000 on an investment of $32,000,000. 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?

The official returns are yet incomplete for the year 1913, but those already compiled aggregate $36,759,784, and this amount will be increased when complete returns are available. Alaska has already yielded considerably more than $500,000,000, has contributed more than half a billion to the wealth of the United States, or a profit of at least $470,000,000 on our much-neglected investment.

In March, 1867, Alaska was purchased by the United States for the sum of $7,200,000 in gold, and in October of the same year the formal transfer was made at Sitka. From 1867 to 1877 Alaska was governed by the War Department, although the customs were from the beginning collected by the Treasury Department, and with the latter the control rested from 1877 until the passage of the act of 1884. This act extended over Alaska the laws of the State of Oregon, so far as they were applicable, created a judicial district and a land district, put in force the mining laws of the United States, and gave the country an administrative system.

The influx of settlers after the discovery of gold in the Klondike in 1896 rendered more adequate laws necessary. In 1899 and 1900 Congress made provisions for a code of civil and criminal law, and in 1903 passed a homestead act. In the meantime a serious boundary dispute had arisen between the United States and Canada regarding the interpretation of the treaty of 1825. This was settled in 1903 by an agreement whereby the seacoast of Canada extended no farther north than 54° 40'.

By the act of May 7, 1906, Alaska was given power to elect a Delegate to Congress. The act of August 24, 1912, provided for the creation of a Territorial legislature.

GOVERNMENT.

EXECUTIVE.

The executive power is vested in the governor, who is appointed by the President for a term of four years by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The governor may veto any bill passed by the Territorial legislature within three days after it is presented to him. The bill must be vetoed within three days if the legislature continues in session; otherwise it becomes law without the governor's approval. The legislature may override the veto by a two-thirds vote of all the members to which each house is entitled.

LEGISLATIVE.

The legislative power is vested in a Territorial legislature consisting of a senate and a house of representatives. The senate consists of 8 members, 2 from each of the four judicial divisions into which Alaska is now divided. The house of representatives consists of 16 members, 4 from each of the four judicial divisions. The term of each member of the senate is four years, one member from each judicial division being elected every two years. The term of each member of the house of representatives is two years.

The first election for members of the legislature was held on November 5, 1912; subsequent elections will be held biennially thereafter on the Tuesday after the first Monday in November. The legislature will convene at Juneau, the capital, for the first session on March 3, 1913, and thereafter on the first Monday in March every two years. The length of the session is limited to 60 days, but the governor is empowered to call a special session, which shall not continue longer than 15 days.

JUDICIAL.

District court.

The judicial power of the Territory is vested in the United States District Court for Alaska, which has the same jurisdiction as the district courts of the United States and has general jurisdiction in civil, criminal, equity, and admiralty causes. This court is divided into four divisions, presided over by four judges appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for a term of four years.

LAND OFFICES.

Local land offices are located at Nome, Fairbanks, and Juneau, where entries for public lands should be filed. The surveyor general for the Territory is located at Juneau.

PUBLIC LANDS.

Citizens of the United States, or those who have declared their intention to become such, may settle upon and enter as a homestead claim not exceeding 320 acres of nonmineral, agricultural public land in Alaska. If unsurveyed, the land must be located in rectangular tracts, not more than 1 mile in length, with north and south, east and west boundaries marked upon the ground by permanent monuments, and notice of the claim filed in the recording district in which the land is situated. If at the expiration of the three-year period of residence and cultivation, or if at the end of 14 months' residence and cultivation the settler desires to commute a 160-acre claim, and the public-land surveys have not been extended over the land claimed, proof may be submitted, entry allowed, and patent obtained upon a survey made at the expense of the settler.

Corporations or citizens of the United States who are in the occupation of public lands in Alaska for the purposes of trade, manufacture, or other productive industry may each purchase at the price of $2.50 per acre one claim, not exceeding 80 acres in area, of nonmineral public land needed and occupied for the purposes of trade, manufacture, or industry.

Deposits of mineral in the public lands and national forests in Alaska other than coal, oil, and natural gas are subject to location and purchase under the general mining laws of the United States by citizens, or those who have declared their intention to become citizens, at $2.50 per acre for placer-mining claims and at $5 per acre for lode-mining claims. Each lode-mining claim is limited in area to a tract not exceeding 1,500 feet in length by 600 feet in width, but the law imposes no limit as to the number of locations which may be made by a single individual or corporation. A placer-mining location in Alaska may not exceed 20 acres in area for an individual location or 40 acres for an association of two or more persons, and no person is permitted to locate, or to procure to be located, for himself more than two placer-mining claims in any one calendar month.

Timber upon the unreserved public lands in Alaska is subject to sale under regulations issued pursuant to section 11 of the act of May 14, 1898 (30 Stat., 409).

The law provides for reservations of blocks of public lands 80 rods in width, between sold or entered tracts, along the shores of waters in Alaska, and various reservations of public lands or natural resources thereof have been made within that district.

Less than 1 per cent of the lands of Alaska are in private ownership. The people of the United States still own more than 99 per cent of the entire area of that vast Territory. It is a great national asset of the people, and it is evident to any student of the times that the people propose this asset shall be well administered. At least we must profit by the mistakes of the past. Land grants have proven to be both inadequate and insufficient methods of aiding railway construction. Inadequate because the lands have no practical value prior to the railway construction. They are not an asset of the railway until the road is actually in operation, and hence the bonds of the Northern Pacific, even with its tremendous land grants, sold at a deplorable discount. Land grants are unsatisfactory because in the end unreasonable profit is given to the railway, some years after its completion and when that aid is not necessary. This profit should be retained to the people. The financial condition of our country at the end of the Civil War was such that the Government was perhaps not justified in building the Pacific railroads. This may or may not be so, but it is not necessary now to determine that question. History has demonstrated that land grants are unwise, and we have had this experience in practically every State in the Union since railways became the accepted means of transportation. Nor do the people propose to turn over the resources of Alaska for exploitation by private capital. The Government can exploit these lands itself for the benefit of all the people. The proposed bond issue to build Government railways in Alaska is not for the benefit of the 35,000 people who are now in Alaska. The money will not go to them, but will go to the people of the United States—to Pennsylvania for locomotives, to Minnesota and Colorado for steel rails, to the copper refineries on the Atlantic coast for copper wire, to the cotton fields of the South and the woolen mills of New England for clothing, and to the farmers throughout the entire United States for much of the food of the people who go there to build the railroads and to develop the resources and to establish homes in that great Territory. Our trade with Alaska is already greater than our trade with the Philippines or with China. What will it be when the population of Alaska is multiplied tenfold by our own people, for Alaska, in the future as in the past, will be peopled by the sons and daughters of every State in the Union. This land is the people's heritage. Its mines should fill their coffers and its fields supply their larders. It is simply a business proposition for the people of the United States to pledge their credit in the development of the resources of this Territory, instead of surrendering one-half or one-quarter of those resources to any private corporation for exploitation and profit.

RAILROADS.

The principal railroads in Alaska are the Alaska Northern, extending about 70 miles in a northerly direction from Seward, on Resurrection Bay, to Kern Creek; the Seward Peninsula, about 75 miles long, with its terminus at Nome; the Tanana Valley, extending from Fairbanks and Chena, about 50 miles among the principal placer-mining camps of the neighborhood; the White Pass & Yukon, extending in a northerly direction from Skagway a distance of 20 miles in American territory, and thence in Canadian territory to White Horse, a distance of about 90 miles; and the Copper River & Northwestern, extending 197 miles from Cordova to Kennicott. The first and last named are standard gauge.

The act approved August 24, 1912 (public 334), provides for the appointment by the President of a railroad commission consisting of an officer of the Engineer Corps of the Army, a geologist in charge of Alaskan surveys, an officer of the Engineer Corps of the Navy, and a civil engineer who has had practical experience in railroad construction. The members of this commission are as follows: Maj. Jay J. Morrow, chairman; Alfred H. Brooks, vice chairman; Civil Engineer Leonard M. Cox, and Collin Macrae Ingersoll.

This body was authorized and instructed to conduct an examination into the transportation question in the Territory of Alaska; to examine railroad routes from the seaboard to the coal fields and to the interior and navigable waterways; to secure surveys and other information with respect to railroads, including cost of construction and operation; to obtain information in respect to the coal fields and their proximity to railroad routes; and to make report to Congress, together with their conclusions and recommendations, in respect to the best and most available routes for railroads in Alaska which will

develop the country and the resources thereof for the use of the people of the United States.

The report of this commission is a splendid argument for the construction of railways in Alaska by the Government. The report recommends the construction of two trunk lines from the coast to the interior, one following the Copper River Valley and the other the Susitna Valley. We are not interested now in the consideration of these routes, for the pending bill leaves the selection of the route entirely to the President. We are interested, however, in the advice and information given in that report. One member of the commission, the beloved Dr. Brooks, has personal knowledge of Alaska, acquired through his long experience in the United States Geological Survey and his intimate personal examination of the resources of the Territory. The other members of the commission visited Alaska. The commission availed themselves of the mass of information collected by the Government through its various departments. They not only found that the resources of Alaska justified railway construction, but also that such lines can be made profitable. The commission did not feel called upon to recommend how the railroad should be built, but the report recognizes that the Government can build such roads on 3 per cent money, while private capital must pay a much higher interest rate, unless the bonds for private construction be guaranteed by the Government. The report shows that on an estimated tonnage on a given route a passenger rate of 7.7 cents per mile and a freight rate of 9.4 cents per ton-mile would be necessary on private construction with 6 per cent money, as against a passenger rate of 6.6 cents per mile and a freight rate of 6.25 cents per ton-mile under Government construction with 3 per cent money. This means that a private company, even if fortunate enough to sell its 6 per cent bonds at par, would be obliged to charge a passenger rate of $32.90 for the haul between Seward and Fairbanks, as against $28.20 on a Government-constructed line, and a freight rate over the same route of $40.20 per ton would be necessary, as against $26.71 on a Government-constructed line. I have selected this route merely to illustrate the point that the Government has great advantages in the construction of railroads in Alaska, by reason of its ability to do so on 3 per cent money, while if private construction be at all possible traffic charges would be much greater. These rates seem high, but we have it on the authority of Dr. Brooks, of the United States Geological Survey, that a freight rate of 10 cents per ton-mile would save perhaps one-half of the annual freight bill of from seven to eight million dollars paid by the people of interior Alaska on the present estimated total of 30,000 tons per annum. At this rate, the value to the people of Alaska, on the present tonnage alone, would be sufficient to retire in 11 years the entire bond issue proposed in the pending bill. Hence it follows that we can not only open up the vast resources of the Territory by the construction of the railways, but we can save the people of Alaska enough on the present freight traffic alone to more than justify the investment.

That, however, is a small item. The real purpose is to make available the great resources of the interior of Alaska. Acres of placer gravels, rich but not rich enough to pay to work under the present high transportation charges and the incidental cost of high labor and supplies, mines of native copper of such fabulous wealth as to rival the great Treadwell, which produces $4,000,000 each year, and the Kennicott, from which the Morgan-Guggenheims have already extracted several millions of dollars, though their railroad to it has been in operation but three years. These rich mines might as well be in the chasms of the moon until railway transportation is provided. I am told that a paying mine has never been found at tidewater anywhere on this old mother earth except in Alaska, yet practically all of the more than $240,000,000 which Alaska has produced in minerals came from places within sight of the smoke of a steamboat. This will give us but a faint idea of what the mineral production of Alaska will be when railway transportation makes available the mineral wealth of the great interior.

The mineral wealth is very generally admitted; indeed, it can not be denied by anyone who has given the subject any study. We are disposed to question the agricultural value of Alaska, however, because of its northern latitude. This is because we do not realize that there are 15,000,000 people in Europe living in the same latitude on substantially the same area, in Scotland, Norway, Sweden, Finland, Lapland, and northern Russia. Those countries produce no gold, their copper production, after centuries of development, is but a fraction of what Alaska already produces from the little rim along the southern coast. Their fisheries produce less than those of Alaska, although the Alaskan fisheries are far from being fully developed. The agricultural lands of Alaska are just as favorably situated as those of northern Europe, and in time will produce just as bountifully and sustain just as large a population.

These statements are not made upon the authority of enthusiastic boomers. We have it from our Government reports. We have it from the figures compiled by the Department of Agriculture, and based on data collected by and through the investigations of the agricultural lands of the Territory by competent men. There are four agricultural experiment stations in Alaska conducted by the United States Government under the directions of Prof. C. C. Georgeson. These are located at Sitka, the ancient Russian capital of Alaska, situated in the southern archipelago; at Kodiak, on the southwestern coast of Alaska, the oldest town on the Pacific coast of America north of Mexico, which was settled by the Russians the year George Washington became President of the United States, and occupied ever since then by the Russians and their descendants, who till the soil and raise their herds upon this pastoral island, where the Government is now developing a breed of cattle suitable for domestic use in Alaska. Another station is at Rampart, on the Yukon, and another at Fairbanks, in the heart of the Tanana Valley, our great northern agricultural empire. This lies within 100 miles south of the Arctic Circle. It is true that the cold is severe, but no more so than in many of the most prolific agricultural regions in the northern portion of the United States. Sixty-five degrees below zero is the lowest temperature of which the United States Weather Bureau has any record in Fairbanks, Alaska. It is interesting to note that the same temperature has been recorded in Miles City, Mont., in the heart of the great agricultural section of eastern Montana. I append the following tables prepared upon data furnished by the United States Weather Bureau. The information given is official, and can be verified at the Weather Bureau in the United States Department of Agriculture.

The lowest temperature below zero of which the United States Weather Bureau has any official record in the following places.

	Degrees.
Fairbanks, Alaska	65
Miles City, Mont	65
Pembina, N. Dak	59
Moorehead, Minn	48
Gering, Nebr	45
Ogdensburg, N. Y	43
Frankfort, Kans	35
Roswell, N. Mex	29
Liberty, Mo	29
Beaver, Okla	25
Juneau, Alaska	12
Kodiak, Alaska	12
Sitka, Alaska	4
Tallahassee, Fla	2
Cordova, Alaska (above zero)	1

AVERAGE DATE OF THE LAST KILLING FROST IN THE SPRING, ACCORDING TO CHART NO. 1, BULLETIN NO. 5, OF THE UNITED STATES WEATHER BUREAU FOR 1912.

May 15. Fairbanks, Alaska; western Nebraska, southern South Dakota, northern Iowa, southeastern Minnesota, central Wisconsin, central Michigan, northern Pennsylvania, central New York, central Vermont, southern New Hampshire, and southern Maine.

May 20. Eastern Wyoming, central South Dakota, southeastern North Dakota, central Minnesota, north central Wisconsin, southern New York, northern Vermont, central New Hampshire, and central Maine.

May 25. Eastern Montana, central Wyoming, western North Dakota, northern South Dakota, northern Minnesota, and northern Wisconsin.

June 1. Northern North Dakota, northern Minnesota, the higher portions of central and northern Wisconsin, central Colorado, western Montana, central Idaho, eastern Oregon, central Nevada, and northern Arizona.

June 5 to June 15. The higher agricultural valleys and fruit-growing sections, including the Okanogan irrigation project in northern Washington, eastern Oregon, southern Idaho, eastern Nevada, northern Arizona, northern New Mexico, central Colorado, and southern Wyoming.

LATEST DATE OF LAST KILLING FROST IN THE SPRING OF WHICH THE UNITED STATES WEATHER BUREAU HAS ANY OFFICIAL RECORD, AS SHOWN IN CHART NO. 3, BULLETIN NO. 5, REPORT FOR 1912.

May 23. Fairbanks, Alaska.

June 1. Central Nebraska, southeastern South Dakota, southern Minnesota, northern Iowa, northern Illinois, central Michigan, eastern Indiana, western Ohio, northern Pennsylvania, and central New York.

June 10. Eastern Wyoming, central South Dakota, central Minnesota, and central Wisconsin.

June 20. Central Wyoming, southeastern Montana, northern South Dakota, eastern North Dakota, northern Minnesota.

June 25. Central Wyoming, central Montana, and higher agricultural valleys in Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Utah, Nevada, and Arizona.

AVERAGE LENGTH OF CROP-GROWING SEASON (WITHOUT KILLING FROST), SHOWING ALSO HOURS OF SUNSHINE DURING SAME PERIOD.

Fairbanks, Alaska, 105.6 days, 2,076 hours.

Ellensburg, Wash., 90 days, 1,380 hours. (Kittitas Valley; 20,000 people, $6,000,000 bank deposits.)

Northern Wisconsin and practically all of the agricultural valleys of the Rocky Mountain region, 100 days, 1,464 hours.

Northern Montana, all of North Dakota, and northern Minnesota, 110 days, 1,607 hours.

Central Wisconsin, northern South Dakota, and practically all of eastern Montana and Wyoming, 120 days, 1,706 hours.

Thus it will be seen that the coldest weather in the Tanana Valley is no more severe than in portions of the United States

where agriculture and stock raising has long been profitably pursued. It must be noted that this is in the Tanana Valley, the most northerly territory which will probably be reached by any Government railway authorized by this bill. The temperature along the southern coast of Alaska is as warm as that along the southern boundary of the United States, and it is to be noted that colder weather has been recorded in the capital of Florida than at Cordova, Alaska, the terminus of one of the proposed routes recommended by the Alaska Railway Commission. This is because of the influence of the Japan current in the Pacific Ocean, which produces the same effect upon the climate of Alaska as the Gulf Stream produces upon the climate of the British Isles and the Scandinavian countries. This warming influence is supplemented by the long days during the growing season in Alaska. In the Tanana Valley the growing season of 105.6 days, by which we mean the season between killing frosts, has more hours of sunlight than during the growing season in Iowa, New York, or New England. Then, too, the interior of Alaska is semiarid, and is a land of almost perpetual sunshine during the growing season. These climatic conditions, combined with the wonderful fertility of the soil, have already produced bountiful crops, in proof of which I quote literally from the Annual Report of the Alaska Experiment Station for 1912:

FAIRBANKS STATION.

This station has attracted much attention during the summer of 1912. Travelers from many parts of the globe registered at Fairbanks during the present calendar year, many of whom, after visiting the station, expressed their amazement upon seeing the fields of ripened grains, alfalfa, clover, vegetables, and flowers. The majority of people still think of Alaska as one great field of ice, and those who see the possibilities of agriculture unfolded before their eyes in one grand panorama, as displayed on the southern slope during the season of 1912, may well be surprised.

The latest visitors for the season were the honorable United States railroad commissioners, accompanied by the Hon. JAMES WICKERSHAM, Delegate to Congress from Alaska; Mr. Falcon Joslin, president of the Tanana Valley Railroad; also a number of prominent Alaska citizens. At this late date—October 12—the crops were already harvested and stored for the winter. There had been no snow at that date, nor was the ground frozen. The yard was still a profusion of flowers, and the clover lawns were green as in midsummer. The crops were exhibited as well as possible, and the visitors were shown several tons of ripened grain in the sheaf and stack, as well as 3,000 pounds which had already been flailed out. They were shown through the large cellar, where more than 1,000 bushels of potatoes of 16 varieties were stored.

It has been stated that upon their return to Fairbanks the railroad commissioners announced that they would not dare to tell what they had seen in Alaska when they returned home, for the people would not believe them.

The season of 1912 has been the banner year thus far, and like reports are coming from all over the Tanana Valley.

Two church Sunday-school picnics were held at the station in the birch grove on the hill above the cottage during the summer, which afforded some 300 of the Fairbanks citizens the pleasure of visiting the station. On both occasions the general theme of expression was, What a beautiful place! What wonderful crops!

CLIMATIC CONDITIONS.

It has been said that the climatic condition of a country is one of the first attributes to be considered when a change in habitation is contemplated, but perhaps opportunity is even more important to the man in very moderate circumstances, who can not live on climate alone. Every country has some drawbacks, among them undesirable weather conditions; it is usually too cold, too hot, too wet, too sickly, or even all of these conditions exist in one locality. Interior Alaska has its cold winters, but the summers are not too warm, nor seldom too wet, and, with proper cultivation, seldom too dry. There are few, if, indeed, any other, localities on the globe which can boast of a more healthful climate.

The last winter here was the mildest known to white man. The temperature ranged along about −10° to −20° F., with a great deal of the time at or above zero. The temperature fell to −34° F. one day in November, −45° F. one day in December, −42° F. one day in January, and −32° F. one day in February. The snowfall was rather light, and very little fell during the early part of the winter. Freighters were compelled to use wagons until December.

GRAIN CROP.

Red Fife wheat seeded May 1 began heading July 3. It had sufficiently ripened to cut on September 10. It made a thick, even growth 4 feet tall and yielded about 55 bushels per acre.

Romanow wheat seeded May 1 began heading July 4. It ripened with Red Fife. The grain stood 4½ feet tall, very even and thick throughout the plat. This variety gave a yield of 60 bushels per acre.

Wild Goose wheat seeded May 2 began heading July 4. It ripened a few days later than the above varieties, stood 5 feet tall, very even and thick throughout the plat, and indicated a yield equally as heavy as Romanow.

The fall proved so cool and damp that these three varieties were cut and hung up in a shed to dry out and harden. The grain is well filled with plump kernels.

Sixty Day oats seeded May 2 began heading June 28. They made a thick, even growth about 3 feet tall, were ripe enough to cut August 10, and yielded about 85 bushels per acre.

Finnish oats seeded May 10 began heading July 4, and were ripe for cutting August 15. The crop was very heavy, standing 4 to 5½ feet tall. This variety yielded at the rate of about 90 bushels per acre.

Banner oats seeded May 2 began heading July 4, made a very thick growth 3½ feet tall, and were ready to cut August 15. This variety gave a yield of 100 bushels per acre.

Beardless barley (No. 19852) seeded May 3 began heading June 26. It made a heavy growth 4 feet tall, was ready to cut August 10, and when thrashed yielded 50 bushels to the acre.

Hull-less barley (No. 19851) seeded May 3 began heading June 25, made a thick, even growth 3½ feet tall, was ready to cut August 10, and yielded 42 bushels of 60 pounds each per acre.

The above grains were seeded with a No. 4 Planet Jr. drill on a south hillside which had been cropped to potatoes the two years previous. The tract is birch timberland cleared three years ago. No fertilizers were used on this tract, neither on the potatoes nor on the grain, but it probably represents the best soil and exposure.

LEGUMES.

Plats of alfalfa, red, white, and alsike clover were seeded about the yard fronting the cottage during the first week in June after the main crops were all in the ground and the yard laid out. These plats were fertilized with stable manure and sodium nitrate. The alfalfa covered a plat 24 by 48 feet. It came up very quickly and made more than a 2-foot growth, standing very thick on the ground. It began blossoming about the middle of August and doubtless would have made a light second crop if cut then. Visitors coming in quite frequently, the alfalfa was left standing until late in September. After it was cut for feed, the stubble had made some new growth when the snow fell.

The red clover covered a plat 36 by 48 feet, making a very thick stand. The summer growth was a little over 2 feet high, and this plat was red with blossoms from the middle of August until cut for feed late in September. This plat was also left standing all fall, being much admired by the visitors.

The alsike clover covered a plat 15 by 20 feet and made a very thick growth 2 feet high. It was also cut for feed with the red clover. Both plats were turning quite green before the ground froze.

The white clover occupied two small plats fringed with pansies, China asters, and China pinks. The white clover covered the ground thickly with about 8 inches of growth, which was almost hidden under its blossoms.

Field peas were grown this year by some of the settlers, and they report that they are well pleased with results. They have not been tried at the station.

Other green manuring crops, such as buckwheat and rye, promise to be more suitable here, as either of these will afford a fair crop to turn under by August 1.

POTATOES.

The potato crop of 1912 has by far excelled that of previous years all throughout the Tanana Valley as far as reported. The yield in Fairbanks and the immediate vicinity, it is estimated, will total upward of 300 tons. The tubers in nearly every instance are superior in quality to those of other years. The prejudice against the native potatoes is being gradually broken down, and it is probable that in two or three years the native potatoes will control the market, if, indeed, imported potatoes are not excluded entirely. As the farmer here extends his clearings he is enabled to enlarge his crops, and not only produce more but also cheapen the cost of production so that he can sell potatoes for 3 cents a pound and still make a handsome profit. The dealers can no longer afford the risk of disposing of their imported stock, which will cost them at least 5 cents, to say nothing about the loss by shrinkage, which is much greater than on the native product. The station crop for 1912 amounted to about 1,000 bushels of marketable size, and probably 5 tons of small potatoes and culls from a little over 5 acres. (Pl. VIII, fig. 1.) The small tubers found a ready market at 1½ cents to 2 cents per pound before the recent hog epidemic struck the camp.

Sixteen varieties of potatoes were planted from May 14 to 22. (Pl. VIII, fig. 2.) The greater part of the crop, however, was of the varieties Eureka and Gold Coin.

The experimental plat was on ground cultivated for the third year, being in potatoes the two previous years. The ground was fertilized for the first time with old stable manure for this crop. Each variety was planted on May 14 in rows 40 feet long, the seed dropped and covered by hand 1 foot apart in the row, making 40 hills of each variety. As the rows were a trifle under 3 feet apart, each variety occupied 120 square feet of space, or 363 such rows per acre. The potatoes were dug on September 18. The marketable tubers only were gathered and weighed as follows:

(1) Butkee, a local product; white skin, rather large, oblong and quite regular in shape, deep eyes, and cooks quite dry. The yield was at the rate of 478 bushels per acre.

(2) Irish Cobbler; white skin, rather large, oblong and quite regular in shape, medium deep eyes, and cooks quite dry. The yield was at the rate of 423 bushels per acre.

(3) Gold Coin; white skin, medium size, round and somewhat flattened, quite regular in shape, small eyes, and cooks quite dry. The yield was at the rate of 375 bushels per acre.

(4) Eureka; white skin, medium to large size, round and slightly flattened, quite regular in shape, small eyes, and cooks quite dry. The yield was at the rate of 345 bushels per acre.

(5) Vornhem; white skin, medium large, oblong, irregular in shape, deep eyes, and cooks medium dry. The yield was at the rate of 314 bushels per acre.

(6) Garfield; white skin, medium size and oblong in shape, some what irregular with many knotty or little side tubers, deep eyes, and cooks quite dry. The yield was at the rate of 308 bushels per acre.

(7) Burpee Early; red skin, medium in size, oblong and quite regular in shape, small eyes, and cooks quite dry. The yield was at the rate of 302 bushels per acre.

(8) Early Ohio; red skin, medium in size and round, a little rough with deep eyes, cooks very dry. The yield was at the rate of 302 bushels per acre.

(9) Freeman; white skin, medium large in size, oblong and irregular in shape with many knotty or little side tubers, rather deep eyes, cooks only fair to medium dry. The yield was at the rate of 302 bushels per acre.

(10) Extra Early Pioneer; white skin, medium large, round and quite regular in shape, rather deep eyes, cooks quite dry. The yield was at the rate of 278 bushels per acre.

(11) Snowflake; white skin, medium large, oblong and irregular in shape, deep eyes, and cooks medium dry. The yield was at the rate of 272 bushels per acre.

(12) White Mammoth; large round and oblong tubers with quite deep eyes and regular in shape, cooks only fair to medium dry. The yield was at the rate of 254 bushels per acre.

(13) Extra Early Ohio; pale red skin, medium size, round, medium deep eyes, cooks quite dry. The yield was at the rate of 242 bushels per acre.

(14) Early Market; light pink skin, medium small, round, a little rough with deep eyes, cooks quite dry. The yield was at the rate of 242 bushels per acre.

(15) Bovee; pink skin, medium in size and round in shape, with small eyes, and cooks quite dry. The yield was at the rate of 206 bushels per acre.

(16) White Beauty; rather large round tubers with small eyes, cooks medium dry. The yield was at the rate of 194 bushels per acre.

Considering the market values of the above varieties, or rather such a class of potatoes as those which find preference in the market, the smoothest white-skinned varieties which are good cookers would be selected. Alaska-grown potatoes are not as dry and mealy as outside potatoes, and oftentimes some varieties become watery when cooked. On some soils the whole crop is watery and unfit for table use. This accounts for the strong prejudice against the native product.

In cooking samples of the 16 varieties grown at this station for the season of 1912 not a single watery potato was found, although those classed as "medium dry" were not far from it.

Some of the red-skinned varieties are the best cookers, but these do not sell readily because of the color of the skin.

The quality and the yield of potatoes differ materially with the season, so that several years of comparison are necessary to arrive with any degree of exactness at the relative values of different varieties.

This is the first season the many little side tubers on the Freeman and Garfield varieties have been noticed. Some very large tubers have prongs, and sometimes clusters of small side tubers firmly connected to the large tuber, rendering them unsalable.

For market purposes, Gold Coin, Eureka, Irish Cobbler, and Butkee varieties are preferred to the other 12 varieties, and these, by the way, were the heaviest yielders in 1912. The Gold Coin and Eureka take preference in the order as named because of their shape and smoothness, and also because of their cooking as well as any white potato on the list.

Based on cooking qualities only, departing from color preference, selections would be made as follows:

Early Ohio, Burpee Early, Extra Early Ohio, and Bovee, of the red or pink skinned varieties. Next, the Gold Coin, Eureka, Irish Cobbler, and the Butkee. Some of the others are close seconds to the last four named, especially the Extra Early Pioneer.

Two and one-half acres were planted to Gold Coin and Eureka on the south slope in ground that was cleared and cropped to potatoes in 1911, but the soil was never fertilized. The yield averaged 7 tons of potatoes, or about 235 bushels per acre for the entire field in 1912.

As stated elsewhere in this report, an acre of light land sloping to the north was planted to five varieties of potatoes after an application of 200 pounds of sodium nitrate, and the yield was slightly more than double that of last year. This ground has been in potatoes three successive years.

For the system of potato culture followed, see the report of these stations for 1911, page 47.

THE VEGETABLE GARDEN.

Turnips, carrots, beets, peas, parsnips, celery, rhubarb, string beans, cabbage, and cauliflower were all grown successfully for home consumption.

Horse-radish made enormous top growth; it is now 3 years old. The main roots are from 1 to 1½ inches thick.

Strawberries wintered with very little loss, but because of the necessity of moving them they did not bear much fruit.

THE FLOWER GARDEN.

The China pinks, asters, and pansies which fringe the clover beds, together with the masses of sweet peas, morning-glories, stocks, poppies, daisies, candy tuft, nemophila, sweet alyssum, and other pinks, pansies, and asters which fringed the borders of the cottage greenhouse and other portions of the yard made one profusion of flowers all summer and until the middle of October.

Prof. Georgeson is so well satisfied with potato culture about Fairbanks that little attention will be given that tuber hereafter at that station. The agricultural experiment station is not intended to compete with farmers, and the farms about Fairbanks are now successful. Indeed, they are producing at less cost than at the Government station, where very properly the cultivation is experimental and hence more expensive in many cases. The local market at Fairbanks now consumes about 400 tons, and the farms produce about 300 tons. They will soon supply the entire local demand. When transportation is provided, the Fairbanks farms will have a market in the newer mining camps, and farming in the Tanana Valley will assume that permanency which is essential to any agricultural community. The success attained is indeed remarkable. Fairbanks already produces more potatoes per capita than many potato-growing States. What other pioneer district can show such a record in advance of railway transportation or other assurance of permanency?

Reference has been made in these debates to the cost of $200 per acre for clearing lands for the agricultural experimental station at Fairbanks. The same report recites that this was done with labor costing $7.50 per day for eight hours' work. That was the prevailing rate of wages then paid at Fairbanks during the busy summer season. I am reliably informed that the tract selected contained a fine body of growing timber, and was chosen because of its close proximity to the town of Fairbanks. It was not cleared as agricultural lands are universally cleared. The Government wished to establish an experiment station. It wished to do so immediately. It wished that station located near the town of Fairbanks for obvious reasons. It was not then demonstrating how cheaply the land could be cleared, but the director was very properly hastening to place the station in operation. It is not fair to illustrate the cost of land clearing in the Tanana Valley by this single instance. We all know that no farmer in the United States would think of hiring labor to clear his land during the harvest season, when labor is scarce and commanding the highest wage. Yet that was done in this case, with the added circumstance that the Government employees are limited to eight hours' work a day. Then, too, I am reliably informed that growing timber was removed and the green stumps grubbed and burned, roots were chopped out, and the ground plowed immediately.

This is not the usual method of land clearing. We all know that it costs a railway many times as much to clear its right of way as it costs the farmer to clear the land through which the railroad passes. Then, too, it is seldom that timberlands are first cleared in any agricultural district. There is always plenty of available ground which is more cheaply cleared, and that is always selected by the pioneer farmer. I am told by those who have lived in those regions of Alaska that the greater part of the land is covered by a so-called tundra of moss, leaves, and vegetation, which decays less rapidly in this northern semiarid climate. This tundra is several inches deep. It dries during the summer months, and the drying can be facilitated by digging trenches through it, which is often done with a plow, and that later in the season this tundra burns readily, thus removing practically all of the surface débris, destroying the brush and small trees, and making the ground practically ready for the plow, while the ash improves the soil and places it in better shape for cultivation than if the débris were plowed under. A few years are required to tame such soils, and the best crops can not be expected until the ground has been tilled a few years. The result is that the farms around Fairbanks are yielding better crops and a better quality of produce each succeeding year. Agricultural permanency in that valley will be assured when we have railroad transportation. No doubt the farmers in the Tanana Valley will share many of the trials common to all pioneer farmers, and no doubt they will also ultimately triumph, as did the pioneer farmers of New England, of Ohio, of the Mississippi Valley, and of the far West. Our duty to these pioneers is to afford them every encouragement by liberal laws and adequate transportation facilities. Well has Secretary Lane said in his last annual report, "I do not believe we sufficiently reward the pioneer." Certainly the pioneer has not been rewarded in Alaska. He has not even been encouraged. The passage of this bill will be one move in the direction of substantial encouragement.

The fisheries of Alaska have yielded more than $167,000,000, including the output of 1912, and to this must be added the output of approximately $18,000,000 in 1913. The bulk of this is canned salmon. The halibut industry is quite well developed, while cod fishing has only begun. The waters of Alaska doubtless contain more fish than all other American waters combined, and some idea of the future value of the fisheries may be obtained from the statement that of over 250 varieties of food fish in Alaskan waters we are utilizing only 7.

The seal rookeries of Alaska have yielded more than $52,000,000 worth of sealskins. Furs have been exported from Alaska of a value exceeding $22,000,000, and the whaling industry is important, the value thus taken amounting in 1912 alone to $1,444,084.

Alaska is the hunters' paradise, abounding in all kinds of wild game indigenous to the northland. The bird life is especially interesting, as Alaska is the breeding place for millions of geese, brant, duck, and waterfowl of innumerable variety, as well as grouse, ptarmigan, and other game birds. The bear, mountain sheep, and mountain goat are numerous, and it is the northern home of the moose, while the caribou is seen in thousands in their annual trek across the northern plains.

The domestic caribou—called the reindeer—now number over 38,000 in Alaska. These hardy and useful animals thrive upon the moss-covered mountains and waste lands of western and northern Alaska, which it is estimated will support 20,000,000 head of reindeer. Already several hundred reindeer carcasses are exported each year, and reindeer meat is not only the principal winter supply of meat at Nome, but reindeer steaks are quite commonly served in the restaurants of Seattle and other Pacific coast cities. In time the reindeer will provide a great meat supply, as they thrive best in the winter upon the native mosses, but at present there is no means of practical transportation to get these animals to the market. The reindeer is also valuable for its milk and hide. In Lapland, on an area of 14,000 square miles, over 26,000 people are sustained in comfort by their reindeer, amounting to about 400,000. The so-called waste lands of Alaska might sustain 50 times that number, and at that rate provide sustenance for a population of 5,000,000 people. Can any other region in all the world indicate such vast possibilities in the use of its waste lands as this region of western and northernmost Alaska?

After all, however, Alaska is chiefly important to us for its marvelous wealth of mineral. Well has it been named the "treasure land." The so-called Seward ice chest of 40 years ago

now proves to be Uncle Sam's golden coffer. Development work now in actual operation at Juneau alone will provide an annual yield of more than $30,000,000 from that one mining district, with an insured ore supply in sight sufficient to maintain that production for 150 years. Improved transportation facilities with cheaper cost of labor and supplies will make possible the development of immense areas of placer ground in the interior which can not now possibly be worked. Forty dredges are in operation at Nome on Bering Sea, where water transportation is available five months in each year. But better railway facilities are necessary, and any reasonable estimate of future productions would seem extravagant, even when based on statements made by those so conservative as the Geological Survey.

Copper mining is at present limited to the islands along the southern and southeastern coast of Alaska. Only one copper mine in the interior of Alaska is provided with railway transportation, and that mine has actually paid over $3,000,000 in dividends in its less than three years of operation. This great production along the coast is but a slight indication of the possible production when railway transportation is provided. But an important factor is the necessity for coke for smelting. At present foreign coke, even from Australia, is used largely in smelting Alaska copper ore, while the coal fields of Alaska contain countless tons of the most suitable coal for coke manufacturing. An assured supply of Alaska coke at a reasonable cost would insure the construction of numerous copper smelting and matting plants along the Alaskan coast, where there is an infinite variety of ores which are suitable for blending in a proper smelter. Then, too, flux will not be necessary, as it is in most smelters throughout the United States, owing to the character of the ores. This, however, will not be possible until railroads are provided and the coal fields are opened to development.

The surveyed coal fields of Alaska cover an area estimated by the United States Geological Survey at 12,667 square miles, but only one-fifth of Alaska has been inspected. Very little of this has even been prospected. The two best-known fields of high-grade coal are the Bering River and Matanuska fields, in both of which considerable development work has been done and some coal extracted. The chemical tests as reported by the United States Geological Survey show the coal from those two fields to be equal in quality to that of Pennsylvania and West Virginia, each field containing deposits of anthracite and very high grades of bituminous steaming coal and areas of the most desirable coals for the manufacture of coke. The withdrawal of these coal fields from entry has prevented their development. I am not now discussing the wisdom of these withdrawals, but the statement is necessary to explain why Alaska has been compelled to buy its coal in foreign countries and that even the Government is purchasing Australian coal for its use in Alaska and is having the same delivered into Government bunkers on the Alaskan coast in Norwegian steamers. The great value of Alaska coal is not only for its use in Alaska, but elsewhere. About this there is no question. Another great demand for this coal is in the manufacture of coke for copper smelters and steel manufacturing. There is no other coking coal of such quality on the Pacific coast of North America, and this coal must be made available before the copper industry of Alaska can be properly developed.

The value of this steaming coal for naval use is, however, questioned in these debates. It appears that no naval test has ever been made of the Matanuska fields, and no satisfactory test has been made of the Bering River coal, although Congress provided for such a test more than a year ago. About 1,000 tons of coal from the Matanuska field has been mined and will be brought out by sleds during the present winter. Some coal was obtained last year from the Bering River fields. It was the test of this coal about which the opponents to this bill made so much argument on the floor of this House a few days ago. The naval report of this coal test admits that it was not a fair test, that the coal was not properly selected, and contained much dirt and slate. The fact is that the citizens of Katalla, Alaska, publicly protested when this coal was brought out. Their statements were then published in the newspapers of Alaska and the Pacific coast to the effect that the coal had been carelessly selected and that much dirt and slate had been included with it. I refer especially to the statement of Thomas G. White, as published in the Seattle newspapers many months before the naval test was made. Mr. White then gave warning that this test would not prove satisfactory because of the improper and careless selection of the coal. His charge is that the coal was taken from the face of several cuts made by coal locators several years previous. Naturally the rain and weather had largely destroyed the exposure. In order to obtain a fair sample other and further development work should have been done so as to obtain coal which had not been exposed to the weather, as this was for several years. This does not appear to have been done, and the results of the tests are far superior to what would have been expected by those who read Mr. White's statement made at the time the coal was taken out and months before the test was made. However, this was not the first test of the Alaskan coal. Commander Boyd, of the United States Navy, in his testimony before the Senate Committee on Territories on May 19, 1913, makes this statement on page 141.

Mr. BOYD. We have had just one test of that coal some years ago. About 35 tons were brought from Mr. McDonald's mine in the same field, was brought to Puget Sound and put on board the *Nebraska*. The *Nebraska* then went to sea and made 24-hour tests, steaming four boilers, two boilers using Pocahontas coal and the other two using Bering River coal. The result of that test, so far as figures go, indicates the Bering River coal is superior to the Pocahontas coal as 18 to 15, so far as value is concerned, but that is a very misleading sort of test. Two of those boilers may have been providing most of the steam, just as two horses in a four-horse team may do most of the work; so the test shows nothing. It did show that the coal can not be worked very readily on the grate. For instance, it was so slack that if the fireman, following his usual practice in leveling the top of the fire with a hoe, strikes the slice bar in breaking up clinkers, if he follows that same practice, he is likely to lose a lot of the coal through the grate. We have a commander of the *Maryland*, who is well informed on Alaska affairs, and is very much interested in the experiment and knows fully the result of that test, and he will make an effort to have his engineer and his fireman so trained by the time they get the coal on board at Controller Bay that they will know best by what system this coal should be fired to make the best test.

Now, I contend that neither of these tests are fair or dependable. Naturally surface tests are not reliable. Coal for naval use must meet the most exacting demand and must be carefully selected. The chemical tests of the Alaska coal show it to be all that could be desired, and it ought not to be condemned upon a sample of coal selected from one place, which had been exposed for several years to the action of the rain and weather, especially as the naval officers themselves admit this test to be unfair.

Tin occurs in Alaska on the Seward Peninsula and in the Hot Springs region of the Tanana Valley, both as placer or stream tin and in lodes or veins.

In view of the enormous amount of tin plate used by the cannery establishments on the Pacific coast, the success of these mines is of deep interest. The official report of the commerce of Alaska gives the value of tin ore exported in 1912 as $90,831.

Iron is abundant at several points in the Territory, but not in localities where it can be made valuable under present conditions. The quantity is said to be large and the quality excellent. If opened, the field might offer return cargo for the vessels now returning light from Nome.

Small pebbles of cinnabar occur in the sluice boxes in the north portion of the Copper River Valley and elsewhere in Alaska, and they may ultimately be a source of profit.

Lead is found in the Ketchikan district.

High-grade antimony is reported from several localities, but in the absence of smelting facilities the ores have but little present value. Bismuth and tungsten are also recorded, and platinum is found in small quantities in the sluice boxes of many placer camps. It is interesting to note that a belt of rock of the same age geologically as those which yield the platinum placers of Russia is indicated on a late map of the Geological Survey as crossing the edge of the Tulsak, suggesting that the presence of the platinum in the sluice boxes may prove to be a fact of commercial value, especially as the metal now commands about $40 an ounce, or double the value of gold.

Silver also is found in nearly all the different quartz regions of Alaska and often is of sufficient value to pay for the reduction of the ore for the more valuable minerals which are being treated.

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, the total value to 1912 being $22,216,872 and the value for 1913, $370,519.

While the marble industry is still in its infancy, those who are familiar with the quality and quantity of marble of Alaska are now preparing to supply the market, not only for interiors of buildings on the Pacific coast, but also to export it to Asia and even as far as Australia.

Gypsum is also found in large quantities.

That stock can be raised from the Yukon Valley southward during the summer is well known to all old Alaskans, who have seen cattle, sheep, and horses living on the native product. Cows for dairy purposes are kept near all the principal towns.

On Raspberry Island there is a band of 500 sheep.

Horses are in universal use in all parts of the Territory, their more extensive use being limited principally by the absence of good roads.

That oats, barley, and rye can be grown successfully has been demonstrated at the experimental stations in the Yukon and 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. There are also splendid samples of wheat. These crops are also largely grown in northern Russia. The successful growth is governed by the date at which the ground obtains a certain warmth to cause the seed to germinate—42° for wheat—and a sufficient time thereafter to mature.

It is possible to grow vegetables in all parts of Alaska except upon the tundra and the high mountains. An examination of the Government experimental station reports shows conclusively that all the ordinary garden vegetables can be raised with entire success.

Fruits and flowers abound in southeastern Alaska, while cranberries, raspberries, blueberries, and many other varieties of wild berries and flowers are to be found all through the Yukon and Tanana Valleys.

FORESTS.

The following statements are condensed from the official report of R. S. Kellogg, assistant forester in 1910, the report of the governor of Alaska for the fiscal year ending June 31, 1912, and from local sources where they relate to the Fairbanks mining industries.

AREA.

The total area of the forests and woodlands in the Territory is estimated at about 100,000,000 acres, or 156,250 square miles, or 27 per cent of the total area. Of this about 20,000,000 acres, or 31,250 square miles, are estimated as containing timber suitable for manufacturing purposes, which is more than the area of South Carolina and nearly that of Maine or Indiana. Of the remaining 80 per cent, or 125,000 square miles, one-half is classed as woodland, carrying some saw timber, but on which the forest trees are of a small size, more scattered, and valuable chiefly for fuel; the tree growth on the remainder being stunted, scrubby, and valueless for any purpose except the camp fires of the prospector. The region north of the Endicott Mountains, all of the shores of Bering Sea, and the Alaska Peninsula south of Illiamna Lake are practically destitute of timber, producing nothing larger than willows of very small growth, and those only in a few localities.

The matter of the construction of the railroad is to be left in the hands of the President. He is authorized under the provisions of the bill to do all lawful acts necessary to accomplish the purposes and objects of the measure. He is authorized to withdraw, locate, and dispose of, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, such area or areas of the public domain along the line or lines of proposed railroads for townsite purposes as he may from time to time designate.

In that a bond issue for $35,000,000 is authorized by the act, no appropriation is required. The act provides for a redemption fund, into which shall be paid 50 per cent of all moneys derived from the sale or disposal of any of the public lands, including town sites in Alaska, or the coal or mineral therein contained or the timber thereon; into this fund shall be paid the net earnings of the said railroads above maintenance charges and operating expenses; the said redemption fund, or any part thereof, shall be used from time to time, upon the order of the President, to pay the interest on the bonds authorized and issued under the provisions of the pending bill, and to redeem, cancel, and retire said bonds, under such rules and regulations as the President may establish in accordance with the provisions of this act.

The officers or agents placed in charge of the work by the President shall make to the President annually, or at such other periods as may be required, full and complete reports of their acts and of all moneys received and expended in the construction of the work, and the annual reports shall be transmitted by the President to Congress.

The railroad rates will be under the supervision of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The bill provides for the construction, maintenance, and operation of telegraph and telephone lines as far as they may be necessary and convenient in the construction and operation of the railroad authorized under the act, and they shall perform generally all the usual duties of telegraph and telephone lines for hire.

Alaska is owned by the United States Government. Rightfully it should be preserved for all the people. The day of special interests is rapidly coming to a close, and it becomes more apparent than ever that the resources of the great, rich Alaskan Territory should not be subservient to private interests, but of right should be conserved and developed for the welfare of the whole people.

It is because I believe that the proposed legislation will surely be a benefit to this Government and its people that I favor this bill. No clearer or more forceful statement of the whole situation has been made than was given in the words of our President in a recent message to this House, when he said:

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 it should itself control in the interest of all who wish to use them for the service and development of the country and its people.

[Applause.]

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, I am led to support this bill after giving the subject of Alaska and its resources very careful study and consideration for two years.

In the Sixty-second Congress I was permitted to serve on the Committee on Territories, and was placed upon the subcommittee having in charge legislation touching Alaska. I may say that when I commenced the investigation of the subject I was opposed to conservation in Alaska as it was then and is now carried on, and opposed to railroad building in Alaska, because I had the idea that if we opened the coal mines of Alaska the people would at once flock into that country and it would be settled up as rapidly as the Territories of the West were settled.

After studying the matter very thoroughly I have come to the conclusion that the only way in which to develop Alaska is for the Government to build railroads there. [Applause.] I know no other way to secure those railroads than to support the bill that the Committee on Territories have brought into this House and now ask us to support.

Gentlemen say, "If you will open up the coal mines alone and build no railroads you will develop Alaska"; and my friend from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] wound up a long speech by saying that the way to develop Alaska was to open the coal mines; that once open, the coal mines and the people would flock into the Territory. But for three hours he had been maintaining that there was not anything in the Territory to support a man after he got there. He labored long to prove conclusively that they could not even eat the potatoes that they raised there, that they had to ship potatoes in. Down in my friend's own home they are eating potatoes to-day grown up in Minnesota and Idaho and Colorado. That is no sign that you can not raise potatoes in Oklahoma good enough for the people of Oklahoma to eat. It is merely a case where they did not raise enough and have to send somewhere else to get them.

The gentleman from Oklahoma read from the statement of some gentleman named Chubbock, or some such name, a dissertation on the potato. If the gentleman had taken the pains to read the report of the experiment station, by Prof. Georgeson, who has spent four or five years in Alaska, he could have learned that they raise as good potatoes and as many of them per acre as they do in any country in the world.

Now, I do not believe that Alaska will ever be the agricultural country that Oklahoma, or Kansas, or Nebraska, or Missouri, or Illinois is, but I do believe that they can produce sufficient to support a population of 5,000,000. I know there are great mineral resources there, and, from my standpoint, I believe it is the duty of Congress to develop Alaska in some way in order that we may get the advantage of those resources. [Applause.]

As the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] said, Alaska belongs to the United States. It belongs to the people. We are not pledging ourselves to any doctrine of government ownership of public utilities, railroads, or anything else by building this railroad. We are doing with our property what any good business man would do with his own property. [Applause.] Suppose a farmer has 160 acres of timberland. Does it do him any good until he improves it? If he lets the timber stand and does not cut it off and put the land into cultivation, if he keeps it in his family long enough, it will break the whole family, because it is not improved and he gets no return for the outlay and taxes on the land. But when he begins improving it, it costs him something to improve it. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DAVENPORT] said in his speech that it costs $200 an acre to improve land in Alaska. Then his colleague [Mr. FERRIS] in his speech dropped $75 an acre and got it down to $125 an acre.

I have seen a statement from a gentleman as intelligent as anybody who ever visited Alaska, who, after having inspected it, says it can be improved for $40 an acre. I do not know which one of these gentlemen is right, and I do not care which one is right. I believe it is the duty of this country to build railroads in Alaska, and especially do I believe it is the duty of the Members on this side of the Chamber to vote for this bill, and I will tell you why. We are responsible for the President of the United States. We ought to carry out his views. We ought to aid him in every way we can. We ought to carry out the pledges of our platform to develop Alaska. The President, in the first message he delivered to this Congress, told us how we ought to do it. Now, let us see just what he 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.

My friend the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] says there are a good many old storehouses all over the country that are not worth unlocking. President Wilson continues:

One key to it is a system of railways. These the Government should itself build and administer, and the ports and terminals it should itself control, in the interest of all who wish to use them for the service and development of the country and its people.

Now, my Democratic friends, that is the language of our President, and he is supported by the report of Mr. Lane, the Secretary of the Interior, who recommends the passage of this bill without any ifs or ands about it.

Now, what are we to do about it? Are we to keep our pledges solemnly made to the American people and aid our President in carrying out his views on this subject or are we to abandon the pledges we made to the people? Are we to disregard the recommendations of the President and excuse ourselves by saying it pledges us to Government ownership of railroads? What is the difference between digging a canal for transportation and owning it and making it free of tolls and building a railroad for transportation purposes? My good friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] wants this Government to dig an intercoastal canal, as it is called, all the way from Boston to Galveston, digging it three-fourths of the way in sight of the Atlantic Ocean and the Gulf of Mexico, and making it free of tolls to the commerce of the country. Everyone who favors that idea ought to be more than willing to vote for this bill to permit the Government to build a railroad in Alaska when we propose to charge everybody who rides on it or takes a pound of freight over it enough for the use of it to pay the expenses of maintaining the property. [Applause.]

And then the bill provides for a sinking fund in order to pay for the road. How? Out of Government property there, out of the gold and the copper and everything else that is there, because it belongs to the American people; and out of the very things that my friend from Oklahoma said would furnish, if the road was built by private parties, an immense tonnage to the railroad if it would only open the coal mines.

A good deal has been said about the coal not being good for naval purposes. The gentlemen when they discuss this proposition ought to go to the bottom of it. They ought to get at the bottom of the coal proposition; they ought to know exactly what there is in it. There has been a strife between the Bureau of Mines, the Geological Survey, and the Navy Department over the coal in Alaska ever since it was known that there was coal up there.

The Bureau of Mines, some years ago, tested the coal from Alaska taken from Bering River coal fields, and it tested better than any eastern coal for naval purposes. Somehow or other that did not suit the Navy. For some reason they wanted to find out what the eastern owners of coal mines wanted. I do not know why, but there was some inducement somewhere that led the people interested to have another test, and so the naval appropriation bill in the last Congress, when it came to the House, carried $50,000 to enable the Navy to get coal out of Bering River coal fields in order that another test might be made. That appropriation was stricken out in the House for a good reason, but it went to the other end of the Capitol and they added $25,000 to it, making $75,000; and I am informed that when it got into conference there was no objection to it on the part of the House conferees, notwithstanding the House had stricken it out. I say there is as good coal in Alaska for naval purposes as there is in West Virginia or Pennsylvania, and I say that the coal taken for the test at Annapolis, and made on the *Maryland*, was taken for the express purpose of defeating the Bremmerton test before mentioned.

Mr. FERRIS. Does the gentleman want to indict the Navy Department?

Mr. BOOHER. The gentleman heard what I said.

Mr. FERRIS. That shows the character of this debate. Every time an authority is quoted there is a disposition to detract from that authority.

Mr. BRYAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma ought to be the last one in the House to say that.

Mr. BOOHER. I have said nothing to which the gentleman can object. I say that the test made by the Navy Department was not a true test; that the coal obtained was obtained for the express purpose of destroying the test made at Bremmerton. Otherwise, how would you get two tests so far apart as those two tests were?

Mr. FERRIS rose.

Mr. BOOHER. Oh, the present Navy Department had nothing to do with it, I am very glad to say; neither did the officers who made the test.

Mr. FERRIS. I do not think the gentleman ought to make that statement.

Mr. BOOHER. Now, I am going to read a letter and show you how the coal was obtained to make this test, and you can judge whether you believe it was a fair test. I tried to get my friend from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] to say that coal did not deteriorate by lying on top of the ground and that surface coal was not so good as that taken from the mine, but, of course, he would not admit such to be the fact. I want you to hear this letter read, and you will want to know where my friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], got the information that the coal was taken out of a tunnel 100 feet deep. Here is the letter:

TERRITORY OF ALASKA,
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE,
Juneau, January 17, 1914.

Hon. JAMES WICKERSHAM,
Delegate from Alaska, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR JUDGE: I note by the newspaper dispatches that the opposition in Congress to the Alaska railroad bill are endeavoring to make capital out of a statement alleged to have been made by Rear Admiral Griffin, of the United States Navy, to the effect that the tests made of Bering River coal had not been satisfactory.

No one who lives in Alaska, having a definite knowledge of the way in which the coal was mined and the quality obtained, expected that the test would be otherwise than unsatisfactory. To dig out of an open cut and transport to tidewater 800 tons or less of this coal cost the Government, I am informed, approximately $100,000. The expedition in charge of the work was a rank failure in nearly every particular, according to the information at my command. There was a constant friction between the Bureau of Mines representatives and the Navy officials, who jointly made up the expedition, or who were in charge of it, and the mismanagement and inefficiency were everywhere apparent. In February of last year Thomas G. White, an old resident of Katalla, who assisted the Government party in getting out the coal, wrote me in effect as follows:

"If we ever succeed in getting out this coal, and it is given a test, it will be pronounced no good, and that will not be a lie either. It is no good for the reason that the coal-mining party, instead of taking coal from the tunnel on the Cunningham claim, where a vein has been developed, took it from an open cut. It is surface coal, and full of rocks and dirt and shale and other debris. No attempt has been made to secure a good quality of coal. Wait for the howl that will come up against it when the test has been made."

White was in Juneau a few days ago, and he repeated the statements made nearly a year before as to the quality of the coal mined by the expedition, adding that he could take a bunch of Indians and get 1,000 tons of first-class coal in the Bering River coal field with one-eighth of the amount it cost the Government party, who got dirt and rocks and an inferior quality of surface coal.

I am writing you this for your personal information. I believe the statements made by White are true, as they have been corroborated, directly and indirectly, by others. I do not believe that the Bering River coal field should be condemned because of the incompetence, negligence, or indifference—call it what you will—of the expedition that seems to have been content with tonnage instead of real coal; and when the opponents of Alaska use an unfavorable report as to the quality of this coal, made by the Navy Department, it is like adding insult to injury.

Sincerely, yours, J. F. A. STRONG, *Governor.*

Now, you have heard the howl, and it seems that an old settler, a laborer, who was helping get the coal out, judged it exactly and told the country what would be the result of that test. As you will see, this letter is signed by the governor of the Territory of Alaska, and ought to be good authority. [Applause.]

Mr. FERRIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOOHER. Certainly.

Mr. FERRIS. Does the gentleman think that even the governor's testimony ought to be superior to the Secretary of the Navy in a question of this sort?

Mr. BOOHER. If the Secretary of the Navy had known these facts, I have no doubt that he would have understood the test that was made and would not have said what he did.

Mr. FERRIS. Has the gentleman from Missouri called the attention of the Secretary of the Navy to these facts?

Mr. BOOHER. No.

Mr. FERRIS. Why not?

Mr. BOOHER. Now, I am going to read you a letter from the Secretary of the Navy which will throw light on the subject and which I invite my friend from Oklahoma to read carefully:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, January 31, 1914.

Hon. WM. C. HOUSTON, M. C.,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. HOUSTON: In reference to my previous letter to you in regard to the tests of Bering River coal, I desire to invite particular attention to the fact that these tests only relate to the coal actually tested.

As stated in that letter, there is nothing to show in the tests just completed what may be expected of coal taken from greater depths on other veins.

The coal as mined was apparently mixed with foreign matter to a considerable extent, either due to the presence of "bone" in the veins or to the conditions due to mining and transporting the sample tested.

The analysis of the coal showed it to have very excellent characteristics, but its ultimate behavior in the furnace could only be told by actual test. This test showed that in spite of the analysis the sample tested for some reason not yet clear did not give a high efficiency. The presence of clinker usually denotes foreign substances, but this is a matter upon which but little is known, and it might well be that coal from deeper shafts, or even from neighboring veins, would behave very differently.

The absence of smoke is a favorable feature of this coal, and the department hopes that future experience may yet show that Alaskan coal is suitable for naval use.

Sincerely, yours, JOSEPHUS DANIELS,
Secretary of the Navy.

Now, the Bremmerton test was made from coal taken from the Copper River coal fields, about 2 miles from the place this coal was taken, and, as I have said, it tested better than any eastern coal for the Navy. I say that such a wide variance between these two tests indicates that something is wrong somewhere in the testing of this coal, because they would not vary that much if there was not. [Applause.]

In order to furnish the best evidence in support of the proposition that there was a close combination between the Pocahontas Coal Co. and the Navy Department I insert a colloquy that took place in the House in the third session of the Sixty-first Congress, when the naval appropriation bill was under discussion. By the way, let us not forget that the Pocahontas Coal Co. has very extensive dealings with the Government in supplying coal for the Navy.

The colloquy referred to is as follows:

Mr. PEARRE. Then I understand that the gentleman's charge is that there is collusion between the Navy Department and the eastern coal operators.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I do not say who is responsible, but I am just giving the facts. I say there is no excuse for the action of the Navy in spending from $900,000 to $1,000,000 a year in bringing coal around from the Atlantic coast to the Pacific coast for the use of the Navy in time of peace. I assert that it is worse than a waste of public funds, for, in addition to wasting it, it does incalculable harm to American shipping.

Mr. KITCHIN. The gentleman means to imply that in time of war they would have use for western coal?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes; in case of war on the Pacific. So if this coal is to be used in war it seems to me of highest importance that they become accustomed to its use in time of peace.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I agree thoroughly with the proposition advanced by the gentleman from Washington. The closest corporation in this country is the combination between the Pocahontas coal people and the Navy Department, and it has been so for 20 years. I know that during the Spanish-American War, when Alabama coals that were perfectly good for steaming purposes were offered to the Navy Department for $3.25 a ton over the ship's rail at Mobile, only a night's sail from Tampa, the Navy Department bought Pocahontas coal and shipped it by rail to Tampa at an expense of $9.60, and that proposition has been kept up ever since.

Now, what control these particular people have over the Navy Department I do not know. But I do know this, that there is no other coal field in America that can sell coal to the Navy Department. The supply of the Navy is confined to this one field only.

Further along during the debate this colloquy took place:

Mr. STANLEY. Does the gentleman know whether or not the Navy Department has made any tests of the Alaskan coal?

Mr. HOBSON. I am just about to bring up that point and various other points. I wish to register here a complaint that the Navy Department is not encouraging the development of appliances so that it can use other coals. When it found, for instance, that the coal in Alabama approximated to the needs of the Navy, it would have been in line of economy and the best interests of the Government to have undertaken to develop smoke-consuming devices and other devices so that the department could then use Alabama coal.

The same applies to the Pacific coast coal, not only that mined on the mainland but that in Alaska, and the Navy Department has not shown great interest in developing additional sources of supply that would prove of great, if not vital, importance in time of war, and we are put to millions of dollars of expense, perhaps, unnecessarily. I will not say unnecessarily, but perhaps.

The gentleman from Oklahoma certainly will not require further proof to satisfy him that such a combination did exist.

The gentlemen who oppose this bill have labored long and hard to convince themselves, and incidentally to convince the House, that Alaska is a cold, bleak, and desolate country; that it has no future and is not worth developing for any purpose. In answer to their argument I will read an extract from the report of one of the ablest men in the Interior Department, who made a careful, painstaking investigation and study of Alaska and its possibilities from personal observations. I refer to Hon. James W. Witten, who for many years has been connected with the Department of the Interior and whose ability and integrity are unquestioned.

In 1903 Mr. Witten was detailed by the Secretary of the Interior as a special inspector to make a general investigation into the conditions in Alaska. His report embraces agricultural conditions and prospects, native population, fish and fisheries, minerals, coal, and timber. In his report on agricultural possibilities he said:

Much of Alaska is not situated farther north than are parts of Scotland, Finland, Iceland, Norway, and Sweden, where agricultural pursuits give employment and sustenance to more than 10,000,000 people. The main portion of Alaska is situated between the parallels which bound Finland, yet 34 per cent of Finland is being used for agricultural purposes, and supports a population of more than 2,500,000 people. Large quantities of butter, cheese, and oats are exported. Much of Alaska lies in the same zone with Iceland; and while the ocean currents may make some difference in temperature, yet Iceland, with only 10,000 square miles of land suitable for cultivation and pasture, and with a population of only 76,300 in 1898, had 21,982 cattle, 44,134 horses, 735,442 sheep, and her farmers furnished in 1890 64 per cent of all her exports and maintained four agricultural colleges. The soils of Alaska are generally of an alluvial character, particularly those in the Yukon and other river valleys, and the rank growth of vegetation everywhere to be found testifies to the fact that they are very fertile.

In summing up this part of his report Mr. Witten says:

Not only do the natural conditions have a tendency to embarrass and prevent agricultural developments, but the lack of means of transportation amounts to almost prohibition.

That farming can be successfully carried on, by permission of the Delegate from Alaska, Judge WICKERSHAM, I shall insert in the RECORD two letters that need no comment. The letters referred to follow:

FAIRBANKS, ALASKA, *November 8, 1909.*

Hon. JAMES WICKERSHAM,
Delegate to Congress, Fairbanks, Alaska.

MY DEAR JUDGE: In answer to your suggestion that I write you a letter about my farming operations I take pleasure in doing so. When you and Mr. Joslin and Mr. Birch and Mr. White were at my place last fall I had not begun to take in my crops, but since then I have done so. I had 3 acres of potatoes, and they yielded me 18 tons, and the market price was $120 a ton, for which I sold most of them. I had 1 acre of beets, on which I had a crop of 8 tons; 2 acres of carrots, which yielded me 7½ tons, with a market price of $140 per ton; 1 acre of turnips, from which 200 sacks of 80 pounds to the sack, or 8 tons, at $80 per ton. I had 2½ tons of rutabagas upon one-fourth of an acre of ground, for which the market price was $100 per ton. I had 1 ton of red beets on one-quarter of an acre of ground, at $140 per ton. I had 15 acres of barley, which I cut and sold for hay. I had 3½ tons which I sold for $75 per ton, and still have enough left to fill my barn chock-full for my own use for the winter. I raised 2 tons of cabbage, which I put away for the winter, besides which I sold between 3½ and 4 tons during the summer at an average selling price of $140 per ton.

I raised 29 suckling pigs, also 13 pigs which weighed about 100 pounds each, and 23 big pigs. I sold 5 of my hogs to the butcher for $60 each.

This fall I put in 6 acres of winter wheat, Bluestem, which I sowed the second week in August, and before the snow came in October the wheat was up 2 or 3 inches high, and I never saw a better stand of wheat anywhere. I have raised good winter wheat, barley, and oats, and all kinds of garden vegetables, and, in my judgment, as a farmer of more than 30 years' experience, the Tanana Valley is a first-class agricultural country.

My farm is near the river and is perfectly level. The soil is sandy loam and is very rich, made up of sediment and silt and sand brought down by the river in ages gone by. The Tanana Valley opposite my farm is 60 miles wide, and there are probably 5,000,000 acres of as good ground as mine in this vicinity. I know from six years' experience on this farm that farming can be made entirely successful, and that this valley can be made to produce everything which can be raised in Minnesota and the Dakotas, and that there is no valley in the North so wide and rich and variable for agricultural purposes as the Tanana Valley.

I have several neighbors immediately around the town of Fairbanks who are engaged in successful farming, and we have in the last year raised almost enough to supply the local market, and there is no question hereafter that the whole local market in the Tanana mines can be supplied from our farms and gardens.

Respectfully, WM. YOUNG.

FAIRBANKS, ALASKA, *November 8, 1909.*

Hon. JAMES WICKERSHAM,
Delegate to Congress, Fairbanks, Alaska.

DEAR SIR: I was born and raised in northern Germany, on the Weser, and my parents being landowners, farmers, and stock raisers, I learned the farming and stock-raising business thoroughly. At the age of 18 I left Germany for the United States, and landed at New York. From there I went to Ohio, then to Illinois, and from Illinois I went to Nebraska, in which State I farmed and raised stock for 18 years, principally in the southern part of the State. From Nebraska I went to the State of Washington, where I engaged exclusively in the stock business—buying, selling, and shipping stock.

In 1897, at the time of the rush to the Klondike, I started for Dawson with 135 steers, but did not reach Dawson until 1898. I have been shipping stock to different parts of Alaska ever since. In 1900 I shipped stock to Nome and also to other parts of Alaska, and have traveled overland with cattle from Valdez to Fairbanks for the past seven years. I have visited the Aleutian Islands and have been on almost every one of the islands of that group, and I find that Alaska is a great country for its climate, grasses, and different kinds of small grain, such as oats, barley, and all kinds of vegetables.

I contended when I first landed at Haines mission, in 1897, that Alaska would be a farming and stock-raising country, and I am more and more convinced of that fact as I travel through the different parts of the country.

Owing to the big fire at Fairbanks, I have not been in and around Fairbanks for four years, and I was very much surprised when I came here last September that the country surrounding Fairbanks had been turned into a farming and gardening community.

I came here this last time with cattle and hogs, and found that they raise as fine barley as I ever saw in any of the States where I have farmed heretofore. I bought barley, oats, and hay here from Mr. William Young, which he raised on his farm just north of the town, to feed my cattle, and found it to be well filled with good-matured and well-ripened grain. I saw as fine potatoes here this fall as I ever have seen anywhere in the States. Cabbage, rutabagas, turnips, and carrots can not be beat in any of the States, and I believe that sweet potatoes will be raised here in the near future. The raising of hay has proven to be a success. I also find a lot of chickens are being raised in and about Fairbanks for the local market.

Respectfully, WM. WAECHTER.

Let us take into consideration the volume of business between Alaska and continental United States for the year 1912, the last year for which we have the official figures. It is a wonderful

showing from a country that we have heard so volubly denounced:

In 1912 the value of merchandise imported into Alaska from the United States was	$21,992,761.00
In 1908	15,862,671.00
Showing a gain in four years of	6,130,090.00
Average increase per year of	1,532,522.00
In 1912 there was sent out of Alaska to the United States domestic export of the value of	40,825,590.00
Showing a total trade with the United States for the year 1912 of	62,818,352.00
While the total commerce of Alaska with the world for 1912 was	72,741,060.00
The value of fisheries in 1878, the first year of the industry after the purchase, was	29,416.00
Value of fisheries, 1912	18,818,480.00
Increase	18,789,064.00
The total cash receipts from Alaska from 1867 to 1911, both inclusive	446,640,984.79
Total cash disbursed, including the original purchase price	35,816,674.54
Balance in favor of Alaska	410,824,310.25

From this showing alone we would be justified in passing this bill.

The greatest enterprise of any age was the building of the Pacific Railroad, and it had to remain inactive and slumber for years for the lack of faith of its practicability and usefulness as a means of transportation and as an inducement to the hardy pioneer to settle up public lands of the Middle West and Pacific coast. No one now doubts its success and benefits. But it was not built without Government aid. The fact is that the money and land given the company more than constructed the road; in other words, the Government built the road and has nothing to show for it. If we build this railroad in Alaska we will at least have the road to show for it.

Let us pass this bill and follow it with a bill providing for the leasing of mineral lands in Alaska and we will have done our full duty to the people of Alaska and kept faith with the people we represent.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, in the consideration of the pending bill I can not refrain from calling attention to the contradictory position in which we find ourselves if the contentions of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] and others are correct.

It is the expressed opinion of those in a position to know that in a short time we shall witness the completion, at a cost of approximately $400,000,000, of a great public enterprise in the Tropics, the Panama Canal, a wonderful exhibition of the possibilities of engineering genius. In the completion of this canal we shall witness the consummation of a project for centuries the dream of men of other lands, but it remained for the American, to whom no task seems impossible, to cease dreaming and grapple in a practical way with this great work.

The proposal to construct this great commercial highway was heartily approved by the masses of the American people, and notwithstanding the fact that it has cost many millions in excess of estimates made by the engineers, no complaint has been heard, all feeling it was a great national enterprise worthy of a great people and which would inure to the benefit of all as a commercial highway and also tend to reduce the burden of naval construction by enabling us to assemble our fleet of war vessels on either of our coasts in time of danger, escaping the long voyage around the Horn.

Having these things in mind, the American people, with patriotic impulse, rejoice as the great work approaches completion. In due time it devolved upon Congress to enact legislation for the government of the Canal Zone and to provide regulations for the levying and collection of tolls to be paid by owners of vessels who saw fit to use this highway, constructed by and supposed to be an enterprise in the interest of all the people.

Strange credulity, indeed, as viewed in the light of what has transpired. He who spoke with patriotic pride of this public undertaking as "our canal" must now feel that the extent of "our" interest was principally in paying for the construction of the canal. In the enactment of the law for the government of the Canal Zone Congress, by the insertion of a clause in the law, practically declared that the vast expenditure of the people's money in the construction of this canal was not made for the general benefit of all the people, but for the special use and benefit of a part of the people, and that part of the people being those engaged in the coastwise trade, an admitted monopoly. This was done in the face of a solemn compact or treaty with a friendly nation and over the respectful protest of that and other nations. But so strong was the appeal of this special interest or monopoly, made in the name of patriotism, that a sufficient number of the Members in both branches of Congress were beguiled into voting the free use of this highway, which had cost so much money and was supposed to be for the benefit of all the people, to those engaged in the monopoly of the coastwise trade in our country.

Thus we spend the people's money in the Tropics for the special benefit of a monopoly. But you say, what has all this to do with the pending bill for the construction of railroads in Alaska? Nothing at all, except to make plain the apparently absurd and contradictory position in which Congress is placed. In the one case we have constructed a canal for the benefit of monopolists; in the other we are asked to construct a railroad to overthrow another set of monopolists.

We are told that in this far-away frozen region of our domain an organization of capitalists has so manipulated affairs that it is impossible for other men who would undertake to promote and build railroads to obtain the necessary money to do so. In other words, certain monopolists and money kings have the game blocked, and we are advised that the only way to unlock the treasure house of Alaska is for the Government to construct the necessary railroads. Strange predicament, indeed. In the Tropics we spend the people's money to aid a monopoly or trust; in the Arctic we are asked to spend it to "bust" a trust. At this point I am constrained to say, without arrogating any particular virtue to myself and having a due regard for the opinions of others, I am opposed to both of these monopolistic combinations.

I have been a consistent opponent of Government ownership and operation of the great public service corporations of our country, believing that it is the function of the Government to regulate and control such corporations, but that the ownership and operation of the same are a privilege of the citizen. I am aware that the proposed legislation marks a departure from the policy scrupulously observed from the beginning of our Government, and the reasons for abandoning that policy at this time should be clear and conclusive. To my mind no conclusive argument has thus far been presented that, from a financial standpoint alone, the Government would be justified in constructing this railroad.

First, what of the Territory itself? Alaska is an empire in territorial extent—590,000 square miles—equal to the combined area of Great Britain, Ireland, France, and Spain. Approximately one-third of this vast Territory lies north of the Arctic Circle and is bounded on the north by the Arctic Ocean. We are told that the northern portion of Alaska consists of broken, mountainous lands, interspersed with numerous lakes and rivers, with a great expanse of swamp land, and, owing to the high latitude of this section of the country, the winters are excessively severe, while the summer season is rendered unendurable from the vast clouds of insects. We are also informed that the Aleutian Islands and the Alaska Peninsula are mountainous and volcanic; also that the southeastern portion of the country, comprising many islands and a narrow strip of mainland, has a very mild climate, considering the high latitude, due to warm ocean currents, but here the rainfall is excessive. Portions of the Territory are heavily timbered and the waters abound in fish. The soil is generally poor, and the prospects of any agricultural development are meager indeed.

With the exception of small areas along the coast it is the natural home of Jack Frost. The population is sparse, consisting mainly of Eskimos and Indians. It is claimed that the country is rich in minerals. This is true, no doubt. Surely there must be something locked up in this great Territory, otherwise it would not be necessary to unlock the so-called treasure house. And inasmuch as nature hides securely her richest mineral treasures, often in the most inaccessible portions of her dominion, I am ready to believe that in this frigid and uninviting land there may be stored beneath its frozen surface great mineral wealth, and which in large measure will never be obtained unless transportation facilities for carrying food into the country and the ore out are established, either by private or governmental agencies, and in my judgment it is only on the ground of developing the mines of the country and procuring the available timber that there is the least justification at all for railroad construction.

It is perfectly apparent to any student of commerce and industry that Alaska can never be developed into a manufacturing country: First, because the population of the country will never be large, for it is idle to argue that mankind will locate permanently in such a country so long as there is ample room in more-favored climes; second, it is too far removed from the centers of population, and, with its other disadvantages, can never successfully compete.

To think of developing agriculture in Alaska to any appreciable extent or put it upon a paying basis is folly. Especially is this true when we know that in the great State of Texas, with its 167,024,720 acres of land, only one-seventh of which at this time is said to be under cultivation, and from the further fact that all the people of the United States could be located in Texas and not be more crowded than in New England at the present time. And when we realize the further fact that in the year 1912–13 the output of cotton in Texas was 4,880,210 bales, or more than one-third of the total crop of the United States, and we are told that not more than one-tenth of the land suitable for the growing of cotton is now under cultivation in that great Commonwealth, which would indicate a possible production of more than double the amount of the present cotton crop of the world. Placing a value on cotton of from $50 to $60 a bale, and the production under reasonable conditions being one bale to the acre, which, taken into consideration with the mild and healthful climate of Texas, makes it apparent to the most casual thinker that the road to success of the real-estate dealer in farm lands in Alaska will, at least, be a cold and dreary one for perhaps a number of centuries yet to come.

I have simply cited this one illustration of the State of Texas, which without further argument ought to be convincing proof that no matter how many railroads are constructed in Alaska it will have but little effect in inducing agriculturists to migrate into that country. It seems to me that some of the glowing statements relative to agriculture contained in the report of the committee should have been left out.

It is also argued that the Government should construct railroads from the coast to the coal mines in the interior for the purpose of obtaining coal with which to supply our war vessels in the Pacific. There is some force in this argument, but undoubtedly the day is not far distant when our fleets of war vessels will be using largely, if not exclusively, oil instead of coal for fuel.

Notwithstanding the fact there is apparently no good commercial reason that can be given in justification of the governmental construction of railroads based on the theory that it will bring ultimate and lasting prosperity to the Territory, there are, to my mind, some reasons why the Government should assume this burden at this particular time.

It is quite apparent that certain individuals have endeavored to control for their particular pecuniary gain whatever there is of wealth in Alaska, and it is perfectly evident to every student of railroad construction that no man or set of men are going to invest their money in the construction of a railroad into a wilderness unless they can clearly see that by so doing they will afterwards reap their reward from the people who flock into the country to make homes for themselves, open up farms, build cities, and establish industries, the transportation of the products of which would bring returns to the men who constructed the road. Heretofore it has been the policy of our Government to aid in one way and another the promoters and builders of railroads into the wild and unsettled portions of our country. And I presume that if the same policy were pursued relative to Alaska men could be induced to undertake the task. But the policy of our Government has changed, and we are now following the idea that the natural resources of the country belong to the people and should not be given to any person or corporation for any purpose.

Therefore the matter resolves itself into this one proposition. The citizen must construct the railroads in Alaska without aid from the Government and take his chances of revenue in the future. This we are convinced no man will do; consequently, the only possible way, apparently, to get railroads into this far northern clime is for the Government to build them. And in view of the gold and minerals that have been found in Alaska, together with the coal and timber possibilities, it may be wisdom to expend this money in the hope that this vast territory may prove to be of greater value than we are at present willing to concede. At any rate, the transportation of merchandise into the country and the products of the country out, during the time the ore is being excavated from the mines and the timber cut from the mountain sides and valleys, may, in a large measure, recoup the Government for its trouble and expenditure. But I am inclined to think that, after the ore is extracted and the timber cut and marketed, Alaska will continue to be, in a large measure, a barren waste and will relapse into a condition of unbroken solitude, the natural condition of all countries not agricultural in their nature.

Again, there has for a number of years been considerable agitation over the railroads of our country and the best way of regulating and controlling them, and it has been argued by some that Government ownership is the only true solution of the problem. It is true we have made some progress. We now have the Interstate Commerce Commission vested with great power in the matter of the regulation of rates, and this commission will be soon, no doubt, clothed with power to regulate the issue of stocks and bonds by railroad companies, which undoubtedly, if judiciously exercised, would be a very wise grant of authority and one which appeals to my judgment, and when the time comes for us to pass upon that question it seems to me that the Government ought to enact such legislation as will protect interstate railroad companies from sandbagging legislation by State legislatures. In short, national governmental control, and not National and State control; a definite, clearly defined policy guaranteeing justice and protection to the owners of railroad stocks and bonds and the public alike.

Thus can the fallacy of Government ownership of all the railroads of our country be forestalled, for such a policy in a country like ours under existing political conditions would, in my humble judgment, result in national calamity. But inasmuch as the germ of Government ownership seems to have infected quite a large number of our people, I am not so sure but that a practical demonstration at this time will be the part of wisdom, and we will all await with much interest the outcome of this test about to be made in Alaska, and let us hope that the lesson we shall learn will be well worth the price.

In consideration of the foregoing reasons and with no little sympathy for the hardy pioneers who have the courage to dare the storms and chilling blasts of far-away Alaska, and in the hope this bill may result in aid and comfort for them I lay aside for the time my well-grounded conviction on legislation of this character. I shall support the measure. [Applause.]

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, Alaska has been in controversy ever since the proposition for her purchase from Russia was presented to Congress in 1867. The Territory was then referred to as "Seward's Folly" and "Seward's Polar-Bear Garden." Many of the arguments we have listened to on this floor against this legislation are similar in character to the arguments that were uttered against the purchase of Alaska: but there were some far-sighted statesmen in those days, and among them was Charles Sumner, who made a notable speech in the Senate upon the subject of the purchase of Alaska. I may say that Mr. Sumner undoubtedly obtained his data from the then Secretary of State, Mr. Seward, who was being severely criticized because he foresaw the advantages that would result to our Government by the purchase of that great extent of valuable territory for the relatively paltry sum of $7,200,000. Mr. Sumner, in summarizing his argument, said:

> Mr. President, I now conclude this examination. From a review of the origin of the treaty and the general consideration with regard to it we have passed to an examination of these possessions under different heads, in order to arrive at a knowledge of their character and value. And here we have noticed the existing government, which was found to be nothing but a fur company, whose only object is trade; then the population, where a very few Russians and Creoles are a scanty fringe to the aboriginal races; then the climate, a ruling influence, with its thermal current of ocean and its eccentric isothermal line, by which the rigors of the coast are tempered to a mildness unknown in the same latitude on the Atlantic side; then the vegetable products, chief among which are forests of pine and fir, waiting for the ax; then the mineral products, among which are coal and copper, if not iron, silver, lead, and gold, besides the two great products of New England, "granite and ice"; then the furs, including precious skins of the black fox and sea otter, which originally tempted the settlement, and remain to this day the exclusive object of pursuit; and, lastly, the fisheries, which, in waters superabundant with animal life beyond any of the globe, seem to promise a new commerce. All these I have presented plainly and impartially, exhibiting my authorities as I proceeded. I have done little more than hold the scales. If these incline on either side, it is because reason or testimony on that side is the weightier.

It was said that that speech by Mr. Sumner, which occupied some hours in its delivery, turned the scales in favor of the purchase of Alaska. Since its acquisition our citizens have taken out over $400,000,000 worth of gold, furs, fish, and copper. And we have only scratched the surface. We have had no transportation facilities to the interior of Alaska worthy of the name. Thus far all that has been done has been done near the coast. The interior of Alaska is practically a virgin field. The construction of railroads is absolutely necessary for its development. Personally I am opposed to ownership by the Government of the railroads, the telephone and telegraph systems, and, as has been recently suggested, the coal mines of our country. I believe that if we ever embark upon the system of Government ownership of public utilities the Prætorian Guard that used to sell the emperorship in the declining days of Rome would look like "thirty cents" as compared with the great army of Government employees in these United States, which could control the elections for President, Vice President, Members of the Senate and the House, and governors and legislators in the various States. They would undoubtedly be the balance of power in such great States as New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, Indiana, Massachusetts, New Jersey, and Missouri, and could absolutely control State and Federal legislation. But our policy

of conservation as applied to the natural resources of Alaska leaves us no other alternative than to have the Federal Government build the railroads in that vast Territory. Wisely or unwisely, we have bottled up the natural resources of that great area. It is remarkable how our so-called conservation policy has been expanded beyond its true purpose. No man wants to see willful waste of any of the great natural resources of our country; but bottling them up entirely, so that present generations can obtain no benefit from the timber, the coal, minerals, and resources of that character, seems to me to be absolute folly. By a parity of reasoning the men who would have entertained ultraconservationist views of that kind a century ago might have exclaimed with just as good grace, "We must not kill any more sperm whales, because if we do our children's children will have no oil for illuminating purposes."

Mr. Chairman, the ultraconservationist discounts the inventive genius of the American citizen. Such a plea for the conservation of sperm oil for illuminating purposes would not have taken into consideration the discovery of illuminating kerosene, of illuminating gas, of incandescent and of arc lights. And it is even so with coal. In some thousands of years from now, when the coal supply of the world shall have been greatly diminished, we will be compelled to develop our heat and our power from other sources entirely. It has been well said that necessity is the mother of invention, and whenever we begin to run short on our supply of coal or timber there will be some Yankee inventor who will discover some device that will most adequately supply their places. If coal and timber are a blessing to mankind, we should use them as we require them, and not tremble about what will happen in 4,000 years from now. It would have been the part of wisdom to uncork the bottle containing all the natural resources of Alaska, so that private capital and private enterprise, under proper Government supervision, might have developed them. But having failed to do that, in my judgment it becomes the duty of the Government to undertake their development. That is the logical result of our conservation policy in Alaska.

Some of the gentlemen who have spoken on this bill have said that to bring out the gold that will be mined in the interior of Alaska will not require even a single box car. That is probably true; but the gentlemen who expressed those views have no conception of life in a mining region. The moment gold is discovered anywhere there is a rush of population to the new fields. Cities spring up over night and thousands of adventurous people enter the new area. All kinds of supplies must be carried to the camps. See what happened at the time of the Yukon excitement. Thousands of hardy pioneers went into the new mining region. A railroad was rapidly constructed over the White Pass for the purpose of accommodating them and bringing their supplies from the seaboard. Cities and towns sprang up like mushrooms. The White Pass Railroad was on a paying basis from the very beginning. And when the road provided for in this bill shall have been constructed new cities and towns will be laid out along the line, just as new cities and towns were laid out on the Canadian Pacific line in Canada, where the prospect for development seemed just as remote as for the development of the interior of Alaska.

The transcontinental railroads that were constructed in the sixties and even at a later period in our own country went through a barren country—a country that then had no cities, a country that then had no towns. But the coming of the railroads developed the cities and the towns. True, the transcontinental railroads were constructed and operated by private corporations. However, these private corporations received large Government subsidies in the nature of land grants, and large sums of money were advanced for every mile of road constructed. The scandals that arose as a result of that legislation stirred the Nation to its very center. Small wonder that we do not want to embark upon a similar sea of trouble at this time. To-day, taking a retrospective glance at the legislation for the construction of the transcontinental railroads, I feel satisfied we all believe it would have been a much wiser course to have had the Government build the lines itself and then have leased them to such railroad corporations as would have been willing to pay for the privilege of using the tracks and the necessary depots, roundhouses, freight sheds, water tanks, and similar appurtenances.

That, in effect, is what the pending bill proposes shall be done. Under its terms the President is authorized to lease the road, together with the telegraph and telephone lines necessary for its operation, to responsible corporations upon such terms as he may deem acceptable under the provisions of the bill. And if the legislation can be carried out along those lines, the engineers and firemen, the conductors and brakemen, the switchmen and track laborers, the telegraph and telephone operators, and all the other employees that may be required to run the trains will not be Government employees, but employees of the private corporation that secures the lease, even though the physical property of the road which the Government may construct is owned by the Government itself.

Mr. Chairman, I saw a statement in one of our newspapers a year or two ago to the effect that the residents of Alaska were compelled to pay $26 a ton for coal which was brought to them in ships from the world's coal fields, while at their very doors there were great deposits of coal which they dared not touch on account of our Government's attitude in having bottled up the coal supply of that Territory. To my mind such a condition is disgraceful to our country and its legislators. With the construction of this railroad all the resources of that mighty empire in the north will be developed, not alone for the benefit of the people of Alaska, but for the benefit of all mankind.

Mr. KENT. I believe that this proposition of the development of Alaska by the Government construction and operation of a railroad is a piece of ordinary common business sense. The Territory of Alaska represents the greatest real estate speculation that this country has indulged in. The purchase was criticized as being unwise, but it has eminently justified the wisdom of those who made the purchase. In ordinary business, if an individual owns land, the question always comes up as to what he should do with it. Is the land worth developing, or is it not? This is the crux of the Alaskan situation. The testimony, to my mind, is conclusive to the effect that Alaska is worth developing. There is no doubt but that the mineral resources are worthy of the attention of the country; that the fisheries are marvelous; that the timber resources are valuable; and that in that vast Territory there is an amount of agricultural land equal to the land that supports the highest civilization of northern Europe. What are we going to do about it? In the development of our western country, knowing little about economics or the theory of risk, believing in the sufficiency of individual initiative and that everything would take care of itself if let alone, that we should grant subsidy to private enterprise, we gave away an immense amount of the public domain for the purpose of furnishing railroad transportation. The western railroads at first did not seem very profitable. The old question of the unearned increment of the land took time to work out, but the railroad grants, the grants of land along the lines and of lieu lands, when the land could not be obtained along the lines, have furnished the greatest abuse of land tenure in the United States.

We have given away a vast amount of our public domain to private interests for developing transportation systems which we could have better developed as a people. There is always the old question of the community and the individual. The community is everlasting. It does not perish with the generation. The community can assume risks that the individual can not assume. Are we statesmen or are we simply gauging all our questions by the individual human life here and now? Are we looking to the future or do we merely consider the present and what a man is justified in undertaking in his own short life?

I can no better state this question of the community versus the individual than by considering the very simple question of private ownership of timber. In the case of individual ownership the individual finds his interest in reaping his crop as soon as possible, regardless of the welfare of the community. He must make his dividend out of that land in his own short life and must waste or destroy in order to secure that dividend. Exactly the same question comes up in this matter of transportation and development in Alaska. If I, as an individual, who could lend all the money I could secure at 5 per cent without risk and without taxation, which it is possible to do under present conditions, were asked whether or not I would go into the business of putting a railroad into Alaska, I should surely refuse unless I could control the resources of Alaska, unless in the event of the risk being determined in my favor I could obtain 30 or 40 per cent on the investment.

Every step we take in the development of society is taken toward the elimination of this element of risk, is taken toward placing that burden upon society which the individual can not afford to bear. This is the meaning of life insurance and fire insurance, and of every other step we are taking in social advancement. The idea of corporate organization is primarily a device for dispensing with the risk of the individual life, is a plain effort to establish a narrow form of communism wherein the single life and its inevitable extinction shall not be the foundation of an enterprise. To revert to this specific case, we have first of all the question, Is this great region worth develop-

ing? The testimony is overwhelmingly universal that it is. Next, we have the question, Shall it be done by private enterprise or by the public? There is no question about what the answer should be. If we think we can hold out from developing this vast territory we are badly mistaken. In a crowded world we have no right to cold-storage a continent. If we refuse as a people to do what business sense demands; if we say to private individuals, "Go ahead and develop it at your own risk," there will be a charge that the community can ill afford to pay, because what is a risk to the individual, to be highly compensated, is something that is not a serious charge upon the community and will probably produce great national profit.

As to the question of Government ownership of railroads, and as to whether that is a bad precedent, that question is simple, absolute absurdity. In the beginning, the railroad was a highway upon which the people could haul their own cars. We have had publicly owned railroads and privately owned railroads, and there is no more precedent for privately owned railroads than for publicly owned railroads. It is always a question of what is the best and the wisest thing to do in every given case. In Alaska, where we are empire building, is a case where the element of risk laid on the individual is more than he can bear unless an extortionate payment be made in terms of public concession, whereas if all of us take upon ourselves this development of our national resources we can well assume a burden that will cease to be harzardous as soon as undertaken.

I am not a bit afraid of talk of socialism. It may or may not be that I am a Socialist. I think an orthodox Socialist would quickly deny my right to the epithet. President Hadley, of Yale, defined socialism as "the belief of those persons who desire to extend the sphere of government." I believe in extending the sphere of government wherever it may be extended to subserve the general welfare. I would let the individual do as much as he can do, using all his initiative and efficiency, but whenever there comes a time when the individual can not or will not render a necessary service without exacting an extortionate price, then and there is a place where we ought to extend the sphere of government. [Applause.] Government by which we mean restraint is not only found in what is recognized as law. There is just as much restraint and therefore as much government in the exercise of private privilege as there is in the repression of the individual under the law. It becomes a question as to when and where we under the law should interfere with the interference that people by reason of capital, by reason of strength, impose upon us. When and where we as a community in municipality, State, or nation should collectively act for our own welfare instead of granting licenses to perform public functions.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TAGGART] is recognized.

Mr. TAGGART. Mr. Chairman, we are now confronted with the question, What is our duty toward our own property? We have in Alaska 590,000 square miles, practically all of it the property of the United States. According to all the reports, it contains inexhaustible resources of coal and copper and great quantities of gold. According to the reports of the Department of Agriculture, a great share of it can be converted into homes for the people.

Now, what is our duty toward that domain? We can take either one of two courses. We can let it lie idle and remain unopened as an investment for the future or we can take steps to have its great resources developed. Nature fenced it in with mountain ranges and gave it rough and stern climate. The Government of the United States, as if it could add to the restrictions that nature placed upon it, has forbidden the American citizen to lay his hands upon the resources of Alaska.

We have all agreed that those resources can not be developed without transportation. How can that transportation be provided? Who will build railroads there? We can have railroads built there, as the State of Texas has had railroads built and as the United States has had railroads built in other days, by giving to those who build the railroads a great share of the land. But if you and I were to vote for any such measure as that, it would not meet with the approval of the American people and we would be retired from Congress.

Mr. Chairman, every railroad west of the Missouri River was paid for by the people of the United States by giving their land for the building of it, and yet they do not own any one of those railroads. Of two railroads in Texas, I am told, one was given 20 square miles of State land for every mile of railroad built and the other 16 square miles of land for every mile of railroad constructed, and yet the people of Texas do not own those railroads. We have now determined that we are going to build one railroad in Alaska and own that railroad. [Applause.]

Alaska has, as I said, 590,000 square miles of land. It is in the same latitude as the Scandinavian Peninsula. Why, the capital of Norway is near 58° north latitude. Three of the great capitals of Europe are at or near 60° north latitude. In the Kingdom of Norway alone there are only 144,000 square miles, and 392,628 of the ablest and most thrifty people in this world make a living in that country. In Sweden there are but 177,875 square miles, and five and one-half million of industrious and intelligent people make their living there, although their land is far away from the influence of the Gulf Stream and has a climate like the interior of Alaska, and there is no coal in the Scandinavian Peninsula. We have with us in these United States some of those people and their descendants who are able and willing to develop the agricultural resources of Alaska and make their homes there.

But I must hurry along, because I wish to say a word about coal in Alaska. Is it strange that gentlemen of the Pocahontas coal region are the first and most strenuous in their protest against developing the coal fields of Alaska? Along that line I wish to read what a former Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Meyer, said in a hearing before the Senate which was held in February, two years ago, before this matter was agitated. Mr. Meyer stated that we are now taking to the Pacific coast for the use of the Navy 150,000 tons of coal annually from the Atlantic coast, which costs $3 a ton in Norfolk, Va., and paying from $5 to $8 a ton to carry it around Cape Horn. He further stated that just as soon as the Panama Canal opens we shall have to take twice as much coal to the Pacific coast as we do now; and he further stated that if there should be a war and it were necessary for the fleet to operate in the Pacific Ocean 200,000 tons of coal a month would be necessary to be taken there.

But gentlemen say that the Navy Department has examined this Alaskan coal and that it is not of the quality required for steaming purposes. Why, Mr. Chairman, we fail to realize what an emergency war is. We fail to realize that war is an occasion when every advantage is grasped at once, when inferior coal will be used, if it is inferior, if we can not procure the superior. There are cases on record in the Navy Department where they actually used bacon for fuel on board our warships in the Civil War—anything to make a fire. Yet these gentlemen practically admit that we would be perfectly helpless with our 150,000 tons of coal and the necessity of bringing 200,000 tons a month more to the Pacific Ocean in case of war. We would be perfectly helpless in the face of the enemy, even if we utilized every ship that could move coal from the Atlantic seaboard to the Pacific Ocean, if we had to use none but the eastern coal. But let us read what the Secretary of the Navy said with reference to Alaskan coal.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAGGART. Yes.

Mr. SHERWOOD. We will be perfectly helpless as against what power?

Mr. TAGGART. Any power that would attack the United States. We could not operate our battleships; we could not haul coal enough to the Pacific.

Mr. SHERWOOD. What power did the gentleman mean?

Mr. TAGGART. Any power that might attack us. I am not mentioning any particular power now.

Mr. SHERWOOD. How near are the Pacific powers to us? About 8,000 miles?

Mr. TAGGART. I will say to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio that I understand——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. TAGGART. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to continue for three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TAGGART] asks unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAGGART. Now I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Does the gentleman refer to Japan?

Mr. TAGGART. I do not wish to make any reference now to any country, but we would be helpless against any power in the Pacific Ocean that might attack us, if we were limited to eastern coal for any great length of time.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Where would they, on their part, get their coal?

Mr. TAGGART. They have it, and we are buying 80,000 tons of coal a year in Asia now to supply our ships in the Pacific, and leaving our coal fields in Alaska untouched. The Guggenheims are getting out millions of dollars' worth of copper from

Alaska now, and some gentlemen here will vote in favor of letting the Guggenheims go ahead and stopping everybody else.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to read what the Secretary of the Navy said with respect to Alaskan coal. He said:

We have tested the Pacific coal—all the coal we could get—and we could not find anything that was unsatisfactory to the Navy. We had samples of this Matanuska coal, as it is called, and, so far as we could see, it was absolutely satisfactory. I understand the Matanuska coal field lies north of Prince William Sound, and from 150 to 200 miles from Seward on Resurrection Bay. It is known to contain extensive bodies of coal of the same or slightly superior quality to that of the Bering River field.

There is at present a railroad extending from Seward toward Matanuska for about 70 miles, which railroad was abandoned for lack of funds as well for various other reasons. It is believed that the extension of this road to the Matanuska mines would make possible the bringing of this coal to tidewater on Resurrection Bay, which has a magnificent and extensive harbor landlocked and free from ice.

I took this matter up with Secretary Fisher, and urged upon him the advisability of having a certain area reserved for the use of the Navy. He was fully in sympathy with the proposition, and made the recommendation in his report to the President, which was forwarded to Congress. I also know that the coal is of that special kind of coal which equals in quality and is of the same character as the Pocahontas coal, and is acceptable to the Government for naval purposes.

It was the Secretary of the Navy who made this statement before the Naval Committee of the House. Yet we come now with one experiment and denounce the judgment of that Secretary of the Navy because they went up and got some coal out of one mine and it did not give satisfactory results.

Mr. Chairman, any kind of statement may be made about the climate of Alaska and the statement can be true. The Territory is so vast and extends over so many degrees of latitude and is so affected by ocean currents and mountain ranges that it has every conceivable variety of climate. At the town of Fairbanks, near the parallel of 64°, an experiment station is conducted by the Department of Agriculture, and I will insert as a part of my remarks what is said in the report to the department for 1912, pages 50 and 51, about the grain crop, without mentioning the vegetables or the hay, which, of course, will grow where grain can be raised successfully:

Red Fife wheat seeded May 1 began heading July 3. It had sufficiently ripened to cut on September 10. It made a thick, even growth 4 feet tall and yielded about 55 bushels per acre.

Romanow wheat seeded May 1 began heading July 4. It ripened with Red Fife. The grain stood 4½ feet tall, very even and thick throughout the plat. This variety gave a yield of 60 bushels per acre.

Wild Goose wheat seeded May 2 began heading July 4. It ripened a few days later than the above varieties, stood 5 feet tall, very even and thick throughout the plat, and indicated a yield equally as heavy as Romanow.

The fall proved so cool and damp that these three varieties were cut and hung up in a shed to dry out and harden. The grain is well filled with plump kernels.

Sixty Day oats seeded May 2 began heading June 28. They made a thick, even growth about 3 feet tall, were ripe enough to cut August 10, and yielded about 85 bushels per acre.

Finnish oats seeded May 10 began heading July 4, and were ripe for cutting August 15. The crop was very heavy, standing 4 to 5½ feet tall. This variety yielded at the rate of about 90 bushels per acre.

Banner oats seeded May 2 began heading July 4, made a very thick growth 3¾ feet tall, and were ready to cut August 15. This variety gave a yield of 100 bushels per acre.

Beardless barley (No. 19852) seeded May 3 began heading June 26. It made a heavy growth 4 feet tall, was ready to cut August 10, and when thrashed yielded 50 bushels to the acre.

Hull-less barley (No. 19851) seeded May 3 began heading June 25, made a thick, even growth 3½ feet tall, was ready to cut August 10, and yielded 42 bushels of 60 pounds each per acre.

The above grains were seeded with a No. 4 Planet Jr. drill on a south hillside which had been cropped to potatoes the two years previous. The tract is birch timberland cleared three years ago. No fertilizers were used on this tract, neither on the potatoes nor on the grain, but it probably represents the best soil and exposure.

Buckwheat seeded May 10 was injured by frost June 8. The first blossoms appeared July 5. It made a heavy growth 4½ to 5 feet tall. The weather was so cool and cloudy all fall that only about 25 per cent of the grains ripened. Some of this was stripped off by hand for seed, and the crop plowed under as a fertilizer. This was the heaviest growth of buckwheat the writer has ever seen, and other easterners who saw it were of the same opinion.

Fall rye and Kharkof winter wheat were seeded on a north slope of light soil the first week in August, 1911. It made a fair fall growth. About 75 per cent of the rye survived the winter, but not more than 5 per cent of the wheat lived. Both grains matured, but much later than usual. Fall grains generally ripen about August 10. The same varieties were seeded August 1 of this year on newly cleared birch land sloping to the south and west.

The Trans-Siberian Railroad in Siberia follows a line ranging from 50° to 60° north latitude, and although the climate in the interior is perhaps colder than the climate of interior Alaska, agriculture flourishes along this railroad in Siberia, so much so that Siberian agricultural products are now found in all the great markets of the world. A study of the latitude and longitude of Alaska and its position with reference to other places is very astonishing. At latitude 60° north and 140° west, or near that point, are excellent harbors on the coast. At longitude 93° or 94° west and 60° north is approximately the location of Port Nelson, on Hudson Bay. Degrees of longitude at latitude 60° north are half the distance apart that they are at the Equator, so that it is less than 1,800 miles from the Pacific to the Atlantic tidewater at that latitude. Port Nelson is exactly the same distance from Liverpool as New York is from Liverpool, and is nearer the Pacific Ocean than Kansas City. In the course of time Alaskan railroads will connect with the tidewater of Hudson Bay. Alaska will then be only 10 days from London. It is actually nearer Europe than the center of the United States.

The Panama Canal will revolutionize transportation between the Pacific and the Atlantic coasts. The canal is less than 2,000 miles from New York; it is 3,277 miles from San Francisco and 5,079 miles from Sitka. Ships going around Cape Horn from New York to San Francisco travel nearly 13,000 miles. The same ships can now reach Alaska by traveling slightly more than half that distance. The freight rates from the Atlantic seaboard to Alaska will be much less than the present freight rates from the Atlantic coast to the interior of the United States.

Who will say that the Government of the United States should not take steps to develop a region that comprises more than one-seventh of its whole territory? It does not mean that we are committed to the policy of Government ownership of railroads any more than the construction of the Panama Canal means that we are committed to the policy of Government ownership of canals. Alaska is an exception. In its present status no person or corporation without enormous wealth could do anything toward developing its resources. The man of small means is absolutely prevented from making a success at any kind of enterprise in Alaska. He would have no means of transportation. Railroads have been built there, not for the profits that might be derived from carrying freight or passengers, but simply as a means of reaching the mineral wealth of the interior. Then the people were prohibited from taking and developing mineral claims, and some of the railroads necessarily failed. Notwithstanding all this, Alaska has an output of the value of $40,000,000 annually, nearly all from the coast, and has up to date produced more than $500,000,000 in wealth. When means of transportation are provided for the use of the people, who can estimate what will then be the value of the output of Alaska? Will not the additional revenue derived from the income tax easily pay the interest on the bonds for $35,000,000 that it is proposed to issue, and will not the sale of lands pay the principal? I believe that the development of Alaska by building these railroads will not ultimately cost the people of the United States a single dollar. If Alaska is allowed to remain in its present condition, it will never be of any value to anyone. It belongs to the American people, and let us open it and help to develop its resources for the benefit of the American people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FERGUSSON. Mr. Chairman, in the short time that is allotted to me I shall simply give some reasons why, from my standpoint, it is my duty to vote for this bill.

I was trained in the school of the strictest construction of the power that governs; but I believe that we have reached an era in the development of our country, with its enormous population, with its great evolution of business and the methods of business, with its great combinations of capital and their lawless disposition if uncontrolled, where we must face this proposition: Are we, under the Constitution under which we have grown so great, able to meet the problems of the present day? This bill proposes a radical innovation; but we can not hesitate at change only because it is change. Evolution of business was and is inevitable; and if we can not adjust the methods of government to the changing conditions as they occur and still be loyal to our system of government then our system of government is a failure. We are confronted with the proposition of a great, unexplored section of country; and this bill proposes the inauguration of a system of governmental control over the development of a country of enormous extent and of claimed natural resources of great value. As to the extent of the resources, that can only be shown by actual development. Three possible courses are open to us in handling the problems presented by Alaska:

Shall we leave Alaska locked up?

Shall we turn Alaska over to the Morgan-Guggenheim syndicate or some such vast combination of wealth, or shall we—the Government having withdrawn from private exploration practically the whole of that country—provide the means, under governmental auspices, for developing its resources and transporting them to market?

No one will advocate seriously that we shall leave Alaska untouched and absolutely closed to private enterprise. With 90,000,000 of people, with the vast industrial centers overcrowded, with the great tide of emigration westward still clamoring for homes and for opportunity, it is our duty to see to it that Alaska is opened up.

It is also certain that no one will advocate the turning over of Alaska to be exploited by great combinations of tyrannical, overpowering, and selfish combinations of wealth. The history of the operations of such in our own country for the last 40 years absolutely forbids any such course. Nor can we allow such combinations of wealth to own the means of transportation to and from that vast country. The evidence so far, as abundantly brought forth in this debate, of the operations of the Morgan-Guggenheim syndicate, and especially of the absolute, almost criminal outrages perpetrated upon the people of that country, shows what the future would hold in store for anything like private enterprise while the transportation system was privately controlled.

But some fear that to pass this bill is but the entering wedge to governmental ownership of all the railroads of the country. That does not follow by any means. What is proposed is partly from the necessity of the case, and it may be looked at as partly an experiment in Government ownership and operation of railroads; but under the most adverse circumstances the ownership and operation of a railroad in a remote country like that, remote from all other avenues of transportation, in a cold, hard climate, with a meager population, certainly is putting the proposition to a most severe test, and, moreover, it will be an experiment under conditions that do not at all exist in the rest of our great country. The building of this railroad is but the beginning of a general system of dealing with Alaska and its enormous resources. The great body of the coal is still in the ownership of the Government; the oil, most of the mineral lands, and, in fact, practically all of the peninsula is still owned by the Government and at present withdrawn from any private exploitation. The situation awaits this first step in the necessity to-day of reclaiming Alaska for the uses of civilization. It will have to be followed, of course, by provisions—under some system of leasing, in all probability—providing and carefully guarding the equality of opportunity for every enterprising citizen who goes there to reap the full rewards of his time, money, and enterprise by insuring at the least possible cost consistent with good service uniform and equitable freight rates for what must go into the country from the outside as well as for the transportation of the products of the country from within to the markets of the world.

Is this bill forbidden by considerations of the Constitution and the limitation of government under it? We can not take that stand, no matter if Jefferson did say, "The country that is governed least is governed best." We can not say that our reverence for the Constitution forbids us to live in the present day of wonderful evolution of business and business methods. It is a species of disloyalty to the Constitution of our great country to say that under it we can not meet the present conditions resulting from the wonderful creation of wealth that has already taken place under it. There must be evolution in Government methods under our Constitution that will be equal to the business methods of modern times. Our forefathers themselves contemplated the perpetuity of their work by providing a method of amending the Constitution so as to make it fit, consistent with the individual freedom of initiative intended to be promoted by it, to govern whatever civilization might result under the free institution of a great people.

We are to-day legislating for practically 100,000,000 people, and I for one will not consent that we are in a strait-jacket, unable under our free institutions to cope with any question that may arise to preserve the initiative, opportunity, and freedom in every citizen to pursue his life, preserve his liberty, and enjoy happiness as his own will indicates. We have the power under the Constitution to control these great combinations of wealth. We are encouraged by the success of our present Democratic administration so far. It is engaged, in advocating this bill, as well as in advocating the bills already passed and those contemplated for the immediate future, in demonstrating again to the world that this is a Government truly devoted to promoting the happiness of the great mass of common people and protecting them from the rapacity of others under this form of government, whether from the individual tyrant or from the corporate tyrant. For that purpose we Democrats have at the head a President who suggests Jefferson himself in his wonderful grasp of the fundamental principles of a free government, who suggests Old Hickory in his firmness and indomitable will, and who is a worthy successor of Lincoln in his broad humanity and sympathy with the individual, however humble. For these reasons I think it is the duty of this Democratic House to pass this bill.

[Mr. LINDBERGH addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, at first I was disposed to favor this proposition. Like many able and conscientious Members of the House, it looked to me as though this was the only remedy to solve the perplexing and vexatious problem in Alaska that has affected the Nation for the past eight years. I am not prepared to discuss this question now as I would like to be. I have listened attentively to all the debates, pro and con, on the proposition; have read all the hearings before the Committee on the Territories; and have arrived at the conclusion that I can not conscientiously support the measure, although I would appreciate it if I could bring my mind to the conclusion that it would be my duty to support it. In a sense, I regret that I am unable to meet the views of my great leaders who stand sponsor for the bill, but when questions of fundamental policy confront me, I must solve them by the best light that is given me to solve them.

My party platform has been injected into this debate, and the inference left that we were directed by it to support this measure, but I am unable to read it into the platform, because no such language can be found there. If it had been in the platform, I would have done one of two things—either informed my people who voted for me last fall in my district before they cast their ballots that I would not support the measure or I would stand on the platform and support it.

To my mind the question involved here is fundamental, a step in the direction of driving at the very foundation of this Republic, as I view it. It involves the question of Government ownership of railroads. You can not twist and distort the English language to mean other than straight Government ownership of railroads in Alaska. Instance after instance has been cited in support of this bill that the Government in the past has in some way aided in building railroads. The report of the committee favoring this bill says we have given approximately 155,000,000 acres of land for the building of railroads in the West and Southwest. I am not here to criticize the able men in Congress who voted to give these empires of land to aid in the construction of railroads. No doubt they acted conscientiously and for what they thought to be for the very best interest of the country. That it is now universally condemned by all I think is conceded, yet the giving of land to aid in the construction of railroads and the proposition for the Government to build, own, and operate them is quite a different proposition. While it is true that empires of real estate were given away to aid in the construction of railroads, yet no proposition was advanced at the time, much less enacted into law, giving to the Government the right to own, run, and operate the railroads after completion.

This bill, shortly to come before the House, not only proposes Government ownership of railroads, but gives to the President of the United States the power to operate it. The Philippine railroad has been cited as an illustration and as a reason why this bill should become a law, because our Government gave its moral support to the Philippine Legislature to issue $30,000,000 worth of bonds for the building of railroads in these islands. The Panama Railway has been cited as another illustration why this bill should become a law. Three reasons assigned in support of the pending measure. Whether any one of these are sound in logic and in economics I will not stop to argue. This measure is but another milestone in the direction of the ultimate ownership of railroads in this country. In my judgment, in less than 10 years Members serving in this House will be met with the argument that as the Government built the railroads in Alaska why not the Government own and operate the railroads in this country? He who stands for the proposition of the Government spending $40,000,000 to-day to build not more than 1,000 miles of railroad in Alaska let him not stagger or pause when presented with the question of issuing from fifteen to twenty billion dollars' worth of bonds in order to buy, own, and operate the railroads of the Nation. Tremendous and mighty forces are at work in the country to-day, ever moving forward with cunning and ingenious argument toward favoring Government ownership of railroads. It remains to be seen whether there will be enough conservatism left in America to meet the mad onrush of Government ownership of railroads. Believing that this is a step in the direction of ultimate ownership of railroads in this country, I refuse to commit myself to such a policy. [Applause.] I do it because I am unalterably opposed to it. Under no conditions whatever could I bring my mind to the point of supporting Government ownership of railroads in this Nation. Rather than do it I would gladly sacrifice my seat in this House and return to my constituency and to private life. It would fasten a debt upon us as long as our Nation endures. The time would never come when our offspring would be free of this mighty and gigantic debt, a debt on which tribute would be paid to the end of eternity by the toiling masses of the Nation.

The Senate bill carries $40,000,000 for the building of railroads in Alaska and proposes to issue bonds to this amount

bearing 3 per cent interest, thereby entailing an interest debt upon us of $1,200,000 per year, and to this must be added the annual cost and upkeep of the road, which will amount to not less than 10 per cent per year of the original cost of construction, making a sum of $4,000,000 for this purpose—a total of not less than $5,200,000 annually as the interest charge upon the American people as a result of the building of these roads. I can not justify my conscience and my convictions upon the subject by voting a mortgage upon every infant born to-day as long as it lives, if that be "three score and ten," or, if "by reason of strength it reach four score," yet the child born to-day will not live long enough to see this debt of $40,000,000 paid, and everyone knows that this is but the beginning—a mere speck—a drop in the bucket as it were; once the system of building railroads is started upon, the Lord only knows where it will end. I refrain from prophecy.

The proof before the Territories Committee shows that to develop Alaska as it should be developed by the construction of railroads it will require the building of 10,000 miles of railroad, and the estimated cost of the construction of railroad in that country is not less than $48,000 per mile, and if it be developed as the people of Alaska and Seattle desire it developed it will entail the expenditure of $480,000,000 before it is finally completed. This stupendous sum is appalling and staggering to the human mind; is inconceivable by the mathematician much less to the layman who by the sweat of his brow must earn the money ultimately to pay this enormous bill. Ah, but we are told that Canada is building railroads. Suppose it is; is that a valid reason and justification for us to embark upon the same enterprise? Must we tax our people in order to keep abreast of what some other nation is doing? And the friends of the measure go further, and point to the fact that every Government in Europe owns its own railroads except England; using this as an argument and a justification for us to build, maintain, and operate railroads in Alaska. There is no comparison between the great Republic of the United States and every nation in Europe; those are monarchial governments, where the voice of the people is but lightly heard in legislative bodies. Ours is a republican form of government, where the voice of the people is supposed to be supreme in legislative bodies.

Time and time again during my short career in Congress I have heard the argument used on this and on that proposition, "They are doing it this way in Europe; why not do it the same way in our country?" So far as I am concerned, I care not if every Government in the world owned and operated its own railroads; I am opposed to our Government owning and operating railroads in this country. I am opposed to it because it is contrary to our policies, our institutions, and our form of government. I am opposed to it because it is socialism of the rankest, wildest, maddest sort. I am opposed to it for economical reasons. I am opposed to it because when that time comes we will have the strongest centralized power upon the globe; all power reserved to the States under the Constitution will be brushed aside and set at naught. I agree that Alaska should be developed—that the door should be unlocked; and I agree further that the key with which to unlock it is railroads, but I can not agree that the people of this country should be bonded to the sum of $40,000,000 for the purpose of buying the key to unlock the storehouses of Alaska. The thing to do is to pass some wise and sane legislation and let private capital go in and develop it. You can build a railroad on every square mile in Alaska at the people's expense and if you do not have the commodities to ship over it it will never pay operating expenses, much less interest upon bonds and the cost and upkeep of the road.

With all due deference to the able gentleman who portrayed such beautiful and glowing pictures about Alaska being a great agricultural country, I can not believe it; I can not agree with him on this subject. God Almighty in his inscrutable wisdom never intended Alaska to be a great agricultural country; for His own reasons He set the bounds of agriculture by proper latitudes, and man, with all his cunning, science, and genius, down to this day has never overcome it and I prophesy never will. That it could be made to grow a few of the hardy vegetables I have no doubt; but how are you going to induce men and women to settle any country where the earth is frozen countless thousands of feet deep and where the indisputable evidence shows it costs from $125 to $200 per acre to clear it, and then compelled to let it remain exposed to the sun two or three years before it will grow anything?

People seek homes for purposes of remuneration, for the purpose of living upon them, for the purpose of raising families and educating them. With countless hundreds and millions of acres of unoccupied land in this country, will they migrate and go to that frozen country for the purpose of making their homes and settling it? History is against it. Judging the future by the past, for a thousand years to come it will not be an agricultural country. So the only thing left to ship over the roads when completed are minerals in Alaska. I concede these are abundant; probably nothing like it to-day in the bosom of the earth in the way of coal, copper, gold, and so forth; yet when you have taxed the people, imposed this tremendous burden upon them, and built your railroads you have still got to wrestle with the problem of opening up these mines. Will the proponents of this bill advocate the Government going in and operating the coal, copper, and gold mines in Alaska? Surely not. So we will be confronted with the proposition of disposing of the lands containing these valuable ores; and after the roads are built we are no nearer a solution of the question than we are to-day. The wise, sane, and sensible thing to do is to pass a leasing law and lease out the mineral resources of that Territory. Let the private capital go in, lease, and work them. By this means the Government at all times would have its hands upon the resources and would prevent monopoly, combinations, and trusts, and in this way would hold down prices to the consumers of these commodities. The railroads built by private capital would be under the control of the Interstate Commerce Commission, which would have the same power to fix rates there as it has to fix the rates over railroads in continental United States.

In my judgment, the thing to do is for Congress to pass these leasing laws, let private capital go in and build the railroads, and then let them be amenable to the Interstate Commerce Commission the same as other railroads are in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I may be wrong, I may not be following out the will and wishes of my people, may be doing my country an injustice and a wrong, but, viewing it as I do, I can not act otherwise than to oppose this measure. I think it is unwise, ill founded; a step in the wrong direction; another and powerful argument to be used in less than another decade, when we meet, as we will meet, the supreme question of Government ownership of railroads in this country; and viewing it as I do, I can not give it my support, and intend to vote against it. [Applause.]

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this bill, because I believe it is our duty to develop Alaska. [Applause.] I believe that in the end the happiness and the prosperity and the strength of the people of the United States and the Nation will be promoted by this Government enterprise. [Applause.]

The argument brought against this bill by nearly every speaker is based upon the assertion that this means that Government ownership of railroads throughout the United States would be socialistic and destructive to free institutions. That is at least the implication we can fairly draw from what has been said in opposition.

Now, in the first place, the answer to that is that the conditions in the case of Alaska are entirely different from conditions here; that unless Government enterprise takes hold of the matter then the great empire of Alaska will remain undeveloped for an indefinite time in the future and there will be no opportunity whatever for individual enterprise to exert itself there.

What was the purpose of this Government acquiring Alaska? What was the purpose of the Government acquiring any territory? Those who have argued that Alaska was a great coal bin, woodpile, gold or copper mine, and that it belonged to the people of the United States to enrich them are far afield from the true reason for developing Alaska. When the United States acquires dominion over any extensive tracts of territory, the duty devolves upon it not so much to exploit the natural resources for the benefit of the people of the States as to build there a civilization, to induce immigration and settlement of the people to that territory, in order that homes may spring up [applause] and that that territory may contribute to the general strength and happiness of the whole Union. Let us take this argument of Government ownership of railroads that is advanced here. What does it amount to? Has anybody yet proven that the ownership and operation of railroads by Government is in all cases wrong or a destruction of free institutions? I submit not. The gentleman who is at the head of the State Department to-day, some years ago after traveling in Europe and seeing State-operated railroads, made the remark that if Government regulation of railroads in the United States proved a failure, the only alternative was Government ownership and operation. Manifestly that is true.

I do not believe in Government ownership and operation of railroads, but that the Government should regulate them in order that they may serve all the people equitably, fairly, and efficiently—if that can not be done, if it be impossible to do

that, if our regulation prove a failure, then I submit that we must adopt the other alternative. The suggestion that Government ownership and operation of railroads is more adapted to monarchical or autocratic governments rather than to governments based on the rule of the people is without real foundation. Australia, for instance, is ruled by the people just as much as we are, and they have Government-operated railroads, so that it is not correct to say that Government railroads are characteristic of monarchical or autocratic governments. The monarchical governments referred to by the last speaker in the last analysis will be found to be of the constitutional or limited variety, so that the voice of the people expressed at the ballot box to a very great extent rules. It is practically conceded everywhere to-day that the people ought to and do control; that democracy is everywhere triumphant in the greatest governments of the civilized world.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, the Republic of Switzerland——

Mr. STEENERSON. Oh, I do not care anything about Switzerland. It is a little bit of a spot and is always brought up as an example, and there is no comparison between Switzerland and this country. [Laughter.] My position is that this is an exception to the general rule against government entering the field of private enterprise. Here the Government owns substantially all the land with all its natural resources. We are not willing to repeat the mistakes of the old land-grant policy, and unless we do, private enterprise will not build railroads there. In constructing and operating this railroad we are not pursuing a socialistic, but an individualistic tendency.

I favor this bill because by extending this enterprise into the interior of this great domain we will make it possible for people there to build homes for themselves and to earn a living by their own exertions.

It seems to me that during this debate and discussion the real reason for this measure has not been emphasized. On page 13 of the report I find one reference to that:

> Unrestricted monopoly might develop immense values there for private interests, but the development to be fostered is such as would utilize these great values for the American people and furnish homes for the rearing of noble and hardy men and women.

That is the real reason for supporting this bill.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. DAVENPORT). The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I thought I was entitled to 15 minutes, and I think I have used only 5.

The CHAIRMAN. The only thing the present occupant of the chair knows is that the former occupant of the chair called his attention to the fact that at this time the time of the gentleman would expire.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I think I am entitled to a little more time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman from Minnesota having more time?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEENERSON. The question comes up in every debate, How far may the Government extend its sphere of activify or its functions without being charged with having a tendency toward socialism? As I have explained in this case, this proposed Government activity, instead of tending toward socialism, tends directly the other way. It is a strange thing, but it is true, that, although you may hear everywhere men advocating socialism and others advocating the let-alone policy, the theory of laissez faire, that we should be governed as little as possible, yet in all the tides of time, we have never yet had a Government that followed in practice either doctrine.

To say that the Government might not interfere with the ownership and operations of railroads, where it was necessary, where not to do so would involve the destruction of individual rights and homes, I deem to be untenable. It is only analogous to the argument that you must not interfere with nature anywhere. Does anyone contend that it is wrong to put an iron shoe upon the hoof of a horse? That is interfering with nature, and yet to do so enables the horse to travel faster and better. And if we can so interfere in the affairs of the people, by furnishing public utilities, if you please, that thereby it becomes possible for individuals to establish homes and flourish and maintain themselves as independent, free citizens of the community, then it is the duty and it is wise for the State to undertake that activity. There is no State, and there never was, built upon the theory that you could not interfere with the industries and activities of the people, nor has anyone ever been successful in establishing a society or a state upon the other theory, that there should be common property in all means of production, and that the Government should be the only employer and the payer of wages. We fear that. We rightly fear socialism. But why?

Not because we believe that the coming of the ideal State, pictured in the writings of the Socialists, would be undesirable, but it is impossible, and while pursuing this Utopian dream we would so overload and magnify the work of the Government that we now have as to destroy the independence and liberty of the individual citizens. The tendency to increase the functions of government is world-wide, and is not due to any conscious design or plan but to changes incident to the development of our industrial life. The world has grown smaller, and the people in it are gradually becoming more and more dependent upon each other for their very existence. Stop the exchange of commodities even for a brief moment and it would cause suffering and hardship unspeakable.

While these revolutionary changes have taken place in the economic and industrial field, civilized man has not improved very much, either socially or morally, and hence the necessity for greater and greater compulsion, which is government, to force him not to overreach, cheat, or injure his neighbor. This necessity explains the need for Government regulation of public utilities and interference with monopoly in trade and business. Where regulation fails there Government ownership has been resorted to. Monopoly in private hands, left unregulated, has proved intolerable, because human greed is too strong to be restrained either by the sense of justice or regard for others, and hence we say it must be regulated by the Government, and, failing that, Government or municipal trading is the last alternative. This course, however, can not in any true sense be said to be "socialistic," because the ultimate object aimed at is not socialism but individualism. If private monopoly were allowed unrestrained sway, the individual would to that extent be economically enslaved. Generally speaking, therefore, Government trading is entered upon and justified only where on account of the tendency toward monopoly private enterprise undertaking the work can not be successfully regulated in the interest of the individual. It may also be entered upon where private enterprise is inadequate like, for instance, the Panama Canal. The proposed Government railroad in Alaska can also be justified on similar grounds, and its construction by making accessible the vast treasures of soil, mine, and forest of that imperial domain will furnish opportunities for the individual home builder which would be denied him under development dominated by private monopoly.

The Socialist denounces competition and advocates monopoly, because it will, in his view, hasten the revolution that is to overturn capitalism and substitute therefor his ideal system. The social reformer encourages competition and the regulation and restraint of monopoly in the interest of the individual and his economic freedom and development under the existing order. He believes that civilization in the future, as in the past, will be a gradual progress to greater freedom and better things economically, socially, and morally. The extreme conservative who so fears Government expansion that he will not curb monopoly by strict regulation or, failing that, by Government ownership of a public utility is really aiding the revolutionist who seeks to overturn our social system and our form of government, for unrestrained monopoly in private hands will eventually become intolerable and result in revolution. While ordinarily, therefore, it is wise to confine the Government to its primary functions, it is not only permissible but obligatory to expand them whenever necessary to curb monopoly in order that the individual may have enlarged opportunity to become economically independent and the founder of a home, for, after all, the family is the unit upon which our whole political and social structure rests. Such expansion tends to progress and not to revolution and is the logical political development of the age in which we live. [Applause.]

Mr. LAFFERTY. Mr. Chairman, the largest question that has arisen during the discussion of this very important bill is that of Government ownership and operation of railroads. There is no question but that this bill is going to pass the House of Representatives. [Applause.] There is no doubt but that it will pass by a large majority. I think there is no question but that it would pass by a larger majority except for this element of opposition that has arisen through the belief that the building of a Government railroad in Alaska might lead ultimately to Government ownership of railroads in the United States.

Personally, I believe in the highest degree of personal liberty so long as the action of the individual is in consonance with justice and decency. I would gladly go out to-morrow and fight against the establishment of any monarchy where the American flag now floats. I do not believe that the people of the United States will ever consent to have any single foot of territory over which the Republic has once exercised its jurisdiction afterwards pass into the hands or under the control of a monarchy.

But I have no fear from the viewpoint of those who are opposed to this bill because it might lead to Government ownership. There is no question but that if this railroad to be constructed in Alaska proves to be a great success—and I have no doubt but that it will—if it establishes and demonstrates that freights and passengers can be carried cheaper by a Government railroad than they can be carried or are being carried by privately owned carriers, there will be a general demand for Government owned and operated railroads, and under those circumstances there ought to be such a demand.

There is no other great power in the world, as has been said, except the British Isles, but that owns and operates to-day a substantial part of its railroads. New Zealand, Australia, Germany, France, Belgium, Holland, Austria, Italy, Denmark, and all the great powers of Europe, and the colonies of Great Britain, are operating their own railroads, and at great benefit to those nations. We have the richest country in the world. We have the largest in point of population outside of China and India. We have the greatest natural opportunities, but we have as many poor people as any enlightened country in the world. We have as many people under the Stars and Stripes who have a hard time getting three meals a day as any country in the world that is civilized. We have one hundred and twenty billions of wealth, it is true, but 50 men through interlocking directorates, control 40 per cent, or nearly half of it. Two hundred thousand men own outright 70 per cent of the wealth of this Republic. I am in favor of the individual. I am a Republican and have been from the time I was born. My father and three of his brothers served in the Union Army. But I come down here to Washington and I vote with the Democrats or with the Progressives, or with the "what-nots," whenever they propose a bill that I believe is right.

I believe that the building of this railroad in Alaska will be a great benefit to those people outside of this collateral question. Many settlers have gone to that Territory.

The Executive of this Republic, backed up by a conservation sentiment, has withdrawn from entry the mineral lands of that great Territory, as large as one-fifth of the United States. It is impossible, practically, for a citizen to acquire a homestead in Alaska, because it is necessary for him to prove, in order to get the title to a homestead, that the lands embraced in his claim are nonmineral, which has always been a provision of the homestead law; and, besides, he is harassed by the special agents who are sent to Alaska.

It is no wonder that only 126 citizens have perfected titles to homesteads in Alaska under those conditions.

Now, a stranger dropping into this Chamber during certain stages of this discussion might have thought the sole issue involved in this bill was whether or not the coal in Alaska was fit for the Navy, and whether or not that fact alone would justify the building of this railroad by the United States. That Alaska has enormous amounts of coal fit for all domestic uses, cooking and heating, there is no dispute. But the issue has been raised that it is not fit for the Navy; that it is not as efficient as Pocahontas coal; that is, a ton of it, some say, will produce only 43 per cent as much heat as the Pocahontas coal, while others say it will produce 75 per cent as much heat.

Now, it does not matter, if you start a battleship across the Pacific Ocean, whether you have Alaska coal of the kind tested by the Navy or whether you have Pocahontas coal; that ship will go just as fast if you keep the furnace full of coal. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SELDOMRIDGE] is recognized.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. Mr. Chairman, the time allotted to me in the discussion of this important measure is entirely too short to permit of a comprehensive presentation of the subject in all of its various aspects.

I believe that this question should be considered entirely with reference to the future needs of the great Territory of Alaska, which embraces within its area a territory as large as one-fifth of the United States, or about 590,000 square miles.

The report of the Director of the Census for 1910 makes the following statement concerning the production of gold in the Territory of Alaska:

> The total value of the products of all mining industries in Alaska in 1909 was $16,033,427. Of this amount gold and silver mining contributed $16,327,752, or 96.4 per cent. This product came principally from the placer gold mines, the gold produced at these mines having a value of $12,762,032, which represented 55.5 per cent of all placer gold produced in the United States in 1909. The value of the gold and silver produced in deep mines was $3,565,720. The industry next in importance was the production of copper, the total value of which was reported as $464,225.

By reference to Senate Document 882, of the wealth produced in Alaska from 1867 to 1911, we find that the total production of the Territory has amounted to over $429,000,000, divided as follows:

Minerals:	
Gold	$195,916,520
Silver	1,500,441
Copper	8,237,594
Gypsum	547,345
Marble	185,443
Tin	88,062
Coal	338,189
Sea and fur products:	
Fur-seal skins	51,835,143
Aquatic furs, except seals	12,496,063
Furs of land animals	8,350,290
Walrus products	368,053
Whalebone	1,707,410
Fishery products	147,953,077
Total	429,523,630

From an original investment of $7,500,000 made by Secretary Seward in 1867, which has resulted in a return to the Nation since that date of over $500,000,000, who is there to contend that the Nation should not enter into a more definite undertaking to develop the hidden wealth of the country?

The product of the Alaskan fisheries is practically assured for generations to come with proper Government oversight and regulation. We may also secure a continuance of fur products both from land and aquatic animals if we have proper laws to prevent waste and depredation, but we can never secure development of the hidden mineral resources of the interior without furnishing our citizens with proper means of transportation necessary for such development.

It is a striking fact that the most productive gold-mining propositions are those in which there are large bodies of low-grade ore. The Treadwell mines are treating ore at a profit which does not run over $2.50 per ton. We have made wonderful progress during the past 10 years in the discovery of treatment methods for low-grade ores, and there is abundant evidence that the interior of Alaska has an unlimited supply of ores of this character. Private capital can not and will not undertake any development of these mining areas under present conditions. Transportation charges on mining machinery, together with the high cost of living made necessary by these prohibitive charges, does not justify the construction of expensive milling plants for the treatment of low-grade ores. These can only be successfully operated and constructed when the Government will take hold of the transportation problem and provide the means for putting machinery on the ground and giving the comforts and conveniences of civilization to those who will be willing to go to Alaska and become interested in her mineral development.

Each new strike during the last 16 years has made known large deposits of low-grade gravels that would not pay to work under the primitive and costly methods of the individual. In later years areas of sufficient extent have been obtained to warrant the installation of costly hydraulic and dredging machinery and the richer portions have been operated; but even with the most improved methods of handling there remain great areas that, owing to the excessive cost of labor and supplies, do not justify development. These areas of low-grade ground, which it will take years to work out, will have to await improved transportation facilities as the only means of reducing the prohibitive costs.

In the Shushana district the present quoted price of such commodities as beans, bacon, sugar, and so forth, is $1 per pound, the price of one sack of flour being $50. Thus it has been during all of the stampedes, with costs greater or less, governed by the distance from rail or steamboat terminals. As soon as trails and roads are cut out and streams bridged these costs are reduced, but never have they reached the basis where it is possible to work the gravels of lower value, except in a few favored sections close to water transportation, where large hydraulic or dredging plants could be installed. The result has been the "creaming" of the richer deposits and leaving the others until the country is generally opened up and it will pay to build railroads.

The opponents of this measure lay great stress upon the fact that the income derived from the operation of a Government-owned railroad will not justify the expenditures. I am perfectly willing to admit, Mr. Chairman, that this railroad is not to be built for the purpose of securing a profit to the Government from its direct operation, but I justify its construction on account of the fact that it will be a Government highway over which shall flow into Alaska the necessary tools and appliances to develop the interior and over which shall flow out the stream of wealth which we have every reason to believe is only waiting for a proper and easy outlet. The income of this enterprise is not to be figured out in the amount of freight

receipts or passengers hauled, but is to be estimated in the aggregate increase of the wealth produced from the Territory.

It seems strange that some of those who are opposing this measure on the ground that it is a Government project should fail to remember just what has been done by our Government in the development of the great West. In a letter addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Territories, under date of January 19 last, the Secretary of the Interior, Hon. Franklin K. Lane, has clearly stated the amount of land that this Government bestowed upon private railroad corporations in the form of railroad land grants. The Secretary writes:

> The records of the General Land Office show that land grants made by Congress in aid of private railway construction in this country averaged about 7,500 acres of land for each mile of railroad built. Railroad land grants made by Congress have aggregated 158,139,000 acres, or 247,093 square miles. These land grants equal in area a territory as large as the combined area of the New England States, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, and West Virginia.
>
> How much other public aid has been given to private railroad building in the form of land grants by States and subdivisions of States and in the form of cash bounties or subsidies or guaranteed interest and principal on bond issues can not even be approximated with any degree of certainty.
>
> Reliable authorities have stated that the actual cost of construction of the Union Pacific Railroad was approximately $50,000,000. The cost to the railroad company of this construction was $93,500,000, nearly $43,000,000 being taken in profit by the contractors and the Credit Mobilier. Land grants to the Union Pacific alone were made to the extent of 11,309,844 acres in addition to the Government's guaranty of bond issues and interest. Previous to the settlement of the Government with the Pacific roads it was estimated by the inspecting engineer of the United States Pacific Railway Commission that the entire property of the Union Pacific system could have been reproduced for $37,280 a mile, whereas at the time the average per mile of subsidized mortgage debt and interest on the road to the credit of the Government was $47,465 a mile.
>
> Land Office records show that land grants by Congress in aid of the construction of private wagon roads were made at the rate of 1,900 acres of land for each mile of road, while early canal building was aided by congressional land grants averaging 63,700 acres of land for each mile of canal.

But the United States is not alone in having deeded millions of acres of land in order to aid railroad construction. Canada has followed our example, and from the letter above referred to the Secretary makes mention of the following facts in connection with railroad construction in Canada:

> From 1876 to 1912 there had been built in Canada something less than 10,000 miles of railway under private ownership. In Government aid these roads had received cash subsidies aggregating $208,072,073 and land grants to the extent of 56,052,055 acres from the public domain.
>
> In other words, it has cost the Government in Canada $20,000 in cash and 5,600 acres in land for every mile of road built under private ownership in that country. Some part of these cash subsidies are in the form of loans which the railroads are under agreement to repay.

The attention of the civilized world has been directed to the great work performed by the Russian Government in constructing the Siberian Railroad, a project of daring conception and enterprise. This railroad was built entirely by the Russian Government. It is 4,272 miles long. Its construction involved the cost of $180,000,000, or at a rate of a little less than $28,000 per mile. Not only did the Russian Government expend this vast sum in the construction of the railroad, but it expended an additional amount of over $11,000,000 to encourage settlement of the country and to develop its trade. The Russian Government has constructed over 7,000 miles of railroad in Asia alone.

I have no fear whatever that the undertaking of Alaskan railroad construction by the Government will encourage the growth of socialism. Socialism is encouraged and developed more by the inactivity and helplessness of the Government to meet its responsibilities and correct public evils than it is by the operation of governmental functions. It is as clear as the noonday sun that private enterprise and private capital can not undertake this work and responsibility. There would be such a heavy tribute and charge made upon the population and production of Alaska as to greatly retard and prevent its development. Our knowledge of the wealth of Alaska, which is no longer founded upon conjecture, but has for its basis the returns of the past 25 years, calls upon us to undertake this work.

We have recently expended $375,000,000 in a great enterprise of international worth. We have no facts before us to confirm the opinion that the Panama Canal will be self-supporting as far as the tolls received are concerned. We believe that we will receive adequate returns in the great impetus given to our commerce and manufactures and that we will bring our country into closer communication with the teeming multitudes of the Orient and the countries on the west coast of South America, with whom we expect to find a large and most profitable market for our manufactured goods.

I am but little concerned about the possibilities of agricultural development in that Territory, and I do not care very much about the immediate development of the coal areas and their productive capacity. But I do believe that the development of Alaska will result in a vast increase in the world's supply of precious minerals that will be brought out from the interior of that country.

In emphasizing as I do the possibility of great mineral development of Alaska, I am not unmindful of the fact that it will create a larger market for agricultural and manufactured products on the Pacific coast. A great population in Alaska engaged in mining operations will be obliged to secure its food supply in large measure from our Pacific coast territory. While there is some reason for the claims of those who favor the bill that there are agricultural possibilities in Alaska, yet I prefer to support the measure solely on the benefit to be derived from the mineral product rather than from agricultural development. I know from experience that an active and increasing mining population gives the farmer one of the best markets possible, and if it should happen that we are to make Alaska the great gold-producing territory of the world, there is no limit to the market which may be opened there for the products of the farm and factory that can be supplied by our western territory.

A study of the mineral production of Alaska reveals the fact that gold constitutes its chief element, and of the gold production the greatest percentage is that derived from placer mining. This placer mining has been largely developed along the water courses during the summer months when it is possible for mining of that character to be carried on. It inevitably follows where there is a great supply of placer gold that this gold must come from the fissure veins in the mountain regions; and for that reason I believe that the opening of the country to settlement, and the prospecting of the mining areas will be followed by a great increase in the production of gold.

The construction of a publicly owned railroad, making the conditions of life in the interior comfortable and less expensive, providing cheap transportation rates for the introduction of mining machinery, the cutting of timber for mining purposes, and all other supplies needed for deep mining, will contribute greatly to the interest and activity that will be aroused in this feature of mining.

Alaska must be developed through American enterprise and by American interests and through American industry. It offers no field of opportunity to those who live in warm climates, where living is achieved with little energy or effort. Those who have gone there under conditions which charm and fascinate us as we read the story of their hardship and endurance certainly deserve the gratitude and the appreciation of all American citizens.

And so, Mr. Chairman, I believe that as an incident to the development of that great region the construction of this railroad is a necessity. I understand it will take only a comparatively short time after this railroad has been built into the interior, connecting the great watercourses of the Yukon and the other large rivers with the seacoast, before communication will be as easy with our cities on the Pacific coast as it is now between the Atlantic and Pacific coasts, and people will then be able to travel from San Francisco or Seattle into the interior of Alaska with the same degree of comfort, and possibly with the same amount of cost, as they now travel from one end of this country to the other. And as we cheapen living, and as we bring the conveniences of civilization into that region, we shall inevitably increase the population there. [Applause.]

I look with great eagerness to the completion of this enterprise, believing that it will greatly hasten the settlement of Alaska; that it will develop a population who will be satisfied with the conditions under which they can live; that it will bring the comforts and the conveniences of our life here in the United States to all who are willing to go to Alaska and cast in their fortunes with the development of that country.

There is great wealth to be found by the strong and adventurous. There is every attraction to our enterprising American youth to leave the comforts of life here and plunge into the life yonder. That which contributed most to the development of our western country in the early sixties was the belief that at the end of the journey there was gold for those who were willing to embark upon the road and face the dangers that confronted them. It was the thirst for gold in the late forties that took the hardy pioneers across the continent to California, and it was that thirst for gold that made them tread through the hot morasses of the Isthmus in order to reach that region, and thus brought California to the attention of the world. In my own State of Colorado it was the discoveries of gold, in connection with the finding of the precious metal in streams adjacent to Denver and Pikes Peak, that brought the pioneers across the prairies and induced them to settle that region. And just as they found gold in the sands and in the banks of the streams, so they followed those watercourses into the mountains, and by

energy and perseverance brought to light the mines which have added so much to the growth and development of our country.

I assert and predict that we have not touched the hem of the garment of wealth that is in Alaska, but that we have simply extracted from the placer washings of the creeks and rivers what might be called the cream of the gold. I believe we shall only find the key to the great treasure house there when the prospectors have fought their way up the mountains and into the hills from which this placer gold has come; and in order that they may find this treasure and reveal it to the world it is necessary that this Government shall stand behind them by contributing to their enterprise and affording to them the conveniences and tools with which to prosecute that development.

I believe that this great public work is justified and demanded. We are face to face with this condition, that unless we act in this way private capital will not undertake this work; that there can not be the investment of private capital without an adequate return for the money invested; and I therefore contend that this Government can well afford to put into this investment $35,000,000 or $50,000,000 without expecting any return of interest upon the capital invested, deriving, as it will, large and ample income from the development and growth of the country. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SELDOMRIDGE] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] is recognized.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I should not trespass upon the patience of the committee at this closing hour of this long debate were it not for the fact that since I have been a Member of the House and before I have had a peculiar and a very considerable interest in Alaska and its problems; were it not for the fact that I was perhaps the pioneer, at least one of the first, to propose the construction and operation of a railroad in Alaska by the Government as a means of at once developing and conserving the resources of that Territory.

This discussion has covered a very wide range. Some of it seems to me likely, if indeed it is not calculated, to detract from the fundamental issue involved in the proposition itself. We are prone to consider the Government construction and operation of railroads in Alaska as an end in itself rather than as a means to an end. We did not purchase and operate the Panama Railroad because the Government desired to go into the railroad business. We did not establish on the Canal Zone a great mercantile enterprise, with more than a million dollars' worth of stock, doing an annual business of $6,000,000, because the Government desired to go into the mercantile business. We did not establish there an ice-making plant, a laundry, a coffee-roasting plant, and beef-corning plant because the Government desired to enter into those enterprises. We concluded to operate the Panama Railroad because the operation of that railroad was a necessary incident to the construction of the Panama Canal. We entered upon those other mercantile enterprises because they were necessary to the convenience, the health, and the well-being of the employees of the canal. We are going to build this railroad in Alaska, not because the Government desires to go into the railroad business in Alaska, but because we desire to conserve and at the same time develop the resources of that Territory [applause], because we want to develop not alone its mines but its agriculture and its factories, and give to it a civilization that will be both symmetrical and self-sustaining. We want to make it not only a good place in which to make money but a good place in which to live. In short, we wish to develop its resources for the benefit of all the people. What can be more appropriate than that the master facilities of development, without which development is impossible, shall be furnished and operated by that instrumentality which is designed to promote and foster the welfare of all the people, the United States Government.

We own Alaska, own it absolutely and without condition. We are free to do with Alaska what good business judgment dictates we ought to do. We need not shut our eyes to the human experience of the past hundred years in our own country. We know, and it is a matter both of public record and of judicial determination, that in the train of private ownership of railroads in this country there came monopoly of our coal, our natural gas, our oil, and our timber. Certainly we are not foolish enough to believe that we can establish and carry out the same policy in Alaska that has brought upon us these evils in our own country and escape them in Alaska. Why, only last week the Interstate Commerce Commission delivered an opinion in which it was stated that millions of dollars have been lost to the railroads, especially the industrial railroads of this country, in special services granted to industrial corporations without charge. Every railroad in Alaska to-day, with one possible exception, is an industrial railroad. We know that if private capital furnishes, develops, and operates these railroads, it will develop them and operate them with a view to private profit. Private capital is selfish. It looks to immediate returns, and immediate returns in Alaska mean the fastening upon the people of that Territory, at the time when they can least bear them, of a vast charge which will be projected into the future. There is no inherent right in private capital to make a profit out of the public utilities of a country. Public utilities, to be real, must be developed and operated with an eye single to the public welfare. The moment that you begin the construction and operation of railroads in Alaska with a view to profit, just that moment the railroads of that country become, not the utilities of the public, but the instruments of profit of a few men.

Mr. WILLIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. I know the gentleman has given a great deal of attention to this general subject, and I want to invite his attention to the provision of the bill which authorizes, empowers, and directs the President to lease the road after it is constructed, and authorizes him to operate it only on condition that he can not lease it. What is the opinion of the gentleman as to that leasing clause?

Mr. ANDERSON. Personally, I should be very much opposed to the leasing of this railroad, for it seems to me that to do so would deprive the Territory of the very thing which we intend to give it—a maximum of service at a minimum of charge.

In other words, we propose Government construction in order that we may have the advantage of the Government's credit and its low rate of interest. We expect that this vast credit and low rate of interest will be reflected in lower costs of operation; in brief, we hope to eliminate the element of private profit and private risk from the costs of both construction and operation. We can not do this and lease the railroad.

Again, underlying the purpose of public service in construction and operation of the road and the elimination of private profit and risk, is the desire to avoid the ills which have attended private construction and operation of railroads, both in this country and in Alaska—to prevent the monopoly of its natural resources.

The history of construction and operation of railroads, more especially of industrial railroads, shows that they have been an incident in the development of private industrial enterprises for profit. It shows—and this is a matter of judicial determination—that it has been practically impossible to prevent the industrial enterprise from obtaining from the railroad special privileges, advantages, and services, as well as arrangements of freight charges, which had the effect of giving the industry a monopoly and destroying independent competition. This is the inevitable result of private operation, especially in a new country. We can avoid it only by providing for the construction and operation of the railroad by the Government, because the Government is the only instrument with a real public-service motive and that has no private motive or interest of profit to serve. The whole proposition is concerned with the question of whether railroads are to be constructed for the public use and benefit or for private use and benefit. It is the same old proposition that no man can serve two masters. The railroads of Alaska must either serve the public welfare or private profit. They can not both serve public welfare and private profit.

In this bill we are offered an opportunity for real constructive statesmanship. If we fail to take advantage of it we shall not only commit an error of judgment, but we shall be derelict in our duty to the public and to the people of Alaska; for in the last analysis the proposition resolves itself into the question whether railroads in Alaska are to exist for the industries and the people of Alaska or the industries and people of Alaska are to be exploited for the benefit of the railroads.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, in my discussion of the bill now before the committee I shall not give much time to the question of the resources of Alaska. I am thoroughly satisfied that we have in that Territory a wonderful country, rich in minerals and fisheries, and capable of great development. The question of agricultural resources which has been so largely discussed does not seem to me of great importance, further than it may have a bearing on the general question of development. It is not necessary or desirable that we should build railroads in Alaska in order to develop its agricultural possibilities. In the great project, however, of opening up that great region for the devolpment of its mineral and fishery resources, the possi-

bility of some agricultural development for the maintenance, or at least a partial maintenance, of its own population is of importance. Conflicting statements as to agricultural possibilities have been made in this debate. I have never visited Alaska, and I have no personal knowledge of the subject. I will, however, present for the information of the committee testimony of one witness whom I know personally and whose testimony I know is reliable and disinterested. The following is from an address made several months ago in Lapeer, Mich., by Mrs. Lucy White Williams with reference to an extended trip through Alaska. Mrs. Williams, who is the treasurer of the National Federation of Women's Clubs, is an experienced traveler and a keen observer. In that address she said in part:

Agriculture in Alaska is in its infancy, but it is a healthy and promising infant. At the present day every part of Alaska which has emerged from the first state of pioneer life grows vegetables. Wherever gardens have been planted the yield has been abundant and the quality of the vegetables superior. To us it appeared only necessary to turn the soil in order to have seeds grow. Vegetation has an almost tropical rankness. We visited the Government experimental station at Sitka and found most of the fruits, vegetables, and flowers to be found on a similar farm in Michigan. Strawberries were really delicious and of immense size. Many of the flowers I am trying to cultivate in my garden are indigenous to Alaska. Some seasons the excessive cold rains and lack of sunshine prevent them from maturing. In the interior of Alaska the climatic conditions are different. Since 1902 the United States Government has had agricultural experiment stations in Alaska. They are all under the immediate supervision of Mr. Georgeson, who lives in Sitka, at the old Beranof Castle. Besides this experimental farm in Sitka, others have been established at Kodiak, Kenai, Copper Center, Rampart, and Fairbanks. The work in all of these stations is progressing satisfactorily. The interior is better adapted to agriculture than the coast line.

The bill before us is, in my judgment, the most important piece of legislation so far as its ultimate effect is concerned of any proposition that has come or will come before this session of Congress. I feel this because of the fact that it brings the attention of the country to a focus upon the immense railroad question—the question of what are we going to do with our railroads and what are our railroads going to do with us.

Our railroads are the great highways of commerce, the great arteries of trade. Their mileage to-day in the United States is a quarter of a million miles. They influence every human activity; they connect the producer and the consumer. If they properly perform their functions, they make easy interchange of the labor of man, stimulating production, extending the market of the producer, lightening the burden of the consumer, and making possible for our humblest citizens a higher standard of living than was ever dreamed of by the ancients. Failing to perform properly their functions, they are a restraint upon commerce and industry and economic advancement. They are to civilization to-day what the watercourses and highways were to our forefathers. By reason of his appreciation of the importance of the control of the Mississippi River, Jefferson brought about the great Louisiana Purchase. To-day more than a score of great railroad bridges cross this river and more than 30,000 cars, carrying passengers and freight, go over these bridges daily, emphasizing constantly that new ways have succeeded the old and are serving fields that the old could not reach. The conditions covering the use and operation of such arteries of trade are of vital importance to our civilization.

This past century, which has been an age of railroad development, has recorded greater change and greater progress industrially and economically than has any thousand years of history before. Living in the midst of rapid change, we do not always grasp quickly enough the significance of developments of the highest importance.

The century which gave to the world steam, electricity, and gasoline, the three great forces of industry, has likewise produced legions of machines driven by these new sources of power, and each producing for the use and support of mankind and creating commerce undreamed of in other days. The same dynamic trinity which has revolutionized manufacturing methods and substituted economic cooperation of labor for wasteful individualism of effort and made cheap necessities of the expensive luxuries of our grandfathers—has made possible transportation methods essential for the extension of the cooperative idea to a world-wide scope. While in other days of homespun and hand-made articles each village was a world unto itself, to-day each village has brought to its doors the products of labor the world over, and thereby enjoys a higher standard of living. These industrial changes have brought, likewise, a corresponding economic and social change. Economists of other days were forced to accept the monstrous Malthusian theory, declaring that population tends to increase more rapidly than does the means of support, and that hence poverty—nay, starvation—must always be with us. To-day we have no need to believe such a slander upon a merciful God—no need to believe that this world must of necessity have always within it the horrors of miserable poverty.

To-day I believe, with Edison, that poverty is no longer necessary in the world. The great problem for humanity is to equalize the opportunities of life so far as possible and to permit even the humblest of the poor to share in its wonderful advancement.

In this new industrial world farm and factory and fireside, producer and consumer, centers of industry and markets everywhere are bound together by great throbbing arteries of trade, and foremost among these is, as I have said, the railroads. If these roads are to be conducted as great toll roads levying heavy toll on the commerce as it passes over them from producer to consumer, holding the producer down to the lowest possible price for his products and holding the consumer up to the highest possible price for that which he would buy, this heavy toll through the doctrine of "what the traffic will bear," which was the guide of private rate making under private ownership and control, then these roads are not aids but rather hindrances and obstacles to progress and civilization.

We early appreciated the possibilities and advantages of their use but not so soon the possibilities of abuse. We showered railroad promoters with bonuses, land grants, exemptions, and privileges, all that they might develop our cities and our Nation. Not realizing the danger, we gave to private ownership a free rein, and nowhere was private initiative handicapped by "fanatical" legislation. Unrestrained private ownership failed miserably. The commerce that should have been served was preyed upon, and the growth of rebates and discriminations and the pillage of the public by unfair rates gave rise to the demand for public regulation of these public utilities. For a quarter of a century or more we have endeavored to regulate and as yet we have not accomplished any great results.

In Alaska we have a free hand, a clear start. And to-day the Alaska railroad bill focuses attention on the question, What shall we do with our railroads? It is a problem that presses constantly more and more strongly for solution.

Note the wonderful increase of railroad traffic in 20 years from 1890 to 1910.

	1890	1910
Number passengers carried	492,430,865	971,683,199
Number of passengers carried 1 mile	11,847,785,617	32,338,496,329
Number of passengers carried 1 mile per mile of line	75,751	138,169
Tons carried	631,740,636	1,849,900,101
Tons carried 1 mile	77,207,047,298	255,016,910,451
Tons carried 1 mile per mile of line	493,838	1,071,086

We have heard much in this debate about the sufficiency of public regulation of privately owned railroads. As yet such regulation is but an experiment, and a most uncertain one as to results at that. Hon. Charles A. Prouty, of the Interstate Commerce Commission, said at the annual meeting of the National Association of State Railway Commissioners in 1912:

The United States is trying out an experiment that has never yet been worked out successfully in any country of the world. It is trying to work out the problem of controlling railroads built and maintained by private capital but which are under regulations which are fixed and controlled by the public.

It has never been worked out to an end, but, in my judgment, it has been tried out sufficiently to give some substantial ground for doubt as to whether the problem can be worked out that way.

The great factors in the problem are rates and service.

As to rates, we have not as yet really begun to solve the problem. We have, through the Interstate Commerce Commission and our various State commissions, made war on discrimination between points or between individuals, and to a very limited extent as to discrimination between industries. We have, however, not as yet given a hearing to Mr. Ultimate Consumer. I have often heard shippers declare that they did not care how high the rates were so long as they were not personally discriminated against. So long as the rate does not exceed "what the traffic will bear" and is not discriminatory, shippers are satisfied and pass it along to Mr. Ultimate Consumer. He has not been a party to hearings before these commissions and he has not been considered, but before the question is finally solved he must be considered.

There is to-day a concerted movement among shippers and business interests of the country in behalf of the 5 per cent advance in their rates which is asked by 50 of the railroads. If this increase is granted the 5 per cent is not to be paid by these interests that are supporting the demands of the railroads, but will be paid by the consumer. It will be another 5 per cent added to the products of the farm and the factory to be paid by the laborer in the city, who already complains as to the high cost of living, and will be made the basis of further demands for reduction of tariff duties.

Government regulation in this country has many obstacles to surmount, but two of them loom specially large just before us. First, the squeezing of the water out of the corporations controlling in order to fix a basis for rate calculation; and, second, a readjustment of rate-regulating authority as between State and Nation, in order that justice may not be lost in the twilight zone. Intrastate and interstate commerce are so inextricably related that they can not be logically and thoroughly rated separately. If the problem is ever to be worked out to a complete solution by rate-regulating commissions we must have a system of rate courts much like our Federal judicial system, in which the Interstate Commerce Commission would be the supreme court and the State commissions would be similar to the Federal district courts.

Railway authorities have insisted that the value of the railroad has nothing to do with the question of proper railroad rates. Mr. R. S. Lovett stated before the railroad securities commission:

No railroad company has ever undertaken to base rates on the value of its property and no railroad man has ever attempted to make rates according to the value of the railroad. * * * Rates must of necessity be the same on all competing railroads, and yet we know that the value of such railroads varies greatly.

Such, however, is not the theory of Government regulation. The United States Supreme Court has declared "the basis of calculation is the 'fair value of the property' used for the convenience of the public (Smyth *v.* Ames); or, as it was put in San Diego Land & Town Co. *v.* National City, 'What the company is entitled to demand in order that it may have just compensation is a fair return upon the reasonable value of the property at the time it is being used for the public.'"

We are about to provide for a valuation of the railroad properties of the country by the Interstate Commerce Commission under the La Follette law. At this point I wish to call to your attention a signed statement by Senator LA FOLLETTE which appeared in La Follette's Weekly of January 31 with reference to the proposed regulation of the issue of railroad securities. This statement seems to me to be incontrovertible, and if our railroad problem is ever to be worked out successfully along lines of Government regulation these wise words of warning from Senator LA FOLLETTE must be heeded. So far as the Senator's statement has reference to the railroad problem, it is as follows:

Not since he became President has Mr. Wilson recommended legislation so important and far-reaching as in his message of January 20. Though expressed in general terms, the President forecasts the scope and purpose of the proposed measures. The message has been followed by a tentative introduction of four bills. There is to be a fifth, designed to confer upon the Interstate Commerce Commission authority to regulate the financial operations of the railroads.

Believing that the enactment of legislation to regulate the financial operations of interstate railroads would be a serious mistake, I set forth below some of my reasons for that belief. I do this in obedience to strong conviction and in the hope that the administration may yet be persuaded against pressing that recommendation.

* * * * * * *

President Wilson's recommendation for the control of the financial operations of interstate railroads by the Interstate Commerce Commission will be very popular, I have no doubt, at the outset. It is not unusual to find advocates for Government control of capitalization among those who have studied the railroad problem. Ten years ago I entertained a like view. I can therefore understand the President's attitude of mind and sincerity of purpose upon this subject. Further study and reflection have changed the views which I then entertained for reasons which I can but imperfectly set forth within the compass of a single editorial.

As one goes into the relations of the railroads to the public, he first sees the vice of overcapitalization as an excuse for excessive transportation charges. It is quite natural that he should first think of correcting the evil by limiting the capitalization to the actual value of the railroad property; but it is inevitable that he should ultimately realize that the true relation of the common carrier to the public, and the true principle upon which that relation should be controlled does not impose upon the Government the necessity to regulate the complex financial affairs of the great national railways. In short, all interests with which the public is in any way concerned can be fully protected by a simple and logical method—a method which protects the people against obligations and responsibilities which they can not escape if their Government attempts to regulate the financial operations of the great interstate railways.

What interests have the public in the control of the railroads?

As to interstate transportation, the people of this country are interested in (1) the character of the service rendered and (2) the price which they must pay for that service; they have no other or further interest.

What obligations do these railroads owe to the public?

Government charters the common carrier, clothes it with the sovereign power to take private property—even against the consent of the owner—for the carrier's use. The acceptance of this sovereign power operates to dedicate the property of the railroad to a public use, and imposes upon the carrier the obligation to so use its property as to furnish to the public adequate service, impartial service, and to render such adequate and impartial service at reasonable rates.

What duty does Government owe to the public regarding the common carrier?

It has created the common carrier. It has invested it with power to take private property for a public use. From its nature, within a limited area along its course, the railroad is a natural monopoly. Possessed of this great power, the railroad might ignore its obligations and oppress the public. Government is therefore bound to see to it that the creature it has clothed with its sovereign power shall discharge its public obligations. It therefore becomes the duty of Government to so control this carrier monopoly that the public shall be guaranteed adequate service, impartial service, reasonable rates. The interest of the public goes no further. The obligation of the Government goes no further.

To acquit itself of this obligation to the public, what is the Government required to do?

It must of necessity ascertain the fair value of the property which the common carrier uses for the public. It owes no duty to the public to undertake the regulation of the financial operations of the railroad. The Supreme Court has well said that—

"If a railroad corporation has bonded its property for an amount that exceeds its fair value, or if its capitalization is largely fictitious, it may not impose upon the public the burden of such increased rates as may be required for the purpose of realizing profits upon such excessive valuation or fictitious capitalization."

The fair valuation of the property is the true basis. The public need not concern itself with all the villainies of overcapitalization, which abound in the history of every railroad in the country.

To execute its public trust, the Government must, in addition to ascertaining the fair value of the property, know exactly the amount of money which the common carrier expends in maintaining the property used for the benefit of the public. It must also know exactly the cost or outlay of the common carrier in operating the railroad.

Having ascertained these three important essentials—the fair value of the property, the cost of maintaining the property, the cost of operating the property—the Government is then prepared to enforce adequate services, impartial services, and reasonable rates. To this end it must make rates sufficiently high to pay the operating expenses, to meet the entire cost of maintenance, and enough in addition to insure an adequate return upon the fair value of the property of the common carrier.

It is charged with no duty to become legally or morally answerable for the financial juggling of the railway management. The rate which it fixes may indirectly operate to restrain overcapitalization; it may even tend to squeeze the water out of excessive stock and bond issues already set afloat; but neither the railroads nor the dealers in railway stocks and bonds have any cause for complaint. The railroads have no right to exact from the public rates high enough to pay interest and dividends upon stocks and bonds which exceed the fair value of the property.

No warrant or excuse can be offered for the Government's assuming any responsibility regarding capitalization of common carriers for the protection of investors. The purchase by an individual of railroad stocks and bonds as a speculation or for investment is solely a matter of option with the purchaser. He buys in his own right and at his own risk. Upon principle, the Government owes no other or different obligation to the man who buys railroad stocks or bonds than to the man who buys Standard Oil or Tennessee Coal & Iron stocks and bonds, or to the man who purchases a horse, a house and lot, or a farm.

But should the Government assume the responsibility of controlling the issue of railroad stocks and bonds it will enter upon an undertaking fraught with grave dangers to the public, an undertaking certain to impose unnecessary and unjust burdens upon transportation.

Ten years ago every railroad in the United States would have taxed its resources to the last limit to resist conferring upon the Government power to superintend and regulate its financial operations. To-day they hail with satisfaction and delight the recommendation for such legislation. And it is to be noted that the organs of Wall Street and the stock exchanges especially commend the proposed regulation.

The reason is obvious. The railroads of the country carried their fictitious capitalization to a point where the public, within the last few years, has grown suspicious of the soundness of these securities. Values rapidly declined. Various schemes were devised to boost the market. They failed. Then came the bold demand for some Government action that would rehabilitate these depreciated securities and stimulate the languishing business of the stock exchanges. To this end, Mr. Aldrich, five years ago, brought forward an ingenious plan to make railroad bonds security for emergency currency issue under the Aldrich-Vreeland bill. And now the railroads are hungry to have some form of Government sanction for all future bond and stock issues; such an approval would at once make an issue of bonds or stocks "a good thing" in the market. The Government may disclaim that its action is a guaranty of the value of such securities; the proposed law may even so provide in specific terms, but for all that the investor will claim that in good morals the Government is bound, in its dealing with the railroad, to make the transportation charges high enough to "protect" the securities which it has authorized railroad companies to place upon the market.

But more than this: When the Government, through its commission, has authorized a railroad to make an additional issue of bonds or stocks it will, in effect, have validated all the issue of stocks and bonds then outstanding.

If it were a proper function of government to "superintend and regulate" the issue of railroad securities in which private parties speculate or invest, it would be vital that the commission charged with this great responsibility should know the true value of the property of the railroad underlying such securities. But the Interstate Commerce Commission does not possess such information. It will be years before the commission will have completed its valuation of the railroad property of the country under the law recently enacted. When the commission has finished that great economic undertaking and submitted its tentative findings, its work will, under the law, have to be tested and tried out in the courts before it becomes even sufficiently stable to form a basis for fixing railroad rates and charges.

In the meantime, is the Interstate Commerce Commission to be called upon to guess at the value, and upon that "guess" to authorize the railroads to increase their capitalization?

The commission has been completely at the mercy of the railroads in every contest over rates where the companies have raised the question that the rate fixed by the commission would not permit the earning of a reasonable return upon its property.

And now it is proposed to require the commission to decide upon the facts presented to it that securities may be issued, upon which the railroads are "henceforth to be supplied with the money they need."

Referring to the fact that the railroads had control of all evidence regarding the value of their properties and that it was powerless to meet that evidence in any contest involving the value of railroad property, the Interstate Commerce Commission, in its report for 1909, said:

"There is no way by which the Government can properly meet this testimony."

If the commission can not, on this fundamental issue, "meet the testimony" of the railroads in a case involving merely the fixing of a freight rate, how dangerous to impose upon them the infinitely greater

responsibility of determining whether railways shall issue, it may be, hundreds of millions of stocks and bonds which will become a permanent burden upon transportation. Consider the lasting wrong which this may work upon the public. The railroads will always have the advantage. They are more familiar with the case as it is to be presented than the commission can hope to be. They have a powerful organization. They have an army of trained experts, engineers, statisticians, accountants, masters of railway finance, and special counsel.

If the railroads win wrongfully in a rate case, it is a hardship upon the public. But an erroneous decision fixing a rate too high may be corrected. The case may be reviewed. The excessive rate may be lowered in a subsequent proceeding. But a wrongful decision by the commission, allowing the railroad to issue millions upon millions of securities which are at once thrown upon the market, is an everlasting burden upon the public—an everlasting injury to the people.

Whoever buys railroad securities now buys at his own risk. Whoever buys securities upon the issue of which the Government has set the seal of its approval will, in good morals, hold that the Government must, under all circumstances, maintain railroad rates so high as not to impair the value of those securities.

The moment that investments are made in securities authorized by the Government, that moment property rights in those securities become fixed. The commission may find that it has been misled, that it has grossly blundered. But its mistake is irrevocable. It is not the simple question of having temporarily imposed a hardship upon a community. It is a case of having inflicted an irreparable injury upon an unoffending public.

ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE.

If we do not work out to a satisfactory solution this great problem along lines of Government regulation, the American people must either give up, declaring that they are powerless to protect their own welfare and secure their own advancement, or they will be obliged to turn to Government ownership with all of its responsibilities and its intricacies.

We know that this Nation of ours will never rest until they have solved this problem, and while we are still struggling to work it out along the lines of Government regulation I believe it is wise and prudent that we should study and experiment likewise along the line of Government ownership. Therefore I am heartily in accord with the proposition contained in this bill now before us, which permits us to begin at the beginning with such an experiment.

In this discussion we have heard much from various gentlemen as to possibilities of failure for Government ownership. These gentlemen have pictured to us various instances of Government extravagance. I notice, however, that they have been equally silent as to the failures of private ownership and the wonderful success of Government effort in building the Panama Canal following scores of years of failure of private effort.

Private effort in the business world is not uniformly successful. More than 90 per cent of men engaged in business register a failure at some time in their careers. And nowhere in all the fields of enterprise does failure score more frequently than in that of transportation. Inefficiency, graft, scandal, and crimes of finance all are found on almost every page of the railroad history in this country. To-day the American people are staggering along under the whole load, lacking the service the country needs, and still asked to pay yet more for that which it has not had and does not get.

So active in our ears are the pleas of the financiers who would make possible payment of dividends upon watered stocks that we hear little of the other side of the story—of responsibilities not met, of the public interests smothered rather than served by private initiative and individual genius.

If we but take thought, numerous and striking instances in confirmation of what I say must occur to us. The public prints are continually recording them. We all know of them in our own personal observation and experience.

Representing a portion of the State of Michigan, I call to your attention such a case, and I would ask any of you cheerful economic doctors of the school of Government regulation to take a look at the patient and tell us in Michigan what sort of a prescription you have to offer that will hold out any hope of a proper recovery.

The largest mileage operated by any one railroad system in the State of Michigan is that operated by the Pere Marquette Railroad system. Upon the proper operation and management of this line with 1,700 miles of road in my State are dependent in large degree the development and progress of a great portion of that State. It does a great intrastate and a great interstate business in the carrying of passengers and freight. It was for many years a profit-producing enterprise, and it played a large part in the development of the State in other days. In 1901 it owned 1,706 miles of track and its bonded debt was less than $30,000,000. To-day it is in the hands of receivers; its bonded indebtedness has, with very little increase in mileage, grown from less than $30,000,000 to nearly $80,000,000. Its present management are unable to satisfy the demands of the public for service, the demands of the employees for wages, the demands of stockholders and bondholders for interest and dividends, and have been known to issue bonds in order to satisfy the demands of the State for taxes. With improved efficiency the rule of the day in all lines of business, with constantly increasing demands for transportation facilities everywhere, and with a constantly developing country tributary, this great railway system, under private ownership and Government regulation, presents a spectacle of failure which should give food for thought to any who think that solution of the problem by Government regulation is an easy matter. For a third of a century we have had our Interstate Commerce Commission, with constantly increasing powers. Since 1907 we have had our State railroad commission, with powers expressly granted to it to regulate rates and to require service. To-day, with the question of rates practically untouched, the question of service seems to be beyond the power of anyone to remedy.

The alleged service being given the public by the Pere Marquette Railroad Co. is a scandal and a disgrace to an age which prides itself upon its industrial efficiency. Large portions of my district are dependent upon this system for transportation facilities, whether it be of persons, mail, or freight. Just as one instance out of a multitude, let me quote the following from a protest filed with the Postmaster General November 16 last, by Dr. J. H. Burley, president of the village of Almont, Mich.:

Please give Almont, Mich., better mail facilities. Our freight service by the Pere Marquette Railroad is getting absolutely unreliable. Conditions of tracks so poor that wrecks occur almost weekly, delaying mail from 36 to 48 hours. Winter coming on, conditions will be worse. Have had only 7 mails in last 8 days. Three days no mail. Kindly give us service from Detroit, by way of Romeo, by Detroit United Railway and carrier from Romeo to Almont, 9 miles.

Permit me to state that the investigation of the Post Office Department sufficiently substantiated this complaint, so that the department acceded to the request and have made contracts to send mail into this railroad town for 9 miles over wagon roads.

The following are expressions from secretaries of boards of trade with reference to this subject:

The freight and passenger service on the Pere Marquette Railroad is not all that could be desired. I believe the officials of the road will agree with us as to this. However, they are regularly meeting with us and cooperating, we honestly believe, for an improvement of the situation, as far as the means they have at their command will allow. It is certainly our impression from observation of the past year, as far as the personnel of the road is concerned, they are doing their very best to serve the public. The writer believes you are familiar, from your official experience, with the financial handicap the road is burdened with and probably have some well-defined ideas as to a remedy.

The passenger service is fairly good. The freight service is, however, about as poor as it could possibly be and maintain any semblance to an organized transportation unit. We have at this time a number of complaints before the Michigan railroad commission complaining of the absolutely rotten freight service rendered by the Pere Marquette under the present management. There is no question but what this service, or rather lack of it, is due to the failure of cooperation by the different departments and by the employees, who are underpaid and dissatisfied. I can cite you any number of specific instances where from 1 week to 10 days would be consumed in transit of L. C. L. shipments moving less than 100 miles. I believe that some of their heads of departments are making an honest effort to improve the service, but, through lack of cooperation, their efforts do not amount to much.

For several years past large sections of my district served by this road have found the freight service insufficient, resulting in great congestion of freight, delays in shipments, and loss to farmers and stock and produce buyers, who were unable to take advantage of the best markets. Within a few weeks this insufficient freight service has been cut in two in the Thumb district of Michigan, and where the rule was before a freight train each way every day, there is now but one every other day. The following is from the Huron County Tribune of January 30 last:

FREIGHT SERVICE IS INTOLERABLE, SAY SHIPPERS—BAD AXE DOES NOT GET THREE P. M. TRAINS A WEEK, AS PROMISED.

The freight situation in Bad Axe has become intolerable, say many shippers and merchants. Last week a shipment of goods by the Clark & McCaren Wholesale Grocery Co. is reported as having taken from Monday till Friday to get to Elkton, 10 miles distant. Bad Axe was supposed to have an outgoing P. M. freight train every other day, but is not getting even this triweekly service, poor as it would be. The fact is that the freights can not get here three times a week. Every station along the road, both on the Saginaw and Port Huron divisions, is so congested with freight and it takes so long to load, unload, and switch cars that neither can make its destination the same day it starts from either Saginaw or Port Huron. Frequently, it is said, the trains tie up overnight along the way on account of the 16-hour limit for the crews, and instead of the trains coming in one day and going out the next, it takes about two days to make the trip each way. This does not make much more than three round trips in two weeks.

Local railroad men are powerless to relieve the situation. They are obeying orders, and are not to blame.

Harbor Beach is said to be even worse off than Bad Axe, and according to reports a delegation of business men from that town to P. M. headquarters in Detroit received little encouragement and but scant courtesy.

Some local shippers have gone over the heads of the P. M. officials and taken up the matter of freight injustice with the commission at Lansing.

Here is another expression, from the Harbor Beach Times of January 23:

THESE ARE DAYS OF RETROGRESSION—PRESENT RAILWAY TRAIN SERVICE WOULD MAKE GOOD MATERIAL FOR JOKESMITHS—EVERY TRAIN IS ON THE SAME KIND OF SCHEDULE USED WHEN DAD WORE COPPER-TOED BOOTS.

Well, sir, there is nothing about our present misfit of a train service over the Port Hope & Palms division of the Pere Marquette Railway over which to "crow." When our citizens were informed, Monday morning of this week, that during the previous night the train-moving map on the best-paying 18 miles of trackage of the entire system of Michigan's big system, the Pere Marquette Railway, had been changed and the new conditions took us back to the days of years ago, when Harbor Beach had no factories and the system was a narrow-gauge affair, they were loud in comments; but right here is where we suggest that your foot be placed upon the soft pedal, so far as the subordinate officers are concerned, for in making this backward movement they simply are carrying into action orders received from the head office.

During the week our people have been treated to all kinds of "auld lang syne" stunts in the line of railroading, including a passenger train of coaches of 1862 vintage pulled by an engine running backwards and other numerous and freakish ideas; yet all is the result of a system that has been taken into Wall Street, robbed, and left by the wayside for dead, now in the care of nurses, trying to keep the poor thing supplied with activity sufficient to make it a matter of sympathy for the consideration of the State railway commission.

In the Detroit Tribune of January 31 appear charges framed by representatives of striking employees of the road to the effect that the roadbed and rolling stock of the road have fallen into such bad condition that lives and property are in constant jeopardy, that 75 engines on the said railroad were, between May and September last, condemned by Government inspectors as dangerous, and approximately 50 more have been withdrawn from service by Government inspectors because of their defective and unsafe condition. These parties further cite as an example of the demoralized and impoverished condition of the railroad the following telegram from J. W. Mulhern, superintendent of the Grand Rapids division, under date of June 25, 1913, to the engineer of No. 9:

This is authority for you to proceed on No. 9, engine 189, without a whistle.

And these parties further allege that said engine, with a passenger train, was thereupon run 550 miles without a whistle, contrary to the laws of the State.

Complaints are now pending before the Interstate Commerce Commission from Mr. Burr B. Lincoln, deputy dairy and food commissioner of the State of Michigan, and other parties alleging insufficient service, as to delays in transit in connection with shipments of live stock, and other demands for service. Occasionally through this course the individual case is cared for, but the thousands of instances occurring each day where injustice is done the public by the failure of this railway system to furnish the service to the public that it is entitled to do not reach the commission and are not adjusted, and if they did reach the commission the commission could not procure the relief to which the complainants would be entitled.

It is not a matter of individual inefficiency. It is not a temporary situation which will work itself out. It is not a case of simple failure of a public agency to perform its duty. It is a serious and urgent situation, which exists by reason, not of willful failure, but of absolute inability of a public agency to perform its duty under the conditions with which unrestrained private ownership has surrounded it. The engineers and the brakemen and the conductors and the station agents and the section men and the men in the car shops and the train dispatchers, and even the division superintendents and the general superintendent and general manager and those officers of the public, the receivers, are not to blame for the present situation, wherein the State of Michigan, which has a right to expect service from the Pere Marquette Railroad Co., is, instead, being hampered and held down in its industrial development by the failure of that privately owned and publicly regulated public utility to give service. The Pere Marquette corporation is carrying water in its stock to the amount of many millions of dollars. Money that the public have paid to that corporation for service has been diverted to the pockets of speculators and gentlemen in high finance. June 30, 1913, this corporation had outstanding, according to its own report to the Interstate Commerce Commission, capital stock to the amount of $28,415,200, and a funded debt amounting to $75,750,720. This gives a total of $107,250,720 on which this corporation seeks to pay interest or dividends. At the same time almost all of the property of this corporation is taxed in Michigan under a law which provides for its assessment at its cash value the same as any other property. A few hundred miles of the lines are outside of the State, and, of course, are not included in the valuation placed upon the Pere Marquette by the State board of assessors; but these do not amount to more than a few millions of dollars in value.

The State board of assessors have just determined the value of the property of this company in Michigan for 1913 at the same figure as for the previous year, namely, $25,600,000. The company will, no doubt, appear before that board, as they have done every year heretofore, and protest that their property is being assessed at more than it is worth, and then will go home and try to figure out some way of paying interest and dividend on an amount equal to three times or more its assessed valuation. It is to be noted that the State board of assessors in Michigan in making their assessment of railroads are not groping in the dark and making random guesses. In addition to other data before them, they have always before them that splendid piece of work, the appraisal of the railroad property in Michigan, which was secured by that pioneer progressive of progressives, Gov. Hazen S. Pingree. This appraisal was made under the direction of Prof. M. E. Cooley, an engineer of national reputation, and Prof. Henry C. Adams, later statistician of the Interstate Commerce Commission and now an advisor of the new Republic of China. In this appraisal the value of the Pere Marquette lines in Michigan in 1900 was placed at $28,890,892.

These suggestions are sufficient to indicate that a situation exists in connection with the Pere Marquette system that presents a great problem for solution, and one that it is urgent for the welfare of my district and of my State, and of your Nation as well as mine, that it should be solved soon, not by any temporary restorative on the 5 per cent plan, but by a thorough cure. I shall at a later time present a resolution asking a thorough investigation of the Pere Marquette Railroad Co., its financial history, and its present physical condition, and the nature of the service it is rendering the public. I am making these observations here to-day as a reminder both of the fact that private ownership, self-regulated, has failed to keep its trust with the public, and that as yet Government regulation of privately-owned public utilities has not really begun to solve the problem. I have not made any reference to Government aid for the Pere Marquette, although that is a factor in the situation. We are now making our start in the development of Alaska, hoping to build up there a civilization worthy of our country. Before we have given large sections of new territory to private individuals to secure railroads for the development of such territory. I believe this is a most propitious time to experiment with a newer method of building our own railroads and securing our money back out of the lands and owning our own railroads to be forever operated along lines best suited to the welfare of Alaska. [Applause.]

Mr. REILLY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, this bill provides for the construction by the United States Government of about 800 miles of railroad in Alaska, the road to be built between such points and over such routes as may be determined by the President of the United States.

The purpose of this measure is to connect one or more of the open Pacific coast harbors on the southern coast of Alaska with the navigable waters in the interior of Alaska and with the coal and copper fields of Alaska, thereby aiding in the development of the agricultural, mineral, and other resources of that Territory.

Authority is given in the bill to borrow $35,000,000 on United States bonds, said sum to be used in the construction of said railroad.

This bill is based on the report of the Alaskan Railroad Commission, which was appointed about two years ago for the purpose of investigating the Alaskan situation, with the view of determining the best policy to be pursued by the National Government in the development of that country.

Alaska was purchased by the United States Government from Russia in 1867 for $7,200,000. Alaska contains 590,000 square miles of territory, being about one-fifth the size of the United States, and has a population of about 50,000 people.

Ninety-nine per cent of the Territory of Alaska is owned by the United States Government and the balance is largely owned by what is known as the Alaskan Syndicate, or the Morgan-Guggenheim interests.

Alaska has at the present time about 450 miles of railroad, the Alaskan Northern, the Copper River & Northwestern, the White Pass, and the Yukon being the principal lines.

According to all authorities Alaska is rich in natural resources, a veritable treasure house, so valuable that no man has assumed to be able to name the sum that would represent her total wealth.

It is claimed that Alaska has more gold than California and Colorado, more coal than West Virginia, Ohio and Pennsylvania, more copper than Michigan, Arizona and Montana, large deposits of iron ore, extensive forests, considerable quantities of the finest marble, and various other minerals in abundance.

From the standpoint of agriculture, strange as it may seem to those who have looked upon this country as a sea of icebergs, Alaska is of considerable importance, as she is located in a latitude similar to that of several countries of northern Europe, where in a territory smaller than that of Alaska 10,000,000 people are supported by the products of the soil.

Mr. Chairman, after reading the hearings of the two committees having this bill in charge, and after listening to the able and exhaustive debates on the floor of this House, it would appear that there is a general agreement on both sides as to certain vital points fundamental in the correct solution of the problem before us.

There is little dispute as to the natural resources of Alaska. All agree that she is unquestionably rich in copper and coal; that she has valuable forests—in fact, that her natural wealth is so great that she practically stands alone as the one great storehouse of the world whose treasury door has yet to be unlocked. It is conceded that if Alaska is to be developed, if her great natural resources are to become available, railroads are necessary; that railroad construction in Alaska by private individuals ceased in 1906 when the Government withdrew from entry the public lands of Alaska; and that private enterprise will build no more railroads in Alaska under present conditions.

I agree with the gentleman from California [Mr. KENT], who has just addressed the House, that the problem here presented is a very simple one, being nothing more or less than a plain business proposition.

Here is the situation: The people of the United States own 99 per cent of a Territory equal in size to 10 average States of this Republic, a Territory wonderfully rich in natural resources, for the development of which railroads are a necessity.

Shall the railroads be built by the people who own the Territory and its natural resources, or shall the people turn over to private individuals the resources of the Territory as a bonus for the construction of the necessary railroads?

The advocates of this bill insist that as a plain business proposition the answer to this question must be that the people of the United States should construct the necessary railroads for the development of their own property, especially so when to act otherwise would mean that the property must remain undeveloped or else be surrendered to private individuals to be developed and exploited as they should determine.

While it has been the policy of our country in the past to give to private individuals bonuses in the form of land grants for the purpose of inducing them to engage in the construction of railroads in undeveloped countries, it is now generally agreed on all sides that the said policy resulted in a criminal waste of the people's property and in the building up of a far-reaching and gigantic monopoly of our natural resources.

The United States Government owes a duty to Alaska and to her citizens to assist in the development of that country. All agree that the assistance most needed is a railroad. Now we, as Representatives of the people of these United States, should either provide for the development of Alaska by means of Government-owned railroads or else we should permit the Guggenheims, the Morgans and their allied interests to acquire the natural resources of that country—in fact, to become the owners of the country—in order that private enterprise will construct the railroads necessary for the development of the country.

I do not know what other Members of this House may do, but I do know that I will not vote to turn over to a few vast natural resources that belong to and should be preserved for the use of all the people.

We have been told many times during the course of this debate by the opponents of the measure that Alaska has no use for railroads; that the railroads already constructed in that country are not paying and never will pay; and that the National Government will lose every dollar it will invest in the country.

The opponents of this bill argue that the proper way to treat Alaska is to take the Government's hands off of her natural resources, lease or give them to private individuals, and then this bleak, cold, barren country will suddenly become able to support railroads which private individuals, after gobbling up all of her resources, will kindly construct.

It would seem that if private enterprise will find it profitable to build the necessary railroads for the development of Alaska, in case the resources of that country should be leased, given or sold to them, that the people of the United States, being the owner of said resources, can well afford to build the necessary railroads, with every probability of the venture being a financial success, especially so since the people, through the Government, can build the road for money that will cost but 3 per cent, while individuals will use money upon which from 7 to 10 per cent will be expected.

It has long been the policy of this country to aid in the development of new territory, by giving financial assistance to private individuals who are engaged in constructing what might be called the pioneer railroad trunk lines necessary for the development of the country.

The United States Government has given more than 150,000,000 acres of public domain to private individuals for railroad construction in our western States. It is safe to state that more than $1,000,000,000 have been donated by the National, city, county and State governments for the building of the great railroads extending from the Mississippi River to the Pacific Ocean.

I stated that this bill provided for the continuance of an old policy of our Government as regards railroad construction in new territory, with this marked difference, however, that in the past the Government of the United States and the people along the right of way, after furnishing the money for the construction of railroads, kindly turned the roads, when built, over to private individuals, while under the terms of this bill, the Government having furnished the money for the construction of a railroad, will retain the ownership of the road for the benefit of all the people.

It is no disparagement of the resources of Alaska that it should be necessary for the National Government to build the railroads necessary for the development of that country. It is very doubtful if our western country, with its rolling plains, its fertile valleys, and great mineral resources, would even to this day have been developed to any great extent if the National Government, the different city, county, and State governments along the rights of way had not come forward and furnished the money needed for the construction of the necessary pioneer railroads.

There appears to be a difference of opinion as to the agricultural possibilities of this Territory. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] in his speech against this bill was rather sarcastic in his references to Alaska as an agricultural country. I desire to compliment the gentleman from Oklahoma on his speech, because it was an able one, wherein every argument or possible argument against the bill was presented with much force and skill.

No matter what the opposition to this bill may say, the fact nevertheless remains that Alaska has agricultural possibilities, and while it is true that the country may never be an exporter of agricultural products, there can be no doubt at all, judging from the reports of the United States experimental stations located in that country, and from the agricultural possibilities of other countries similarly located geographically, that Alaska will be able to produce agricultural products sufficient to support a population of at least 10,000,000 people.

Mr. Chairman, in passing this bill we are not entering upon a new policy; neither are we committing ourselves to the policy of the ownership and operation of railroads of this country by the National Government. We are simply continuing an old policy of governmental assistance in the construction of railroads for the purpose of developing a new country.

It is argued by the opponents of this measure that it will establish a precedent which will eventually lead to the Government ownership and operation of all the railroads of the United States. This argument has been the strong talking point of almost every speech made in opposition to the measure.

As a general proposition I am opposed to the Government ownership and operation of our railroads, and as I view the situation to-day I will continue to be opposed to the proposition until it is proven by a fair trial that Government supervision and control of railways is a failure.

Is it possible that the gentlemen who oppose this bill, because, as they claim, its enactment into a law will be the first step toward the ownership by the Government of all the railroads of this country, are willing to sacrifice nature's richest storehouse of natural resources, now the property of all the people, by turning it over to private individuals as the price of railroad construction in Alaska, in order that some future advocate of Government ownership of railroads will not be able to point to the Alaskan Government-owned railroad as a reason for the Government ownership of all the railroads of this country?

The question of Government ownership of railroads is not before us at this time, and when that question does come squarely before Congress for solution, a Government owned and operated railroad in Alaska may or may not be a strong argument in favor of Government ownership of railroads of the United States.

I am going to support this measure, not because I believe in a Government-owned railroad, but because it appears that rail-

roads are necessary for the development of Alaska; that private capital will not build the railroads unless we pay the price demanded, a surrender to private enterprise of the natural resources of that country; and because only through the Government building this road will it be possible for the people to continue as owners of Alaska.

Alaska, through her representative [Mr. WICKERSHAM], is here pleading for the passage of this bill. She is asking that this bill become a law, because the history of that country under the domination of the Guggenheim and Morgan syndicate is almost without a parallel in modern times. It is a history of strife, of lawlessness, of corruption, inspired by private greed, a greed that has paralyzed every effort of those who happened to be outside of the pale of the Alaskan syndicate, to develop the country, and Alaska is asking for a Government-owned railroad because she desires that her natural wealth be developed for the use of all the people of this country, and not for the benefit of the Alaskan syndicate.

The construction of an Alaskan railroad by the National Government will eventually be of great benefit to the people of the United States. Alaska even to-day, undeveloped, is of considerable commercial importance to this country. We had more trade with Alaska in 1913 than with China and many other countries, and there is every indication that with the proper railroad facilities our trade with that Territory will become an important item.

We need the coal and copper of Alaska in our industrial development. Especially do we need the coal of Alaska for the use of our Navy and our growing eastern commerce. In case of an eastern war that would require the presence of our Navy in the Pacific Ocean, Government coal mines in Alaska would mean an annual saving of millions of dollars to the Government in the cost of fuel.

Practically all the natural resources of our country outside of Alaska are held in the iron grasp of monopoly. It will be for the benefit of the people to have under the control of the General Government the coal, copper, and other mineral resources of Alaska, to be used, if necessary, in combating and destroying the gigantic monopoly that now controls the coal, iron, copper, and other natural resources of the country.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to allow myself to speculate upon the agricultural possibilities of Alaska or upon the probable value of her vast coal and copper deposits or upon the effect the passing of this bill will have upon the question of Government ownership of railroads in this country.

Suffice for me is to know that Alaska is marvelously rich in natural resources, and that the only way by which those resources can be preserved for the use and benefit of all the people is for the Government to build a railroad as provided by the terms of this bill.

Mr. O'HAIR. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, if I should vote the way I would like to on this matter, and should follow the feelings and dictates of my heart, I would vote for this bill. You can not read the history or talk with people who have come down from Alaska without feeling a great deal of admiration and sympathy for them. But I apprehend that it is not sympathy they want—it seems to be a railroad at the present time.

I have always observed that when a mining proposition, or an oil proposition, or any kind of industrial proposition is brought to you from a far-off land, a place that is inaccessible, where the prospective stockholders can not go to investigate, the greatest success in selling the stock is generally experienced. [Laughter.]

From all I can hear and from conversation with gentlemen, there are mighty few Members of this House who know anything about Alaska first-hand.

Since this matter was called up I have been seeking out those who know something about it, or said they did, and reading a few books. Every man that I have seen and every book that I have read written by men who live in Alaska booms the country. Of course they do if they live in Alaska. If I lived in Alaska, I would tell all the good things about it and I would leave untold everything that would not get votes for this railroad.

I have made up my mind, gentlemen, that if Alaska is worth enough to deserve a railroad somebody will build it, and if Alaska is as worthless as the gentleman from Oklahoma says it is nobody ought to build it. It has been true of every country on the Western Hemisphere, at least, that no place that has been worth developing has failed up to this time to have a railroad built by private enterprise.

I hear a good deal of talk about the Panama Canal and of railroads to the far West. Now, those are entirely different propositions. This is a developing proposition. It is not a proposition to build a road from here to Alaska, where we are going to begin to take out the gold, coal, oil, reindeer, and the polar bears. This is not a proposition to build a railroad over barren wastes, impassable swamps, or bleak mountain passes, but it is a proposition to build a railroad of 700 miles from somewhere on the coast to the interior of Alaska for the purpose of developing more than a half million square miles of land. That is the proposition pure and simple.

The Government dug the Panama Canal not for the purpose of developing swamps and tropical jungles on the Isthmus of Panama but for the purpose of enabling the commerce from everywhere to be transported through this barren waste to the ports and markets of everywhere.

The proposition is world-wide and world developing. It was necessary for the Government to build the canal, because the project was so uncertain and stupendous that no private enterprise would ever be organized on a large enough scale to accomplish the undertaking.

The Government donated vast areas of land to private enterprises in order to induce them to construct overland routes across the great western deserts to the Pacific coast, and those transactions have been a subject of scandal for the past generation; but those enormous grants and gifts were not made for the purpose of developing any country, they were made for the purpose of constructing lines of communication across vast sweeps of worthless desert in order to reach a country which was worth developing. No one ever supposed that the Government was willing to contribute or did contribute to the construction of railroads for developing the far Western States—that was accomplished by private enterprise, for the simple reason that those States were worth developing. I have never known of a project for the development of any valuable natural resources that was not eagerly sought by investors.

Whenever the Government goes into the business of building railroads for the purpose of developing parts of our country it will inevitably be called upon to take over other enterprises, such as the mining of coal, the Government ownership of irrigation, the Government ownership of manufacturing enterprises, and then Government ownership will reach a condition of complete centralization. No other condition on the face of the earth can so effectually and completely break down individual liberty as a centralized Government, with all business matters under its ownership; and until I become convinced that the philosophy of the Socialist is correct I shall never cast a vote in favor of the Government going into any business of a commercial character or nature. It is repugnant to our form of government. The true function of constitutional government is to enact just laws and to fairly and impartially administer them. Let the citizens own and manage the wealth of the Nation and let a just and righteous Government, honestly administered, compel an honest accounting of that guardianship; in other words, the Government should never lose control over any commodities, products, or resources under its jurisdiction for the purpose of enforcing a square deal. It is only within the last few years that the people of this country have awakened to the fact that this Government can and must and will control the railroads, the telegraph, the telephone, the express companies, the trusts, combines, and monopolies.

Alaska has to-day about 35,000 white people and 30,000 natives. It covers an area of about 590,000 square miles. There are about 20 sections of land in Alaska for each of the men, women, and children of the white race. In the last 10 years Alaska has produced about $200,000,000 worth of gold and about $200,000,000 worth of fish and seal furs. There are about 26,000 miles of seashore, including islands and inlets, and the navigable streams furnish about 3,000 more miles of water frontage in Alaska. Most of the land available for agricultural purposes is near the seashore and along the rivers. Lack of railroads can not be said to have retarded the growth of the population along the shores of the ocean and the rivers, and yet there is about 1 mile of frontage for every white person in Alaska along her navigable waters. You might build 10,000 miles of railroad in Alaska, but you would not improve the facilities provided by nature for transportation along her navigable front. The Government has done wrong, criminally wrong, in withdrawing the great coal fields and forests of Alaska from entry and virtually locking up the resources of that great rich country.

I do not believe the charge that this country is a barren waste. I do not believe the assertion that Alaska can not be made profitable as an agricultural country. The evidence is too convincing for me not to believe that this country, when proper laws are put into effect, will become a great mining country, with vast resources from its agricultural products, and capable of feeding millions of people. Under the conditions that exist to-day, if you were to string Alaska with lines of roads as thick

as they are in Illinois, you could not transport 1 pound of coal; you could not get a stick off of the timber reservations.

The railroad is not needed to bring the fish and seal furs out of the country, because these products are already on the ocean front, and it surely would not appeal to the business sense of anybody to build a railroad at an expense of $40,000,000 to haul the gold out of Alaska. If a railroad were built as is proposed by this bill, it would serve only about 10,000 to 15,000 people; so the proposition resolves itself into an investment of at least $1,000 for each white person in the Alaskan Territory in order to build 700 miles of railroad; and those who say the country would settle up and a great many more people would go there by the building of this railroad have not a peg to stand on, when it is shown that those miles of ocean frontage and river bottom lands fronting on navigable streams are more accessible to-day and always have been than the interior would be with unlimited railroads. The most level and most fertile part of Alaska lies along its coast line and along its rivers, yet every white citizen living in Alaska could go fishing on a navigable shore and have no person to disturb his solitude within 1 mile of him, unless it were a native that he took along with him to cut bait. Now, there is something wrong with Alaska, and before I vote to spend $40,000,000 of the people's money on a questionable venture I intend that the promoters of this scheme shall prove their case to the satisfaction of reasonable men. We have spent $400,000,000 digging the Panama Canal, and I think the Panama Canal is all right, but I would rather have had $400,000,000 spent on internal improvements for the benefit of the "folks at home." It is very high sounding to talk about digging canals and spending great quantities of money for the benefit of the world, but I think the time has come in this country when it is the duty of every man who has an official position to bend his energies to caring for the welfare of Americans first.

It is a good deal like a man who buys his wife a piano when she needs a cook stove. The piano is all right, but unless you can afford both the cook stove should be bought first. So the proposition to build an Alaskan railroad is all right if we had plenty of money to first improve our public highways, to enlarge and deepen our rivers, lakes, and harbors, to promote irrigation, and to establish Government hygienic conditions for both man and beast.

I would rather know how to prevent hog cholera than to have a railroad stretched clear from the Pacific Ocean across Alaska to the North Pole, and yet we are having trouble in getting an appropriation of one-half million dollars to find out how to prevent and cure hog cholera. The loss to the farmers for each year from hog cholera is approximately $100,000,000. Forty million dollars will build 8,000 miles of fine macadam highway in the United States. This highway, extending across the continent almost three times, would pass in front of the doors of from 20,000,000 to 30,000,000 people. Which would you rather have, the railroad in Alaska, so far away that no one of us and probably few of our children will ever see it or use it, or 8,000 miles of macadam highway at the very threshold of one-third of our people?

It is the same old proposition. Some of the Members of this House are like a great many people who hear a glittering tale for the first time. They are willing to spend their money like a lord on something that is shrouded in mystery, and especially are they willing to spend it when it is somebody else's money. I never voted to spend one cent of American money away from America. I do not think I ever have in private or public life voted against spending American money in developing and promoting internal resources and internal improvements. The people who pay the bill are entitled to the benefit and not the world or somebody away off in an inaccessible territory.

Alaska will never be developd by building a railroad; but if you will give Alaska a chance by repealing obnoxious, selfish, paternalistic, restrictive laws that now throttle and fetter her, there is no doubt in the world but that she will take care of herself, and the goddess of Alaskan prosperity and the spirit of Alaskan progress will unfurl their banners to the Arctic breezes and inscribe a declaration of commercial independence by the light of the Aurora Borealis.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, a week ago I spoke upon this bill at some length and do not therefore desire at this time to trespass at any great length upon the patience of the committee.

There seems to be general agreement that if there are sufficient resources in Alaska to support permanently a considerable population of home builders it is wise to open this great empire and develop those resources. The first step in the opening of any country to settlement and development is the establishment of adequate means of transportation; that is, by the construction of railroads.

It is evident that private capital will not be invested in railroad building in Alaska unless the owners of that capital are given such opportunities for profit and such control over the resources of that country as seriously to interfere with the rights of the present owners, the people of the United States.

Alaska must not be turned over to exploitation by private special interests. Therefore, if railroads are to be built and the rights of the people of the United States still preserved, those railroads must be constructed and operated by the Government; there is no other logical conclusion to these premises.

But whether the Government of the United States or any other entity should build railroads in Alaska depends upon the resources and possibilities for development of that country; if these resources and possibilities are shown to exist, the necessity for Government action in the construction of a railroad for the development of its own property and the benefit of the people of the United States is perfectly clear. The important question to be determined, therefore, is, What are the facts as to the resources and opportunities for development in Alaska?

Consequently I desire to submit some further observations, as the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] would say, upon the question of the resources of Alaska, and I therefore, because of lack of time, ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD upon that subject.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, under the leave just granted I submit certain additional facts as to the resources of Alaska. As to the great value of the minerals, fisheries, and furs of this mighty Territory there can be no doubt.

On an investment of $7,200,000 Alaska has given us in return since 1867 (and by far the greater portion since 1899, 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

A faint idea of what Alaska may be expected to do when it shall have adequate means of transportation is given by the following table:

Value of articles shipped to the United States in 1912.

Copper, ore and matte	$4,904,715
Fish:	
Salmon, canned	15,551,794
Salmon, all other	907,242
All other fish and fish products	589,529
Fish fertilizers	41,662
Fish and whale oil	283,339
Furs	728,554
Gypsum	129,375
Marble	77,159
Tin, ore and concentrates	90,831
Whalebone	18,012
Other merchandise	1,000,261
Gold and silver	16,031,705
Total	40,354,178

Some doubt has been expressed during this debate as to the possibilities of stock raising in this far northwestern country. On this point the annual report of the Alaska agricultural experiment station for 1910 says:

Cattle, horses, hogs, sheep, and angora goats can be raised nearly or quite as well in Alaska as in other of the most northern countries. Theoretically the Galloway cattle are specially well adapted to this climate, but nearly all the well-known breeds have now been produced here: Herefords, Durhams, Ayrshires, Holsteins, and Jerseys grow as rapidly and mature as quickly as in other countries. What are not to be kept for milk are usually killed from October to December, after they are yearlings, so they are fed silage or hay only one winter. They can then be made to dress from 500 to 600 pounds each. The heifers are nearly or quite full grown and giving milk frequently before they are actually 2 years old. All the pure breeds and those of mixed breeding apparently do as well in Alaska as elsewhere.

Comparatively few colts have yet been raised here, but enough to prove conclusively that they grow quickly, are perfectly healthy, very hardy, and make as large and as valuable horses as could have been produced from the same stock farther south. Horses can be raised much more cheaply than would be generally supposed. Pasturing is still so abundant it costs practically nothing, and food and shelter for colts and young horses are actually needed only a very small portion of the time, some winters scarcely at all. Horses have repeatedly wintered well with little or no care where no other domestic animal would have survived.

That the introduction of the reindeer into Alaska has wrought wonders and that this branch of stock raising possesses immense possibilities is shown by the following from a recent report of Dr. Sheldon Jackson:

In Lapland (on an area of 14,000 square miles) there are about 400,000 head of reindeer, sustaining in comfort some 26,000 people. There is no reason why Arctic and sub-Arctic Alaska should not sustain a population of 100,000 people with 2,000,000 head of reindeer.

Lapland sends to market about 22,000 head of reindeer a year, the surplus of her herds, which, at an average weight per carcass, dressed, of about 150 pounds, is equal to 1,660 tons. As this is a surplus over and above the wants of the population, the value of this industry in the near future as a source of meat supply from lands otherwise comparatively valueless for other purposes becomes apparent. The present herds are nearly all located on the western coast from the Kuskokwim to Point Barrow, a distance of some 800 miles, but in the near future this industry will extend over the entire Alaska Peninsula and many northern localities not yet occupied. Those best acquainted with surrounding conditions estimate that Alaska has grazing grounds sufficient to support from 10,000,000 to 20,000,000 head of stock.

On this interesting subject the New York Independent of February 2, 1914, states that—

Fifty thousand thrifty reindeer are already grazing on Alaskan wilderness pastures as contentedly as if their ancestral home had been there. They are, however, the quite recent descendants of some 15 or 20 animals that were imported from Siberia about 20 years ago by way of experiment. It was a good day for the north when the fathers of the flock first landed. Never has any animal done more for man or more remarkably accomplished a country's material salvation.

The native peoples of the Alaskan coast country were in a bad way before their animal benefactors came to help them, and were eking out a very poor existence. There was nothing in the way of a permanent industry to keep them profitably busy, and the food supply was very often dangerously near the vanishing point. Dr. Sheldon Jackson, a missionary working among them, conceived the idea of importing from Siberia a few head of reindeer, which were giving the people of that country, under similar natural conditions, both work and food. Shortly afterwards the United States Government took up the experiment, and now all the reindeer herds in Alaska are under Government control. They are let out on favorable terms to the native herders, and already the profits have been 300 per cent on the original investment.

There is no fear of starvation in Alaska now, as once there was, for the reindeer gives an unfailing supply of meat and milk. Its skin makes a warm and serviceable clothing. And the responsibility of taking care of the herds has developed the natives from rather shiftless hunters and trappers into men of regular and thrifty habits.

Concerning the agricultural possibilities of this great peninsula, Mr. Seth Mann, from whose report the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] very properly quoted, says:

The Government agricultural stations in various parts of Alaska have demonstrated many of the agricultural possibilities of the respective regions where they are located; and in the neighborhood of Fairbanks there are a number of commercial farms and gardens which are operated at a profit and which supply the needs of the city of Fairbanks and the neighborhood and also the demands of the steamer traffic. Excellent strawberries are grown, and vegetables are raised without difficulty. The growing of various grains is as yet largely in the experimental stage. But crops of wheat, oats, barley, and rye are matured on the Government farms.

The summer season is short for the maturing of wheat, but there is much less difficulty with the other grains mentioned. Some hay is cut by individual farmers. The interior of Alaska is more favorable for agricultural purposes than the regions along the coast since there is more sunshine in the interior and more cloudy and rainy days upon the coast. However, the city of Juneau is supplied with vegetables from local farms situated from 1 to 12 miles away from the town. It does not appear that Alaska will ever export the products of agriculture, but it seems fair to assume with the growth of population which will result from the building of railroads, roads, and trails and the development of the mineral resources of the Territory that larger areas of arable lands will be brought under cultivation, and that the needs of the people of Alaska will be supplied from its own fields.

Relative to fruit-growing the report of the Alaska agricultural experiment stations has this to say:

Fortunately for Alaska there are some fruits which do well here. The currant and gooseberry and the raspberry thrive and fruit as well as anywhere on earth. The currant and the gooseberry are both indigenous to Alaska. The red currant is found more or less abundantly in the mountain valleys throughout the Coast Range. It is particularly abundant in Kenai Peninsula, where the writer has seen large bushes loaded with fruit, which was much appreciated by the bears, as evidenced by their tracks and their voidings. A dwarf red raspberry grows abundantly in the interior valleys and on the lower slopes of the hills as far north as the Arctic Circle. The writer once was a member of a party of berry pickers less than a degree from the Arctic Circle, and the raspberry was the most abundant fruit. Alaska has other berries equally good. The blueberry of the interior is so abundant in places that the slopes look blue at a distance, and the native cranberry is also found in low, moss-grown thickets in the interior and in the swamps in the coast region.

Another recent report makes the following statement with reference to the growing of vegetables:

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, kohl-rabi, 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.

If further evidence were necessary to prove the real agricultural value of this wonderland of wealth, the following from the report of the Alaska Railroad Commission would seem to be conclusive:

* * * Of the agricultural importance of the Tanana Valley there can be no question. The district can not be expected to raise products which will be valuable for export, at least under conditions which can now be foreseen. It should, however, become in part self-supporting by raising a large amount of the food material now imported from outside. Though cattle raising has not been carried on to any extent, yet it is probable that this can be successfully done in competition with meat brought in from the States. The snowfall is, however, heavier than in the upper White River Valley, and some winter feeding would be necessary. Whatever experience may show in regard to raising cattle, there should be no question that a local dairy industry could be developed.

* * * It may be said that the Susitna, lower Tanana, and upper Kuskokwim Basins contain farming and grazing lands unrivaled in extent and fertility in Alaska, and which in time to come may furnish a food supply for export.

* * * * * * *

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.

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Chairman, if no other gentleman desires to speak, I want to use but a moment and to ask, incidentally, permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVENPORT. The reason I do that, Mr. Chairman, is because during the debate a number of gentlemen have seen fit to criticize in a way that I know they did not mean any harm by; but, at the same time, a greater portion of their argument is directed against the Guggenheims, and my congenial friend from Alaska [Mr. WICKERSHAM] and I engaged in several colloquies during the delivery of his speech on that proposition.

Now, I know there is nobody in this House who is going to be offended in one way or another. If it had not been for the fact that Oklahoma exists and that my colleague [Mr. FERRIS] and I are from Oklahoma, and that the Guggenheim firms exist, a great portion of this argument would never have been in this RECORD.

But what I am trying to say is—so that my genial friend will know—is that he did not think in 1908 that the Guggenheims were so bad, because he was willing to serve them in the capacity of their attorney. And I wanted to state that while Mr. WICKERSHAM is here, because he has occupied prominent positions in Alaska, and after he had lived there he solicited employment from Mr. Birch for the allied interests.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I deny that proposition.

Mr. DAVENPORT. All right. I will read the correspondence.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Wait a moment. Your statement was that I "solicited employment."

Mr. DAVENPORT. He submitted a proposition as to what he would work for them for, and in the bottom of the letter he asked where Mr. Jarvis was. He sent his regards to Jarvis in the Birch letter, and when he decided to run for Congress he wired Jarvis that he desired to run for Congress, and asked where Birch was. I want to be fair. But in 1908 he did not think the Guggenheims were as bad as they are now.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Have you the original papers?

Mr. DAVENPORT. No. I have a letter from Birch saying that the copy is an exact copy of the letter.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DAVENPORT] seems to be intimately associated with the Guggenheims just at this time in his correspondence.

Mr. DAVENPORT. I never saw any one of the Guggenheims but Senator Guggenheim, in the Sixtieth Congress, and I never saw Birch. But when the gentleman said what he did, I immediately got busy and did write to Mr. Birch, at New York, and asked him if it was a fact, because a gentleman in this House, whose reputation is good, said it was a fact. And I present a copy of the letter, which I will read:

JAMES WICKERSHAM,
ATTORNEY AT LAW,
Fairbanks, Alaska, April 8, 1908.

STEPHEN BIRCH, Esq.,
Seattle, Wash.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. You ought to read the other letter.

Mr. DAVENPORT. I will read Birch's letter in reply to mine.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Have you not the letter that was written to me first?

Mr. DAVENPORT. No, sir.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Then you have not the correspondence?

Mr. DAVENPORT. I have a copy of Mr. WICKERSHAM's letter that he wrote, and knows that he wrote, and which he does not deny.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. You ought to make a complete statement by reading both letters.

Mr. DAVENPORT. I will make a complete statement, and I do not wish to misrepresent the gentleman, either. I wanted the gentleman to be present, so that if it was not true he could deny it; for if the Guggenheim representatives were as bad as he had pictured them, I might think they put up a job on me. I wanted to know whether it was true or not. The letter says:

MY DEAR MR. BIRCH: Your letter of March 17 has been received, and I hasten my answer that it may catch the last mail out over the ice.

I regret that I can not meet you in Seattle the latter part of this month, because one can make one's ideas plainer in conversation than by writing, but since the opening of the April term of courts prevents it, I shall briefly state the matter by letter.

I have entered upon the practice of law here, and represent some of the most important interests in the Territory, and the outlook for returns is satisfactory; still I long for the fleshpots of the "outside," and would accept an offer from your allied Alaska interests to act as their general counsel, but not in any subordinate capacity. I will accept a three years' contract at $15,000 per annum with offices in Seattle and office force and maintenance. Upon that sort of arrangement I would devote my time exclusively to their interests and give them the best service possible. My opportunities here, however, are so good that I could not afford to give them up for less than a three years' contract with you.

Please advise me by wire if anything is done in connection with this offer and it may be thus arranged.

Remember me kindly to Capt. Jarvis.

Very truly,

JAMES WICKERSHAM.

And then, on June 23, 1908, this message was sent by the gentleman from Alaska:

[Telegram.]

SIGNAL CORPS, UNITED STATES ARMY,
Fairbanks, Alaska, June 23, 1908.

Capt. D. H. JARVIS,
Northwestern Steamship Co., Seattle, Wash.:
I intend to run for Congress. Where is Birch?

JAMES WICKERSHAM.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Now, what of it?

Mr. DAVENPORT. I simply offer it to show that he did not think the Guggenheims were so bad in 1908. Mr. WICKERSHAM had gone off the Federal bench January 2, 1908, and on April 8 this correspondence was going on. That is all I care to say.

The CHAIRMAN. The Delegate from Alaska [Mr. WICKERSHAM] is recognized.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Now, Mr. Chairman, the letter which the gentleman has read is a correct copy of a letter that I wrote. I wrote it in answer to a letter which was written to me by Mr. Birch, and if Mr. Birch or the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DAVENPORT] had desired to be fair, either with me or with the House, they would have put both letters in the RECORD, because then it would have been easily discovered——

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Chairman, I stated to the gentleman that I did not have his letter.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Certainly; the gentleman did not have it, or he would have put it in, I suppose. But if the gentleman had been as anxious to be as fair with me as with the Guggenheims he would have got the other letter.

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Chairman, I was just as anxious as the gentleman. After I had made my speech the gentleman howled "Government or Guggenheim," and that is why I sought the investigation.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes; that is correct, and I howl again; and I say now that the demonstration that the gentleman has made here exhibits the power of the Guggenheims on this floor to do things which are wrong.

Mr. DAVENPORT. I have never seen the Guggenheims, and the gentleman knows it.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Oh, the gentleman has had a great deal of correspondence with them lately.

Mr. DAVENPORT. No; I have not had any.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Not at all. If that correspondence was properly published down in the gentleman's district, he would have a lot of trouble about it.

Mr. DAVENPORT. I will say, Mr. Chairman, on this floor that I wrote this letter and got this reply. The gentleman's statement is unfounded. He can make any statement he wants to down there in my district and in Alaska in regard to me, and I can stand on my record at home and abroad just as well as he can.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The gentleman has not read the letter that he has that he wrote to the Morgans.

Mr. DAVENPORT. The Morgan letter was published in the Senate, but that was not the Guggenheims'. Senator LIPPITT used the letter over there.

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 (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, and had come to no resolution thereon.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH, by unanimous consent, was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Edmund Buck, H. R. 26854, Sixty-second Congress, and James M. Fink, H. R. 24215, Sixty-second Congress, no adverse reports having been made thereon.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. ASHBROOK, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 10084. An act to authorize the changing of the names of the steamships *Buckman* and *Watson*.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BAILEY, for 10 days, on account of important business.

To Mr. SHARP, indefinitely, on account of serious illness in his family.

To Mr. FOSTER, indefinitely, on account of service on the committee investigating the Colorado mining strike.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE BREMNER, OF NEW JERSEY.

Mr. HAMILL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAMILL] offers a privileged resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 400.

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. ROBERT GUNN BREMNER, a Representative from the State of New Jersey.

Resolved, That a committee of the House, with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions, and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was unanimously agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as the committee on the part of the House the following gentlemen:

Mr. HAMILL, Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey, Mr. SCULLY, Mr. TUTTLE, Mr. MCCOY, Mr. TOWNSEND, Mr. HART, Mr. BAKER, Mr. WALSH, Mr. EAGAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. ASHBROOK, Mr. BROWNING, Mr. CARY, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. WALLIN, Mr. WINSLOW, Mr. KEISTER, Mr. BROUSSARD, and Mr. FESS.

ADJOURNMENT.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect this House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was unanimously agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, February 6, 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 Secretary of Commerce, transmitting draft of a bill to include in the class of employees now entitled to the workmen's compensation act employees of the Coast and Geodetic Survey of the Department of Commerce (H. Doc. No. 708); to the Committee on Labor and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, submitting an increase of estimate of appropriation under the head of "Contingent expenses, Treasury Department: Miscellaneous items" (H. Doc. No. 709); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting findings of fact and conclusions of law in the French spoliation claims, relating to the brigantine *Resolution*

in the case of Thomas H. Simes, administrator of the estate of Edward Catts, *v.* The United States, and in other cases (S. Doc. No. 396); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting findings of fact and conclusions of law in the French spoliation claims, relating to the brig *Hiram*, in the case of George F. Chace, administrator of Stephen Chace, *v.* The United States, and in other cases (S. Doc. No. 395); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting findings of fact and conclusions of law in the French spoliation claims, relating to the brig *Dove*, in the case of Joseph Ogden, executor of Jane Ann Ferrers, *v.* The United States, and in other cases (S. Doc. No. 394); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

6. A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting findings of fact and conclusions of law in the French spoliation claims, relating to the schooner *Thomas*, in the case of Joseph Ogden, executor of Jane Ann Ferrers, *v.* The United States, and in other cases (S. Doc. No. 393); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

7. A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting findings of fact and conclusions of law in the French spoliation claims, relating to the brig *Mermaid*, in the case of the President and the Directors of the Insurance Co. of North America *v.* The United States, and in other cases (S. Doc. No. 392); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

8. A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting findings of fact and conclusions of law in the French spoliation claims, relating to the schooner *Hunter*, in the case of Harry R. Virgin, administrator of Rufus Horton, surviving partner of the firm of John & Rufus Horton, *v.* The United States, and in other cases (S. Doc. No. 397); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6831) to quiet title to lot 5, section 33, township 14, range 18 east, Noxubee County, Miss., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 222), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 1346) to authorize the Eastern Maine Railroad to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge without a draw across the Penobscot River between the cities of Bangor and Brewer, in the State of Maine, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 221), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LINTHICUM, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to which was referred the resolution (H. J. Res. 209) authorizing the President to extend invitations to foreign Governments to participate, through their accredited diplomatic agents to the United States, in the National Star-Spangled Banner Centennial Celebration, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 223), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 6114) granting a pension to J. F. Mercer; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 8584) granting a pension to Hattie Dannells; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 8465) granting a pension to Lydia W. Wolgamot; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 11650) granting a pension to Christina Whitcome; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 11410) granting an increase of pension to Peter Risban; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 11999) granting a pension to Melissa A. Hawley; Committee on Pensions discharged, and 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. SMITH of Texas: A bill (H. R. 12996) to provide for a public building at Ballinger, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12997) to provide for a public building at Pecos, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia): A bill (H. R. 12998) to provide for an investigation of the collection and disposal of city wastes in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia): A bill (H. R. 12999) to authorize the construction and operation of a municipal asphalt plant in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia: A bill (H. R. 13000) to provide for the construction of a viaduct and bridge to carry Benning Road over the tracks of the Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad Co., and of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia): A bill (H. R. 13001) to provide a park in the northeast section of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BALTZ: A bill (H. R. 13002) to prevent the transportation by interstate carriers of certain persons and articles for the alleged prevention of so-called labor troubles; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 13003) to provide for furnishing the pupils of the high schools of the District of Columbia with free textbooks; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BROWN of New York: A bill (H. R. 13004) for a survey of Hempstead Harbor, N. Y.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. FLOOD of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 13005) to give effect to the provisions of a treaty between the United States and Great Britain concerning the fisheries in waters contiguous to the United States and the Dominion of Canada, signed at Washington on April 1, 1908, and ratified by the United States Senate April 13, 1908; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROUSSARD: A bill (H. R. 13039) to amend the act of August 30, 1890; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ADAMSON: A bill (H. R. 13040) to regulate the importation of viruses, serums, toxins, and analogous products, to regulate interstate traffic in said articles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEY of Ohio: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 216) remitting taxes on Oldroyd collection of Lincoln relics; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HARDY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 217) to convey the thanks of Congress to the captain of the American steamer *Kroonland*, of the Red Star Line, and through him to the officers and crew of said steamer, for the prompt and heroic service rendered by them in rescuing 89 lives from the burning steamer *Volturno* in the North Atlantic Ocean; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FINLEY: Memorial from the Legislature of South Carolina, favoring immediate action for repeal of the fifteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CANTRILL: A bill (H. R. 13006) granting a pension to John T. Holton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13007) granting an increase of pension to Jerome Bonaparte Secrest; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLINE: A bill (H. R. 13008) granting an increase of pension to William Zegenfus; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COX: A bill (H. R. 13009) granting an increase of pension to William H. Harper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13010) granting a pension to Ernest McFadden; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DALE: A bill (H. R. 13011) granting a pension to Ida Rauch; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13012) granting an increase of pension to Michael Holland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DIES: A bill (H. R. 13013) for the relief of the heirs of Ann Frisby; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13014) for the relief of the legal representatives of Rosanna Dischinger, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. EDMONDS: A bill (H. R. 13015) to place the name of Alexander W. Selfridge upon the unlimited retired list of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13016) to place the name of W. K. Heath upon the unlimited retired list of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FESS: A bill (H. R. 13017) granting a pension to Carrie Trump; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13018) granting an increase of pension to George A. Orebaugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMMOND: A bill (H. R. 13019) to give the Court of Claims jurisdiction in the matter of the petition of Charles J. Wright and others; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 13020) granting an increase of pension to William H. Abbott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 13021) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Jennings; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: A bill (H. R. 13022) granting an increase of pension to Webster Benner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 13023) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Irwin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PETERS of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 13024) for the relief of the Bates & Guild Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REILLY of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 13025) granting an increase of pension to Catherine McEnerney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCULLY: A bill (H. R. 13026) granting an increase of pension to John McGuire; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. J. M. C. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 13027) granting a pension to Lyman Mosier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 13028) for the relief of Joseph Cameron; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: A bill (H. R. 13029) for the relief of John L. Maile; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 13030) granting an increase of pension to William F. Mosier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWITZER: A bill (H. R. 13031) granting a pension to D. H. Darling; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13032) granting a pension to William Defoe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THACHER: A bill (H. R. 13033) granting a pension to Peter Black; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13034) granting a pension to Maurice Downey; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13035) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Jenney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13036) granting a pension to Charles W. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TUTTLE: A bill (H. R. 13037) for the relief of G. D. Campbell & Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13038) for the relief of the Campbell Lumber Co. (Ltd.); to the Committee on Claims.

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 citizens of East St. Louis, Ill., protesting against the "One hundred years of peace celebration"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), petition of a committee of Grand Lodge, Order Sons of Italy, protesting against the passage of bills restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also (by request), memorial of citizens of New York City, protesting against the passage of bills restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of A. E. Westbrook and 11 other citizens of Ashley, Ohio, favoring the passage of House bill 5308, relative to mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of Frank Knauber and 54 other citizens of Newark, Ohio, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRYAN: Memorial of the Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Pacific Coast, favoring an appropriation for Alaska's participation in the Panama Exposition; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of John Louis Camp, No. 13, United Spanish War Veterans, relative to the rank and title of major general for Thomas McArthur Anderson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States, Commandery of the State of Washington, favoring the passage of the Sherwood bill (H. R. 1946); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CALDER: Petition of Societa Cittadini Padulesi di Mutuv Soccorso, of Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against the passage of bills restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DALE: Memorial of the New York Wholesale Grocers' Association, relative to the right of the manufacturers to make the resale price on goods; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Switchmen's Union, of Buffalo, N. Y., favoring the passage of House bill 1873, the anti-injunction bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the National Association of Clothiers of New York City, protesting against the passage of the Bartlett-Bacon anti-injunction bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of the Gorham Co. and Samstug & Hilder Bros., of New York City, favoring the passage of the Ransdell-Humphrey bill, for flood control; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. DANFORTH: Petition of the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor, of Alabama, N. Y., favoring legislation relative to United States attorneys in private practice of law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor, of Alabama, N. Y., favoring legislation prohibiting interstate transmission of racing and betting odds and affecting the opium trade; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor of Alabama, N. Y., favoring legislation relative to Sunday rest in the District of Columbia and relative to prostitution in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor of Alabama, N. Y., favoring legislation preventing sale of liquors in Hawaii; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, petition of the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor of Alabama, N. Y., protesting against Sunday work in post offices; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor of Alabama, N. Y., favoring legislation prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquors in buildings used by the United States and favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DYER: Petition of the National Association of Assistant Postmasters, relative to House bill 12473; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the National Association of Clothiers, against House bill 1873; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Switchmen's Union, favoring House bill 1873; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of the Switchmen's Union of Buffalo, N. Y., favoring the passage of the Bartlett-Bacon anti-injunction bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the National Association of Clothiers of New York City, protesting against the passage of the Bartlett-Bacon anti-injunction bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution of the executive board of the Wisconsin State Union of the American Society of Equity, protesting against all bills which strive to define more clearly the Sherman Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRANCIS: Petition of the business men of the sixteenth district of Ohio, favoring House bill 5308; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Petitions of the Benefit Society Vorwarts and sundry citizens of Roscoe, Pa., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAMMOND: Petition of the Arbeiter Unterstuetzung Verein, of New Ulm, Minn., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Memorial of General Knox Branch of the American Continental League, of Providence, R. I., protesting against the "One hundred years of peace celebration"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska: Petition of sundry citizens of Cozad, Nebr., favoring the passage of the Lindquist pure fabric and leather bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LIEB: Memorial of the German Maennerchor of Evansville, Ind., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of the Switchmen's Union of North America, of Buffalo, N. Y., favoring the passage of the Bartlett-Bacon anti-injunction bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. J. I. NOLAN: Petitions of the San Francisco Typographical Union, No. 21, of San Francisco, Cal., and five other labor organizations in the city of San Francisco, in behalf of the passage of the seamen's bill (S. 136); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Petitions of organizations of Providence, R. I., protesting against the passage of bills restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the General Knox Branch of the American Continental League, of Providence, R. I., protesting against the "One hundred years of peace celebration"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of F. R. Reynolds, of Providence, R. I., favoring the passage of House bill 29, relative to eight hours a day for women in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. REILLY of Connecticut: Petition of Polish citizens of Wallingford, Conn., and Independent Musiker Association, of New Haven, Conn., against House bill 6060; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petition of members of the German-American Alliance of Middlesex County, N. J., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the National Association of Assistant Postmasters, relative to the dismissal of assistant postmasters; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the National Association of Clothiers, of New York City, protesting against the passage of the Bartlett-Bacon anti-injunction bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of members of the German-American Alliance, and Adam Vogel and John Fee, jr., all of Middlesex County, N. J., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. J. M. C. SMITH: Petition of A. S. Williams Post, No. 40, of Charlotte, Mich., and Lewis Clark Post, No. 2757, of Olivet, Mich., protesting against any change in the American flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the National Association of Clothiers, favoring the passage of the pure fabric bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, papers to accompany a bill (H. R. 7868) for the relief of Rose G. Houchen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, memorial of the Retail Jewelers' Association of Irving, Mich., protesting against guaranty of gold-filled watchcases; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Petition of citizens of Los Angeles, Cal., against House bill 9674; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of the California State Federation of Labor, favoring Bryan-Poindexter bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of California, against excluding the Menace from the mails; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of Alaska Fishermen's Union; San Francisco Typographical Union, No. 21; and Elevator Constructors' Union, No. 18, favoring seamen's bill; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of the Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Pacific Coast, favoring an appropriation for participation by Alaska in the Panama-Pacific Exposition; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petitions of citizens of Los Angeles, Cal., favoring House bill 5139; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of George H. Dunlap, of Los Angeles, Cal., against House bill 5139; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of the Polish Citizen's Club of Los Angeles, Cal., against House bill 6060; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the German-American Alliance, of San Diego, Cal., and Concordia Turnverein, of San Diego, Cal., against House joint resolution 168; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THACHER: Petition of John Russell, commodore Plymouth Yacht Club, of Plymouth, Mass., relative to deepening, etc., of the Government Basin near the wharves in Plymouth (Mass.) Harbor; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of the Boston Fish Bureau, protesting against the passage of the McKellar cold-storage bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TRIBBLE: Petition of J. E. McGee and other citizens, protesting against oil mills operating cotton gins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Petition of Mrs. Elizabeth Grass, of Fargo, N. Dak., favoring increase of pension for Army nurses of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, *February 6, 1914.*

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, breathe upon us the gentle and refining influence of Thy holy spirit. In the midst of all conflict of interest and clash of opinion may we be enabled to keep the unity of spirit in the bond of peace. Grant us that grace of heart and life upon which a true foundation of manhood may be builded. Give to us the spirit that creates and seals forever the blessed bonds of friendship. Give to us passionate, ardent patriotism, that our lives may be given, may be consumed, in the interest of the great commission that Thou hast committed to our hands. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

THE UNITED STATES STEEL CORPORATION.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Interstate Commerce Commission acknowledging the receipt of the resolution of the 2d instant, relative to an examination and inquiry for the purpose of ascertaining whether the United States Steel Corporation or any of its subsidiaries has been guilty of giving or receiving any unlawful rebates, offsets, or preferences, especially within the last six years, etc., and stating that the resolution will receive prompt attention, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 107) relating to supervision of the Lincoln Memorial.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 832) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (S. 833) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (S. 834) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 9574. An act 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; and

H. R. 10084. An act to authorize the changing of the names of the steamships *Buckman* and *Watson*.