George H. Hart, Nauvoo.
John E. Hayes, North Chicago.
N. J. Highsmith, Robinson.
Thomas J. Hopkins, Wenona.
O. H. Johnson, Bowen.
T. J. Kelly, Seneca.
H. M. Levering, Petersburg.
T. B. Lyons, Winchester.
Marion L. McCandless, Pinckneyville.
Sarah McGinnis, Shabbona.
J. O. Morris, Forrest.
Charles E. Nicodemus, Forreston.
Max H. Prill, Centralia.
John F. Quinn, Joliet.
Louis W. Richter, Melrose Park.
Rolla L. Russell, Princeton.
Charles J. Schmitt, Meredosia.
J. M. Sheets, Oblong.
Robert Sherrard, Oak Park.
H. Bruce Shroyer, New Windsor.
James H. Spiker, Bushnell.
John J. Sweeney, Springvalley.
Thomas J. Walsh, McHenry.
John E. Wyatt, White Hall.

NEW JERSEY.

S. Dana Ely, Rutherford.
Richard F. White, Perth Amboy.

OHIO.

Sherman A. Murry, Washington Court House.
Harry E. Rice, Xenia.

WEST VIRGINIA.

S. C. Young, Charles Town.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, *January 10, 1916.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

O Lord our God and our Father, whose blessings are beyond compare, "Thou openest Thine hand and satisfiest the desire of every living thing." The world is large enough and fruitful enough for all. Thou hast taught us how to live together in peace and harmony, but "man's inhumanity to man makes countless thousands mourn." Hasten the day when man's humanity to man shall make countless millions glad. Heaven is ours now, but we make it hell by selfish ambitions, greed, and unholy desires. Forgive us our sins, we beseech Thee, and inspire us to the higher and nobler life in Christ Jesus our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, January 8, 1916, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

S. 52. An act to provide for a commission to codify and suggest amendments to the general mining laws; and

S. 2519. An act to encourage the reclamation of certain arid lands in the State of Nevada, and for other purposes.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate joint resolution was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. J. Res. 51. Joint resolution appropriating money for the payment of certain claims on account of labor, supplies, materials, and cash furnished in the construction of the Corbett Tunnel; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H. R. 136. An act granting an extension of time to construct a bridge across Rock River at or near Colona Ferry, in the State of Illinois; and

H. R. 4717. An act to authorize Butler County, Mo., to construct a bridge across Black River.

BRIDGE ACROSS OCONA LUFTY RIVER, N. C.

Mr. BRITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have changed the reference of the bill (H. R. 3675) to provide for the construction of a bridge across the Ocona Lufty River at Cherokee, N. C., from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

The SPEAKER. What is the bill about?

Mr. BRITT. It relates to the construction of a bridge on the lands of the Cherokee Indians in North Carolina, and is a bill in which the Indian Bureau is interested. I think it should be referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

The SPEAKER. Did the chairman of either committee recommend this?

Mr. BRITT. It has not been formally recommended.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to know what the request is.

The SPEAKER. The request is to take the reference of a bridge bill away from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and refer it to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. ADAMSON. I do not know anything about the bill.

The SPEAKER. It is a bill to build a bridge on Indian lands.

Mr. MANN. Is the consent of Congress required because this is a navigable stream, or because it is on Indian lands?

Mr. BRITT. It is because it is Indian lands.

Mr. MANN. It is not a navigable stream?

Mr. BRITT. It is a nonnavigable stream, an intrastate stream, and separates the land of the Cherokee Indians and the Government land on which the Indian school is located. It is desired to construct a bridge for the benefit of the Indians who cross this small stream.

Mr. ADAMSON. If it is not a navigable stream, of course a change of reference is proper, but if it is a navigable stream it would not be proper.

Mr. BRITT. It is a nonnavigable stream. It is the Ocona Lufty River, in North Carolina.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I will not object, but I think the gentleman is making a mistake if he wants to get his bill passed.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Is this river recognized as a navigable river by the War Department?

Mr. BRITT. No; it is a small stream running between the land of the Cherokee Indians and the Government land on which the Indian school is located, and the bridge is for the convenience of the Indians going back and forth from their reservation to the school and the Indian village.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Has it ever been under Federal improvement?

Mr. BRITT. Yes.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Is the gentleman now asking for anything to improve that river?

Mr. BRITT. We are asking for an appropriation of $15,000 to build this bridge only.

Mr. MANN. That is an Indian Affairs matter.

The SPEAKER. Is this stream on the boundary of two States?

Mr. BRITT. It is not. It is within the State of North Carolina.

Mr. MANN. This is to get an appropriation, which would come from the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. ADAMSON. The gentleman from Texas asked the gentleman from North Carolina if the Government had made an expenditure to improve that stream. Has the Government attempted to improve the navigability of the stream?

Mr. BRITT. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. ADAMSON. On the gentleman's statement that it is not a navigable stream, of course I can not object.

The SPEAKER. This is entirely within the State of North Carolina.

Mr. ADAMSON. That would not make any difference; if it was a navigable stream it would still be a navigable stream. I suggest that the gentleman let it lie over until we can look into the matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT. Reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from North Carolina accede to the request of the gentleman from Georgia that the bill lie over for the time being?

Mr. BRITT. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina withdraws his request.

RURAL POST ROADS.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Speaker, on Friday last, as the chairman of the Committee on Roads, I filed a report, as directed by that committee, on the bill (H. R. 7617) to provide that the Secretary of Agriculture, on behalf of the United States, shall, in certain cases, aid the States in the construction and maintenance of rural post roads. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], of that committee, desires to file mi-

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

nority views, and I ask unanimous consent that he may do it at any time within five legislative days, but that that, of course, shall not interfere with the consideration of the bill if it should come up sooner.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WASLH] have five legislative days in which to file minority views on the bill referred to. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing an editorial from the Toledo Times entitled "A worthy bill," on the subject of old-age pensions.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by printing an editorial on the subject of old-age pensions. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DILLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask immediate consideration of the bill H. R. 320, a bridge bill, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, pending that I would like to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting therein a set of resolutions adopted by the Local Union of Mine Workers of America, together with the letter transmitting the same to me.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing certain resolutions and the letter transmitting the same to him. Is there objection?

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Kentucky what the nature of those resolutions is?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. The resolutions relate to the printing of a report heretofore made by the Industrial Commission.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the gentleman I might say that the Committee on Printing has just had a meeting this morning and we are prepared to bring that report out. We have many resolutions of a similar kind lying on our table, and I trust the gentleman from Kentucky will withhold that request, and I am sure the committee will make a report on the bill that will be entirely satisfactory to all concerned. We have reached an understanding with respect to these unions, and if the gentleman will withhold his request I think by to-morrow we will be ready.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I am only complying with the request of this organization, and therefore submit the request for unanimous consent to print.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

LEAVE TO SIT DURING SESSIONS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. WATSON of Virigina. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the Committee on Labor I desire to submit a request for unanimous consent that that committee may be allowed to sit during the sessions of the House until the further order of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WATSON] asks unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor be permitted to sit during the sessions of the House.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the gentleman that he prepare the ordinary resolution so the clerks will have it in proper form.

Mr. WATSON of Virginia. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that the committee was in session engaged upon a very important hearing and we did not have time to prepare a resolution.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman can reduce it to proper form.

Mr. WATSON of Virginia. I will do that.

The resolution submitted is as follows:

House resolution 82.

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor be allowed to sit during the sessions of the House until the further order of the House.

The resolution was agreed to.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Florida rise?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. To ask unanimous consent to address the House next Monday after the ordinary business is finished, not to interfere with any public matter, on the subject of public buildings.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] asks unanimous consent to next Monday——

Mr. MANN. Next Monday is unanimous consent——

The SPEAKER. After the transaction of the regular business of the House, that he may be allowed to address the House for one hour on the subject of public buildings. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. ADAMSON. If everybody else is through——

The SPEAKER. No; the Chair is going to recognize the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. ADAMSON. I wanted to yield to him, if I got recognition.

LEAVE TO SIT DURING SESSIONS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Alabama rise?

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I am directed by the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization to ask unanimous consent that it may sit during sessions of the House, and I will reduce that to writing and hand it to the Clerk.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, as I understand, it is for two days, namely, the 20th and 21st of this month.

Mr. BURNETT. I will modify the request to that.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will put it that way, then. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that on the 20th and 21st of this month the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization be authorized to sit during the sessions of the House.

Mr. MANN. Did not this committee have this permission generally?

Mr. BURNETT. No; we did not.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks that the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization be allowed to sit during the sessions of the House on January 20 and 21. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The resolution agreed to is as follows:

House resolution 83.

Resolved, That the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization be granted permission to sit during the sessions of the House.

BRIDGE ACROSS PEND OREILLE RIVER, IDAHO.

Mr. DILLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill H. R. 320, a bridge bill, which I have sent to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Dakota asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill named. Is there objection?

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. LEWIS. To inquire as to priority in this matter.

The SPEAKER. There are two or three little things which will take 5 or 10 minutes, and in the meantime the gentleman's audience will be increased. [Laughter.] The gentleman from South Dakota asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill H. R. 320, a bridge bill. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and the Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 320) to authorize the county commissioners of Bonner County, Idaho, to construct a bridge across Priest River.

Be it enacted, etc., That the county commissioners of Bonner County, State of Idaho, are hereby authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge, and approaches thereto, across Priest River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, in township 56 north, ranges 4 and 5 west, Boise meridian, in the county of Bonner, in the State of Idaho, in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The committee amendments were read, as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out the words "Priest River" and insert in lieu thereof the words "Pend Oreille River."

Page 1, line 6, after the word "at," insert the words "Priest River at."

The question was taken, and the committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. DILLON. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment: Line 3, strike out the word "commissioners," and after the word "Bonner," strike out the word "County."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 1, line 3, by striking out the word "commissioners," and after the word "Bonner," strike out the word "County."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. DILLON. I move to amend the title by striking out the word "commissioners" and striking out the word "County" after the word "Bonner" and striking out the word "Priest" and inserting the words "Pend Oreille."

The amendment was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. DILLON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS CHATTAHOOCHEE RIVER, GA.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill H. R. 775.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ADAMSON] asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a House bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 775) granting the consent of Congress to J. P. Jones and others to construct one or more bridges across the Chattahoochee River between the counties of Coweta and Carroll, in the State of Georgia.

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to J. P. Jones, of the county of Coweta, or to the county of Coweta, or to the county of Carroll, all of the State of Georgia, acting jointly or separately, and their successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge or bridges and approaches thereto across the Chattahoochee River at a point or points suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Jones's ferry, also known as the old Moore ferry, or at Strickland's ferry, or at both, between the counties of Coweta and Carroll, in the State of Georgia, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire why the bill is framed giving the option to so many individuals to construct between these counties?

Mr. ADAMSON. I will say to the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, that the question is very natural. The bill deals with a very peculiar situation. The county of Coweta, on the east side of the river, has a good road down to Jones's ferry. West of that ferry, the Carroll people do not think the road is good, and so they have built a good road down to Strickland's ferry, a mile and a half below. The counties can not agree on one bridge, because they can not agree at which ferry to build the bridge. Each county wants to build the bridge, and probably both will. It is certain that Jones will build one at his ferry. I do not think the counties are going to agree where to build it. We want the bridge, and we do not care if we have two.

Mr. STAFFORD. Do I understand that you are granting the right to one Jones to build either or both bridges, and also the right to the counties to build either or both bridges?

Mr. ADAMSON. I will say that Mr. Jones is a wealthy man, who owns the land on both sides at his ferry. He wants the bridge. He lives in Coweta County and wants the county to build the bridge if it will do so. Coweta County and Carroll County can not agree at which ferry to build the bridge. Jones says he is going to build a bridge, if we consent, unless the county does so. Carroll County is going to build one at Strickland's ferry. Three parties have asked me to secure the consent of Congress to build, and I have dispensed with the necessity for three bills by including them all in one.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is merely a highway bridge?

Mr. ADAMSON. That is all. There is a good railroad bridge below there, some 90 feet high.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

On motion of Mr. ADAMSON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS OHIO RIVER, STEUBENVILLE, OHIO.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, there are one or two other bills. I do not see the authors or those who reported them. If I can get consent, I will call them up myself.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is here. He has a bill.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House bill 3593.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3593) to authorize the Ohio-West Virginia Bridge Co. to construct a bridge across the Ohio River at the city of Steubenville, Jefferson County, Ohio.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Ohio-West Virginia Bridge Co., a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of West Virginia, is hereby authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Ohio River, to and into Cross Creek district, in the county of Brooke, in the State of West Virginia, from the southern end of the city of Steubenville, in the county of Jefferson, State of Ohio, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

Also the following committee amendment was read:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "Virginia," insert the words "its successors and assigns."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I consider it bad practice to take these bills up under unanimous consent a week prior to the date when they are in order; but I do not intend to interpose objection at this time in the session on that account. I would like to inquire whether this bridge company has already obtained the consent of the State authorities to go ahead with the construction of this bridge, or is the initiative being taken here in Congress? And then do they intend to get the consent from the respective State authorities?

Mr. NEELY. I will say to the gentleman from Wisconsin I am not informed in the matter.

Mr. MANN. It is under the State law. Each of these States have laws covering that.

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not know what the respective laws are.

Mr. NEELY. I know of no State law in West Virginia that would require such authority to be obtained.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] says there is a State law that grants that consent.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, I offer the suggestion that there is nothing in the Ohio law that has to be consulted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. STAFFORD. One further question. Is there objection to the construction of this bridge by any local association?

Mr. NEELY. None whatever. Mr. Speaker, a bill which is precisely the same as the bill under consideration here was passed by the Senate on January 7. It is Senate bill 2409. I ask unanimous consent that it be substituted and taken up in lieu of the bill under consideration.

Mr. MANN. Where is the Senate bill?

Mr. NEELY. It is on the Speaker's table.

The SPEAKER. When was it brought over?

Mr. ADAMSON. It was brought over Saturday, January 8.

The SPEAKER. Does the chairman of the committee know whether it was referred to his committee or not?

Mr. ADAMSON. I understood it was to be laid on the Speaker's desk. I have not inquired in the committee room.

Mr. MANN. If it is a Senate bill you had best let it go for the minute until you find out. It is privileged matter if there is a Senate bill on the Speaker's table.

Mr. ADAMSON. All right. Let it go temporarily until it is found.

Mr. NEELY. I ask, then, that it go over temporarily until the Senate bill is found.

The SPEAKER. When a bill comes over from the Senate and a gentleman wants it held on the Speaker's table he ought to notify the parliamentary clerk or the Speaker, one or the other. Let this go over temporarily until we find out about it.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, there are two other bridge bills here, one introduced by Mr. LANGLEY and one by Mr. RUSSELL, if the House wants to take them up before the oratory sets in.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks you had better proceed with the oratory when you get through with the small matters.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, IOWA.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 73) to amend chapter 231, known as the Judicial Code, act of March 3, 1911, volume 36, United States Statutes at Large, section 81, page 1111, introduced by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER]. It provides for a change of time for holding court in Judge Wade's district. I will say that there is no opposition to the bill on the part of the bar and the judge and the court officials.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WEBB] asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill H. R. 73, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the bill in full.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that on page 2, line 18, something is left

out. It does not make good sense. On line 18 it says, "For the central division at Fort days in May and September."

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker, that is a mistake in copying. This is a copy of the Judicial Code so far as read.

Mr. MANN. I suggest that you had better let it go over until to-morrow.

Mr. TOWNER. Yes. We will let the matter go over until to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the matter will be deferred until to-morrow.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BLACK, for one week, on account of illness.

To Mr. KONOP, for one week, on account of illness in his family.

POST-OFFICE AFFAIRS.

The SPEAKER. Under the special order heretofore made, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS] is recognized for one hour. [Applause.]

WHAT IS A DEMOCRAT?

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, the question is sometimes humorously asked, "What is a Democrat?" and this seems an opportune time to attempt to answer. Byron, the poet, said, "Democracy—the devil was the first democrat" [laughter], while enthusiastic devotees have declared that the first democrat was the Carpenter of Nazareth. Now, we Democrats belong somewhere between these extremes. Where is it?

Herbert Spencer declared democracy to be the ultimate social truth. The truth is, my friends, democracy is difficult to define, because it is not a dogma or a doctrine susceptible of formal statement. It may be better described as that great movement in history which has had for its object the elevation of the common man. It is a world aspiration; not a ritualistic profession, but a cardinal sympathy whose formulas change from age to age. Its ruling thought, its unvarying purpose, is, I say, the elevation of the common man. It seeks the temporal salvation of the plain people as religion seeks the spiritual salvation of us all. And let me say that a democrat, indeed, may belong to any party, may belong to any age; his cardinal characteristic is a sympathy with the common man, and if he strives to advance the movement, active throughout the ages, for the elevation of the plain man, then he is a democrat, however he may disguise himself by party phrases.

"THE LEAST GOVERNMENT IS THE BEST GOVERNMENT."

I say the formulas of democracy change from age to age and are adapted to human circumstances like the maxims of a court of equity. A formula of the greatest democratic value in one set of human conditions may be totally out of place in another. And this is well illustrated in the experience of modern democracy. The crying evils and wrongs of the eighteenth century sprang from private and artificial monopolies. By royal grants and prerogative certain persons favored by the king were given a monopoly in the manufacture or sale of the necessaries of life, like salt, saltpeter, currants, iron, powder, furs, firearms, calfskins, lists of cloth, potash, vinegar, steel, brushes, pots, bottles, lead, oil, glasses, paper, starch, tin, new drapery, Spanish wool, Irish yarn, and even gold and slaves. The holders of these monopolies used them to raise the prices on the people, and so incurred the ill will and the challenge of democracy. It fought these great monopolies, and its war cry was the formula, "The least government is the best government." With it democracy overthrew the private monopolies of that age and stripped the kings of Europe of their power to establish private monopolies. For the eighteenth century democrat the "least government" meant no monopolies, no lettres de cachet, and in that sense meant also the best government. It was an age of the misuse of the functions of government for private ends.

When the king got hungry for quick money he created and granted some favorite monopoly. And to get rid of these oppressions democracy invented its formula and with it destroyed monopolies and unlocked the gates to equal rights in trade. Is it not odd to hear men misusing this fine old maxim now to keep monopolies in private hands, especially the postal monopolies, from operation by the postal authorities under the Constitution?

This eighteenth century aphorism was one of the most serviceable formulas democracy has ever had. It has served its purpose, and served it gloriously, and to misapply it now in defense of its historical enemy, the private monopoly of our day, is profanation indeed.

NINETEENTH CENTURY FORMULAS.

The democratic philosophy is affirmative as well as negative, constructive as well as eliminative, and requires something more than "don'ts" for its realization. It has its "do's," its constructive as well as its negative commands to utter. To realize its aims there are things—constructive things—it must do as well as things prohibited, just as with the average human being. The eighteenth century work of democracy was eliminative in character; it had to destroy certain abuses. The nineteenth century democracy had positive duties to discharge, and it framed its formulas accordingly.

EQUAL RIGHTS TO ALL; SPECIAL PRIVILEGES TO NONE.

Unquestionably this great maxim is the best statement of democratic duty. Special privileges, offensive monopolies, it still condemns, and for a century American democracy has battled with the beast of special privilege falsely called the "protective tariff." Sometimes democracy, sometimes the beast, is triumphant, but the fight of democracy will go on until its purpose is achieved. But the program "equal rights to all." How is that to be realized? My answer is that its realization calls for the constructive element in democracy. This movement in history which has its mind on the elevation of the common man, not merely by preventing unjust attacks upon what he has but through constructive measures, enables him to enjoy along with superman the developmental advantages and agencies of advancing civilization.

CONSTRUCTIVE DEMOCRACY.

Your superman will take care of himself, but where human selfishness is involved unfortunately he can not be trusted to take care of others outside the circles of his blood or friendship. It is democracy's mission to protect the rights of the common man. How? Well, on the negative side by abolishing any special privileges in others, on the constructive side by providing the common man with the opportunities necessary to realize his rights. Let us see what this means in practice. The common man can not build roads for himself like the lord of the manor. Well, sir, democracy takes possession of all the roads and builds a road to every man's house, over which traverse your superman and your common man upon conditions of equal opportunity and so of equal rights. Again, the priceless gems of education giving access to the accumulated knowledge of the world. For this the equal right was granted and then denied by the want of educational opportunity to the masses. They had not the money to pay for private tutors. Democracy provided the opportunity. In the name of society it established the common school, where all the children of men may have their vision opened to the science of our time. And, again, man has need to communicate with his fellows beyond the reach of look or voice. The fortunate, or the superman, could afford his own courier, which the common man could not, or pay the price exacted by private persons for such service. Democracy again supplied the opportunity. It establishes a postal service actually reaching to the ends of the earth, over which the message of the common man moves with the same celerity as his more fortunate brother's and at rates which all can pay.

In the courts of democracy "equal rights" mean something more than paper rights, or rights which exist only on paper—rights which the masses have not the facilities to enjoy. They mean realized rights, and democracy knows they must be realized before they can be justly called "equal."

Equal rights, then, do not mean merely the like legal privilege to enjoy a wholesome common advantage, but the placing of that advantage on a plane where the plain people can actually reach and enjoy it. This I affirm is the mission of democracy. It is its mission as sustained by history; it is its mission as defined by hope. Democracy esteems and applauds the superman, but it loves the plain people, yet while it is striving to elevate him to the great dignity of his species, it does nothing to pull down the genius or the man of achievement. The common road has not hindered his travel; it has smoothed and extended it. The common school has not lessened his horizon; it has brightened it. And the postal courier has not obstructed his messenger, but has relieved him of his burden and multiplied his feet a million times. And your supermen themselves—what institution can claim more of them than are found in the annals of democracy? The men like John Stuart Mill, like Thomas Jefferson, who knew that service of their fellow man gave the surest title to true greatness.

AGENCIES OF CIVILIZATION.

What is the lesson we learn from history of the mission of democracy. It is that the grant of equal rights to the citizen imposes the duty of providing, when practicable, for the actual enjoyment of such rights, otherwise the rights are not equal

rights or rights at all. They are mere mockeries, mere lawyers' quibbles. This is true of all those advantages of existence and great agencies of civilization which are susceptible of common enjoyment, and of which the developing resources of society permit of an equal use. Democracy is wedded to no ism, to individualism, to communism, or to socialism when the question of method is to be solved. It is not a one-fingered philosophy, not a one-geared machine. What it demands is that the common blessings of life shall be made susceptible of enjoyment by the common man in fulfillment of its motto, "Equal rights to all." It adopts such social methods to achieve its great purpose as reason and experience approve. And, gentlemen, this means the condemnation of agencies which may be found deficient or insufficient for its purpose. Democracy pronounced this sentence on the private road, it pronounced it on the private school, and on the private carrier of the written communication. They were weighed by democracy and found wanting in capacity to sufficiently serve the human family. And democracy has recently pronounced the same sentence on the private express carrier. Let us see what it said about the express companies and then judge it by the facts of recent history.

THE PARCEL POST.

The express companies had been in operation for generations, with the most desirable shipping rights over the railways. They therefore had a fair chance to make good. Now, democracy charged that they were insufficient; that is, inefficient. They failed to reach the farm, most in need of the package service; and as to the urban population, they denied transportation to half the traffic by charging prohibitive rates; in short, they were doing only a half man's work and giving a grossly inadequate discharge of the package service. It then established the people's express service—the parcel post—to remedy this condition.

Comparative parcel post and express rates.

Rates from Baltimore—	1 pound.	5 pounds.	10 pounds.	15 pounds.	20 pounds.
To Easton:					
By post	$0.05	$0.09	$0.14	$0.19	$0.24
By express	.26	.27	.30	.32	.35
To Oakland:					
By post	.05	.09	.14	.19	.24
By express	.26	.31	.34	.39	.44
To Washington:					
By post	.05	.09	.14	.19	.24
By express	.26	.27	.30	.32	.35
To Atlantic City:					
By post	.05	.09	.14	.19	.24
By express	.26	.30	.33	.37	.41
To Philadelphia:					
By post	.05	.09	.14	.19	.24
By express	.26	.27	.30	.32	.35
To Richmond:					
By post	.05	.09	.14	19	.24
By express	.26	.29	.34	.38	.43
To New York:					
By post	.05	.09	.14	.19	.24
By express	.26	.29	.32	.36	.40

This parcel post has been in operation three years. What does experience of the results say? Here are the facts:

In 1912, the year before the parcel post, the express companies carried 317,000,000 packages. That represented their total service in that year in moving the potential package traffic of the country. It was about three parcels per capita, for which they secured an average rate of 50 cents per package. In 1915 these companies carried 280,000,000 pieces—at 48 cents each—and the parcel post carried 400,000,000 pieces—at 14 cents each, counting only packages of a pound and more. In three years the traffic leaped from 317,000,000 to nearly 700,000,000 packages—from three packages to seven per capita, in 1915, of which four were moved by the parcel post. Four per capita by the three-year-old rival, as against less than three per capita by the time-trained, if not the time-honored, private express agency. "Efficiency! What crimes are committed in thy name!" For 40 years the people were denied this service, because it was asserted falsely that the post office was not efficient enough to do this work of the express companies. Now we find that the express companies were killing more traffic than they carried, were performing only about half the function, and, call the statement demagogic if you will, it is a true statement; the traffic they refused to carry was the common-man's traffic. It was traffic that could pay 14 cents per package to the Postal System but could not pay 50 cents to the companies, not to speak of the postal Rural Route Service necessary to carry the package to the farmer on more than a million miles of daily route. So much for the efficiency of these de facto parcel posts, the express company adjuncts to the postal function.

Now, how about the economy of these transportation rivals in the package field? This is a point of the greatest importance. The express companies lost $2,500,000, they say, on the 1915 traffic, and recently secured, on this ground, an advance of their rates from the Interstate Commerce Commission. Their statement shows that they secured 48 cents for each piece, and that it cost them 24 cents each to handle it. It cost the Postal System less than 5 cents each to handle its most expensive parcel, the one of 3 pounds and more in weight, that required the aid of vehicle delivery. Six censuses of the parcel-post traffic have been taken, for a half month in April and October of each year, and they show a progressive decline of the cost of parcel vehicle delivery from 39 mills to 28 mills per parcel, and this while the costs to the companies have been going up.

If the cost, 2 cents a parcel for "pick up" and 2 cents more for "collection of the rate from the consignee" (services the companies give, but the post has not yet given), be added, it appears that the Post Office could handle its package (giving all the facilities granted by the companies) at 9 cents, and the heavier express package at 12 cents, against the 24 cents which it costs the companies. The experience shows that if the Post Office were given the express traffic it could make a profit of some thirty millions a year, at their rates, and paying the railways what they now receive of the companies.

But does the parcel post pay? Yes; about 25 per cent on the average, and the larger the package the greater the profit. The parcel that calls for wagon delivery weighs an average of 5½ pounds. It costs less than 5 cents for all postal processes and 6 cents for railway pay—11 cents in all. The Postal System received for it 18 cents, leaving 7 cents profit.

Efficiency; economy; it is hardly necessary to say more. The express company is obviously delinquent under both standards, while democracy's establishment, the parcel post, has given us proof of incomparable achievements in both. It has cut the operation cost per parcel to less than half by express, it reaches the 25,000,000 rural population, and has more than doubled the package traffic. Thus is democracy's purpose for the common man realized, and its wisdom in the selection of economic methods justified by results. Your common man had an "equal right" to have his package carried, but the companies carried only for those who could pay their rates, only three out of the seven parcels potential, whereas the Swiss parcel post carries 10 per capita, probably the figure our parcel post will attain when fully developed.

The House to-day realizes its great need for additional revenue. If the Post Office Department will expand the parcel post to its normal dimensions as is done in other countries there is awaiting it a profit of from $30,000,000 to $35,000,000.

Somebody asked does the parcel post pay, a very proper question. Let us see about that. We have 5 cents, the cost of handling the parcel. Then we have railway pay for 5½ pounds, which costs 6 cents more. You can compute it yourself. The new traffic is costing about 6 cents a ton-mile, or a cent a pound for 333 miles. That is the out-of-pocket expense, for under the sliding scale this is the rate we are paying the railways on parcel traffic.

The country thought that the express companies were making egregious profits in their time. I want to inform the House that no express company in the history of the country has ever made one-half the profits out of the small parcels that the Post Office is making at this moment. At least 25 per cent of the parcel-post receipts represent profit to the service.

We have had enough experience with it now to satisfy the most timid man that the clause in the substitute bill passed by this House, giving the Postmaster General the power to change the weight limit, the size limit, the rates, the zones, and all the conditions of the service, is a power very wisely placed as judged by the result, and that he ought to exercise that power to cover the whole parcel-post function of transportation, as abroad, and give the farmer who is on the farm where the express service can not reach an equal right to transportation in small shipments. That means, at least, a weight limit of 100 pounds. It means also a size limit, say, of 2 feet square. And it means, besides, the collecting of the rate on delivery, and that, as the President promised in his inaugural address, "the United States should be given a parcel post equal to that of any other country in the world." Now, the weight limit in all these other countries, except England, runs from 100 to 132 pounds.

In Germany, in Austria, in Belgium, in Norway, in Sweden, and elsewhere the weight limit is set at 100 pounds and up. In England, it is true, it is only 11 pounds, but in England they never had the occasion for a parcel-post service that we have had in this country. Let me tell you why. In England the railroads deliver and collect the class traffic from all points they

reach, and they graduate their rate down to 2 pounds, and as low as 8 cents for the service, whereas in the United States the rate is graduated down only to 100 pounds for railroad service and the lowest rate is a quarter of a dollar.

Mr. Speaker, I am here to-day to tell, in my feeble way, the economic romance of the parcel post in this country. It has dispelled all doubt as to American postal efficiency. It found a field in which the private servitor was doing only three-sevenths of his work, less than a half-man service, and it took this small parcel with the small rate that the express company could not move without bankruptcy, and it is moving it to-day with a tremendous profit. The Bible says the servant is worthy of his hire. Judged by every test of efficiency, of extension of service, of economy in the performance of that service, the postal establishment is entitled to the full field of operation, with regard to the small shipment, and if it is given that field this country will find within a year's time that some $30,000,000 of net revenue will have been added to its Treasury.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Is it not the claim of the railroad companies that this service is now being rendered for the Post Office Department without adequate compensation?

Mr. LEWIS. I do not think it is now the claim of the railroads that that is so. There was complaint for a time; but three sections of the country have been weighed since the parcels post went into effect. I ought to add, however, in justice to the subject, that if the parcels post is extended to the hundred-pound weight limit (and only 5 per cent of express packages exceed that in weight), then we ought to have, in my judgment, not quadrennial weighings but annual weighings, and I believe also under such circumstances the railroads ought to be relieved of the burden of delivering the mails under the 80-rod provision. It so happens, however, with respect to railway pay, that under the effect of this sliding scale we are paying so nearly as can be ascertained some 6 cents a ton-mile, barring rural post offices. The express companies are paying about the same rate, on the average, to the railroads for carrying their traffic. The trouble is that in one section of the country they may be paying as high as 8 and in another section as low as 4 cents, but 6 cents a ton-mile about expresses the average for the different sections of the railroad field.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS. Yes.

Mr. HOWARD. Up to what limit would the gentleman suggest that the Government exercise monopoly on its packages in the parcel-post service?

Mr. LEWIS. Up to 100 pounds, but I would not say monopoly. We do not need any monopoly in the contest with the express company. We supplant them the moment the conditions and facilities of transportation are made equal. People do not realize that the postal establishment instead of being an inefficient institution is, indeed, one of the most efficient working organizations on the face of the earth. Even before the parcel post was established it was moving the average mail piece at a cost of a cent and a third per piece, and moving it over a million miles of rural routes, 250,000 miles of railway, and from once to even nine times a day over 150,000 miles of town and city streets and avenues.

Mr. Speaker, the parcel post has earned a right to be heard, and it demands its right to do a full-fledged parcel service—to have the regular weight limit of 100 pounds, and also the pick-up service.

Mr. ESCH. What effect would a pick-up or collection service in connection with the parcel post have upon the patronage of that service by the citizens?

Mr. LEWIS. I think a very great effect, I will say to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ESCH. Such an effect that it might still greatly reduce the competition of express companies in the field of the Parcel Post Service?

Mr. LEWIS. Oh, certainly so; where the rates are at all equal, say a 20-cent parcel-post rate and 25-cent express rate, the citizen will call up the express company to get his package. We are losing millions for want of a "pick-up" and "collect" of the rate from the consignee.

PROPOSALS FOR PARCEL-POST DEVELOPMENT.

Weight limit: One hundred pounds for pick up and delivery; no limit when package delivered to and collected from railway terminal by shipper.

Size limit: Eighty-four inches, measuring the length and half the girth combined.

Pick up: When postage on shipment is not less than 15 cents.

Insurance: Graduation of insurance rate from 3 cents minimum to 15 cents for $100.

"Collect": Privilege of "collect" on rate from consignee when postage is not less than 21 cents, the consignee to pay fee therefor at rate of 10 per cent of postage to be charged; minimum, 4 cents; the consignor to guarantee postage. Farm products direct from farm, no extra charge.

Classification: Parcels of first-class mail in single bundles directed to noncity-delivery offices may be sent if bearing "drop-letter" postage plus parcel rate. Any statement relating to contents of parcel may be inclosed within the parcel. Any mail piece exceeding 4 ounces in weight and marked "fourth class" or "parcel" may be posted at parcel rates.

Zones: The zones shall each be 50 miles in extent and be based on the present units.

Rates: First 50 miles, one-half cent per pound, plus 10 cents; farm products, plus 4 cents; minimum rate, 15 cents; farm products, 5 cents. Each additional 50 miles, 2 mills per pound or 5 pounds for a cent. No rate to exceed 12 cents per pound. Actual distances by rail to be taken up to 300 miles.

With the definite experience before us, we can say that the above rates would yield about 25 per cent profit.

Mr. STEENERSON. Formerly the department officials, and I believe the gentleman himself has so stated, stated that the average amount paid the railroads for weight of the mails would be 10 cents per ton-mile?

Mr. LEWIS. Yes.

Mr. STEENERSON. The gentleman has now stated that the average is only 6 cents per ton-mile.

Mr. LEWIS. Yes; and I am glad the gentleman has called my attention to that.

Mr. STEENERSON. Has the gentleman explained the reason for this lower estimate?

Mr. LEWIS. No; but I will do so now. The last statement we had of the cost of railway pay was for April, 1913. With a view now to answering the statement formerly made by me, I will state that it showed that the average paid the railways was 10 cents a ton-mile.

Very well. Since that time some two or three, at least two, sections have been reported. Gentlemen perhaps are familiar with the very complex scale of pay under which the railroads receive compensation for carrying the mails. If the weight of the mails per day should be as low as 50 pounds on a particular route, the post office may have to pay as high as $1.50 per ton-mile, but then as you reach a daily weight of 48,000 pounds or more, the pay on that weight is about 5.27 cents per ton-mile. During the summer, I will say to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON], after exhaustive study the effect of this sliding scale became apparent to me. The effect is that the cost of any new traffic added, say from this date on, or indeed from the date of the parcel post itself, when divided into the additional compensation pay, amounts to about 6 cents per ton-mile, barring railway post-office pay. The sum of the added traffic moves on the low rates, so that future additions to the postal traffic under existing law will move, not at 10 cents a ton-mile, but move at something like 6 cents per ton-mile, which is above the rate paid by the express companies.

THE ELECTRICAL COMMUNICATION.

Equal rights to all. Equal rights to all. Is this great canon of Democracy realized in the use of the telegraph and telephone? Do the limitations of private monopoly permit the masses to utilize these instruments of communication according to their means and their needs; this régime of private monopoly which still lingers in this part of our postal system after its eviction by the postal system of practically every country but our own? Does the common man enjoy real equal rights to use either, or, as with the express company, is he barred from the equal right to use them by their prohibitory rates?

TELEGRAPH RATES.

Before the parcel post we had the highest parcel rates. They are now among the lowest in the world. But we still have the highest telegraph rates. They run from 25 cents to $1. Where the post conducts the telegraph they run from 12 cents to 24 for the longest distances. Here are the averages for Europe and the United States:

For 150 miles in Europe 12 cents, the United States 25 cents; 250 miles in Europe 12 cents, the United States 30 cents; 700 miles in Europe 12 cents, the United States 50 cents; 3,000 miles in Australia 24 cents, the United States $1.

TOLL RATES.

Our toll or long-distance telephone rates are even more immoderate. They run from three to seven times as high as the postal telephone rates of other countries. Here is a statement of the average rates for nine countries on the Continent of Europe:

Distance in miles	100	300	400	500	700
Continental rate	$0.20	$0.37	$0.39	$0.46	$0.53
American rate	$0.60	$1.80	$2.40	$3.00	$4.20

That is, for 100 miles we pay three times, for 300 miles five times, for 400 miles six times, and for 700 miles eight times the ordinary rate on the Continent of Europe for a three-minute conversation.

Mr. Speaker, I am obliged to make a sensational statement about these long-distance rates. It costs the American as much to ship his long-distance conversation over the wires, mile for mile, as it costs him to ship a ton of freight over the rails. The railroads get on the average 7 mills a mile for moving the ton of freight. The telephone company charges 6 mills a mile for carrying the three-minute conversation. Gentlemen can realize how weighty their conversations sometimes are. They weigh about a ton on the long-distance wires. [Applause.]

Mr. SNYDER. In your comparison of long-distance rates in the United States with rates on the Continent of Europe, do you attempt to maintain that the efficiency is equal or that the service is as good?

Mr. LEWIS. There are two kinds of service in the other countries. We have only one here. Abroad they give two kinds of service. If you are the superman that wants the quick service and will pay the double rate, you can get the "instantaneous service," but if you are an ordinary man or your affair is an ordinary affair, you can get these low rates of which I speak. The Bell system has rates only for the superman—for the Packard man. Its Ford facilities are entirely denied. [Applause.] I am using their own allegory, not my own; but their own allegory condemns them from the standpoint of democracy.

SOCIAL RESULTS.

Mr. Speaker, what is the result of these rates? Well, sir, it is just the same result as by express. Taking the telegrams and long-distance messages together, other countries use the wires from two to four times as often as we do. Denmark shows 17 such messages per capita and New Zealand 12; we show only 3. While we rank first in the use of the letter—101 per capita—12 outrank us in the combined use of telegrams and long-distance messages. And while our companies maintain only one telegraph office to seven post offices, these postal institutions maintain two telegraph offices for every three post offices. This is the penalty the masses must pay, an almost complete deprivation of service, that private monopoly may own this part of the Postal Service; the highest rates and the lowest service among the nations.

A POSTAL TELEPHONE.

"There is a road to every man's house. There ought to be a telephone on the inside," said the president of the Bell telephone system. True, very true. But it was democracy that built these roads to every man's house, and it will have to be democracy that strings the wires, the postal wires, into the common man's home. The resources of society are quite sufficient. He has an equal right, then, to the use of this great agency of civilization. Democracy will actualize this right for him by postalizing the telephone and telegraph.

How can the right be made equal? By providing a local rate so low that the humblest citizen can pay it, to call the doctor or to call the farmer and buy his table necessaries direct, by parcel post, at their first price and their first smell. Postal telephones give this low rate. The average local rate of postal systems, including the independents in the United States, is less than a cent a call. Any man can afford to pay that, and our postal system could give that rate with a profit and give a greatly improved service, using the automatic telephone. A cent a call postal rate would equalize every man's right to the telephone service, just as our postal rates have done.

But how stands the facts to-day? Let us take the city of Baltimore, which is fairly typical of our American cities. The lowest rate obtainable there for a two-party business and residence phone is at an annual sum of $24, giving 360 calls, at 7 (6.66) cents per call. If you want more calls, you can have them, above 360 to 1,800, at 5 cents each, and above 1,800 to 5,400, at 4 cents each. Now, the unlimited rate for the city of Berlin, for an exclusive service, with four times the population of Baltimore, is $42.84, or 80 cents a hundred calls. The Baltimore busines man pays $174 for 5,400 calls.

This Baltimore rate exceeds the flat-rate tariffs ($160) of London and Paris combined and equals the combined unlimited tariffs for Christiania, Stockholm, The Hague, Copenhagen, Auckland, Amsterdam, and Rotterdam. Instead of running below the letter rates, as with postal systems, our local telephone rates run with the street-car fare. It is $48 for the first 600 calls in New York and Washington, 8 cents a call. You can send a 4-pound parcel from Baltimore to New York for 8 cents by post (27 cents by express) and the post will deliver it and make about 1 cent profit.

It is pertinent now to discuss the effect of these local rates on the popular use of the telephone. Well, in 1911 Baltimore had 43,000 telephones; each was used but 993 times (calls) in the year, while the average for the country is over 2,000 calls. The phone in Washington, at rates higher than Baltimore's, represented only 822 calls per annum. That is, the private-rate methods prevent those who pay for their telephones from using them for more than half of their potential demand. The people of Baltimore had to do with 71 calls per capita, as against 156 calls per capita for the rest of the country.

Let us recur a moment to the comparison between Washington and Baltimore. Rates of $3.53 per 100 calls meant a phone utilization of 993 calls in Baltimore. Rates of $4.22 per 100 calls meant only 824 calls in Washington. That is, to increase the rate of Baltimore 20 per cent, to that of Washington, would reduce the phone utilization by 17⅓ per cent. The company would secure the same gross revenue with slightly reduced exchange expense and the subscriber 17⅓ per cent less service for the same payment. Conversely, you reduce the Washington rates by 20 per cent to correspond with Baltimore and you raise the utilization by 17⅓ per cent. The experience of the great Bell System shows that an average per 100 calls——

Washington at $4.22 means 824 calls, 44,000 per employee.

Baltimore at $3.53 means 933 calls.

Bell system at $1.86 means 1,747 calls, 65,000 per employee.

Independent at $0.86 means 2,055 calls, 111,000 per employee.

Norway—Postal at $0.62 means 2,332 calls, 118,500 per employee.

Here is a law of increasing returns, on the economic side, probably without a parallel. What it means is that if you ought to allow as much as 7 per cent return to secure private investors—I do not see how you can fairly expect them for less—you will have to scale your rates somewhere near those in Baltimore, and kill half the working capacity of the phone and the operative personnel. But if you had a fixed charge of only 3 per cent to pay, especially with the automatic telephone in use by postal systems, a cent a call, with the high utilization would produce sufficient revenue for all purposes.

Mr. FOCHT. I quite agree with the gentleman in respect to the excessive tolls on the telephone, and how they hamper and hinder business, and I would like to inquire—I did not gather the gentleman's conclusion with reference to the low cost at which the Government was able to handle the parcel-post business.

Now, as to the inability of the express companies, do you assign that to their lack of ability and efficiency, or to overcapitalization, or some species of graft?

Mr. LEWIS. I assign it to laws of their nature. The postal establishment is governed by a public-service motive. The private investor goes into a field with a private investor's motive. He would not last long in the field unless he sought to secure all he could in the way of profit. We know as men of affairs that there is a law of private finance as distinct as may be from a law of public finance. For example, let us take this local telephone rate, to which I am coming, for an illustration.

The average use of a telephone by the independent companies in the United States is 2,055 calls a year, at a rate of 86 cents per 100 calls, with 111,000 calls per employee per year representing the service of the personnel under that kind of rate and utilization. But in order to get the 2,000 calls per year on the phone the independents are giving a rate that is less than a cent a call.

Now, we come to the city of Washington, which is paying 4¼ cents a call, a little over four times the independent rate. The telephone in Washington is used only 824 times a year and the employees handle only 44,000 calls per annum. The rate determines the working output of plant and personnel.

Now, then, we come to the motive. Your private investor in the city of Washington is making, say, 8 per cent profit out of his system of rates. I am not sure that he ought to get less. I do not think I would like to put any of my money into any such enterprise that did not promise something like 7 or 8 per cent. So it is a law of the nature of the private investor that requires him to make these rates what they are. But suppose Gen. Burleson were introduced into this field in Washington, and he were told, "Your phone here is used only 800 times a year. Its normal use, as indicated by the rest of the country, is 2,000 times a year. If you reduce the rate from 4 cents to 2 cents, the service will double, and you will not get quite as much revenue out of it as you did at 4¼ cents, but what you lose in one pocket you will gain in the other pocket, by doubling service to the public, and the public and the post office are convertible terms. If you double the service on one

hand and you lose 5 per cent in revenues on the other, from the standpoint of the postal establishment, your gain is 95 per cent, and you have actualized the equal right of the common man to use a telephone.

It so happens, although the subject is too complex for oral statement, that the difference between a required profit of 8 per cent and the required interest rate of 3 per cent on the investment would probably, with the aid of the automatic telephone, enable the postmaster to give not a 4-cent, not a 3-cent, not a 2-cent, but ultimately 1-cent-a-call rate for this great city. The rate in other countries tends to run about half the letter-postage rate.

Now the homes of the masses are nearly as bereft of the telephone service as they were of the express. The postal institution is the agent to popularize these agencies of communication. It has a genius for doing small things cheaply and well, the small things that deter the timid private investor, and it can actually make its wholesale price its retail price. Now, it is the postal object not merely to confer equal rights in form. It so organizes its services, so formulates its rates, as to remove any economic barrier to its use. The common man has realized his "equal right" to use any form of the postal service. Its rates are adopted to his means. A cent-a-call rate will put the phone in every home. Can there be any doubt that we should postalize the communication as we did the parcel and thus realize the rights of the plain man?

Two lines of attack only are made on the postal program. It is argued that there are more telephones in use per capita in the United States than in postal telephone countries. This is not true for Canada and elsewhere. It is not true for Maryland, with its 67 phones per 1,000, against 171 in Iowa—Maryland ranks twenty-ninth among the States. But even where it is true it is explained by our greater social wealth, which is the guaranty that we can have a telephone in, as we have a road to, every man's house. We have one-fourth of the horses in the world, two-thirds of the automobiles, and our postal system carries approximately as many letters as all the countries of Europe.

It is contended that as to toll, or long-distance rates, the Bell system gives what they call an "instantaneous" service, while the postal telephone-toll rates I have quoted command only a "take-your-turn" service, as with our telegrams. The postal systems give both kinds of services. For twice the popular rates they will give the busy man of means whose affairs justify his paying such rates a real "instantaneous" service. But your common man "taking his turn" can have the low rates which are within his means. They attempt to sustain the American rates with the suggestion that they represent a "Mercedes" or Packard car service, while the postal rates abroad are likened to the Ford. Exactly. Democracy abroad has given a Ford, or rather an affordable service, rates to suit the classes and the masses, and with distinctions of service amply gratifying the demands of both.

Another attack, made mostly by the poorly informed or the interested, suggests that our postal system is run at a deficit. This is a statement made in ignorance of the facts. It ignores the fact that 29 per cent of the total postal services are performed in the carriage and handling of second-class matter, and 24 per cent of this for nothing, together with 2 per cent more for Government mails, 26 per cent in all. This service—over $50,000,000 annually—represents a pure gift by the people to the cause of education and the dissemination of knowledge. It amounts to about the same proportion in postal operations as the passenger traffic in railway operations. Suppose the people who ride on the railways had government to compel the railways to carry all their passengers for nothing, could they then be heard to condemn the railways for maleconomy or inefficiency in failing to pay interest and dividends. "Ingratitude, thou marble-hearted fiend." This is what some of the beneficiaries of the $50,000,000 postal subsidy are doing.

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY.

But the greatest single application of democracy remains to be stated, and includes in its beneficent object common man and superman as well. You are familiar with the thought that nearly all governments have been founded by force, and since the force was limited to given localities, so, too, has been the government. Only the government founded by the Cæsars appears as a possible exception to this remark. It extended from Persia to Gibraltar, from the Pillars of Hercules to India's coral strands, and resulted in the Pax Romana, the operations of which have meant so much for modern civilization. No one since has been able to found anything resembling international government, and so we have no real international law.

In the absence of such government with the legislative, the judicial, and the executive functions the equal rights of men to life, liberty, and property are trampled under foot in an anarchistic international community. There is the same kind of need for law and order in the international community that there is in the city, the county, and State. For the rule of anarchism the régime of government should be substituted to safeguard the most commonplace human rights; and this means a legislative, a judicial, and executive institutions, under which a system of definite government and law may replace the gap, the anarchistic gap, in universal government, which now gives rise to the occasions causing abominable war.

"It can not be done," says the tory and the blinded pessimist, who dreams as much as other dreamers, but always dreams nightmares and who is afraid to brush down the cobwebs lest the ceiling may fall. It can be done, say the voices of the fathers who formulated the Federal Constitution. We did it; we formulated the interstate government, now possessing 48 members, and it performs all the functions of an international government, including some national functions. When we deprived the State of the treaty-making power we took away its war-making power as well. A Congress makes laws to govern the interstate, the international, relations of these 48 States, which the interstate courts interpret and the interstate marshals enforce. We had to meet just the same problems to be met by your generation in introducing law and order into the international community. Questions of the inviolability of State boundaries, disarmament of the member States, interstate and foreign commerce, representation in the lawmaking body. Your task is not greater than ours, and your duty and your opportunities, they are impossible. Meet them as we meet ours, with discriminating courage and a faith in the future sustained by the achievements of democrary in the past. The philosopher Turgot once declared: "I never admired Columbus so much for discovering a new world as I did for going out to hunt for it on the faith of an opinion." Here is your difference between your democrat and your tory. There are bogs, there are incurable evils. He would avoid the bogs by never moving in any direction. He never takes chances, and yet some chances must be taken if progress is to be made. Even the surest propositions of science involve elements of doubt for the finicky, and but for the leaders, the pioneers, the supermen willing to take some chance, republican governments, the common school, manhood, suffrage, and the principal elements of civilization could never have been gained. A new era is coming. When the burgetarian of the future finds that his interest charges on the public debt abroad are greater than the gross receipts of the railways, and again he is asked to put more money into the maw of militarism, then the international question is going to become a domestic question, and what the fathers did for 48 States in this country in constructing an interstate government to prevent war, will then be done for the 53 States whose sovereignty represents the population of the globe. [Applause.]

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Amen!

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD] is recognized for one hour. [Applause.]

EMBARGO ON ARMS AND AMMUNITION.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Speaker, when the European war first broke out Mr. Wilson, as President of the United States, true to his firm purpose to keep our country out of war, admonished our people to remain neutral and refrain from every word or act that might betray a preference or prejudice for or against either party to the unhappy conflict. I presume that every man of ordinary intelligence sympathizes with one side or the other engaged in that horrible struggle. Like most other Members of Congress I have heeded the advice of the President and have carefully refrained from any public utterance on the subject of the war, but from the very beginning the tories of Boston and the money changers of New York and New England have been saying and doing all in their power to push the United States into war with Germany. The real attitude of these propagandists is easily discovered from a reading of the following quotation which appeared yesterday in the New York Times over the signature of Dr. Charles W. Eliott, of Boston:

> One satisfactory solution can now be clearly discerned, and only one, which would be both feasible and effective. A firm and durable combination of Great Britain, France, Italy, Russia, and Japan—present belligerents—and, by invitation, the United States or Pan America and Scandinavia could assure the freedom of the seas for all of the world in time of peace and for themselves and their allies in time of war.

On last Thursday the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] assumed to address the House on the subject of an embargo on arms and ammunition. Instead of discussing the grave question which he had chosen for his theme he devoted his whole vehement harangue to an ardent espousal of the English cause, a virulent invective against the Germans, and an absolute forgetfulness of America.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the time has now come when somebody should speak on behalf of our own country.

Let us overlook the passionate outburst of the gentleman from Massachusetts and discuss his subject—an embargo on arms and ammunition—which he so carefully ignored. The gentleman did at one time get close enough to his subject to say that there is nothing in international law which would constitute it an unneutral act for any citizen of the United States to export arms or ammunition to any of the belligerants. Nobody disputes that proposition. So far as international law is concerned any citizen of the United States has a right to export arms and ammunition to any Government or any individual in the world, whether it be to Germany or England, to Austria or France, to Madero or Huerta, to Carranza or Villa. But it is also true that there is nothing in international law which would constitute it an unneutral act for the United States to lay an embargo on the exportation of arms and ammunition whenever it shall be deemed to our interest to do it. Of course I do not forget that some of the tories of Boston have urged that if war has once begun and has resulted in a given state of facts beneficial to one belligerant it would be an unneutral act for our Government to so change its own laws as to change such existing state of facts; that the progress of the war has resulted in the British driving the Germans from the sea, so that the allies now have a beneficial monopoly of buying arms in the American market, and that for us to now enact any legislation which would impair that monopoly would be an unneutral act, even though such legislation were enacted solely for our own benefit. Nothing could be more absurd. It shall be enough for the purposes of this discussion to call attention to the fact that the United States has already taken an opposite view of this question during this war.

On March 4, 1915, a fleet of German cruisers was afloat on the high seas. On account of the superiority of the British Navy this German fleet could not go to home ports for its supplies, but had to rely solely upon what could be secured from neutral ports, mainly those of the United States. This German fleet had become a serious menace to British shipping and the transportation of soldiers from British colonies to the seat of war. This was a condition brought about by the progress of the war, which was favorable to the Germans and disadvantageous to the British. On that day, March 4, 1915, the Congress of the United States changed that condition which had so been brought about by the progress of the war by the enactment of a resolution which made it impossible for those German cruisers thereafter to get supplies from our ports as it theretofore had been lawful for them to do. No protest from Germany or any other country was made against this legislation. By the enactment of that resolution the United States has foreclosed the question whether a neutral power may, by the amendment of its own laws in its own interest, change conditions which have resulted from the progress of a war between other powers. The only question remaining is whether the best interests of the United States would be promoted or retarded by laying an embargo upon the exportation of arms and ammunition.

Mr. Speaker, I favor an embargo. [Applause.] There are many urgent reasons why it should be established.

In the first place, an embargo would lessen the expenses of our military establishment. The gentleman from Massachusetts and many others from those sections where arms and ammunition are manufactured are urging Congress to undertake a scheme of militarism which would cost billions of dollars. They tell us that such a policy is absolutely necessary to save our country and perpetuate its institutions. If there is such a danger, by all means in our power we should prepare to meet it. Naturally the first thing we should do is to look about us and ascertain from what source such a danger is likely to come. We should then be in better position to prepare to meet it.

Now, what country can or is likely to undertake our overthrow? I call upon the gentleman from Massachusetts to tell us where is the lair of the lurking lion whom he dreads and against whom he asks us to make such costly and burdensome preparation? It would not be fair to the gentleman from Massachusetts to observe him so overwhelmed with alarm and assume that he has no ground upon which to base his apprehensions. Then, sir, I again ask, from what country do we fear an attack of such character that it is necessary to bend the backs of the people under the burden of taxation which would be necessary to meet the expenses of your gigantic military scheme?

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman permit me to ask him a short question?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I will yield for a question if it is pertinent to the question that I am discussing.

Mr. McKENZIE. I would like to ask the gentleman whether he favors a temporary or a permanent embargo on exportations of arms and munitions of war?

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is hardly germane to the question I am discussing. But I may say for the gentleman's benefit that I would be glad to see a statute enacted putting a perpetual embargo on the shipment of arms and ammunition from this country. Moreover, I would be in favor of a law that would declare a Government monopoly on the manufacture of all arms and ammunition. [Applause.]

Mr. TAGGART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Yes.

Mr. TAGGART. The gentleman favors, then, the placing of the same kind of an embargo on the exportation of arms and ammunition for the foreign armies as is placed now on the exportation of arms and munitions to the foreign navies? That is, you wish to extend the national embargo to the foreign armies as well as to the foreign navies?

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield to the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I will yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. It is just a question. I want to ask the gentleman this question: The President having recommended that we take steps for preparedness, does the gentleman think it would be good public policy, or in the interest of peace, for the President to publicly declare he thought we were in danger of having war with any other country?

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Speaker, that is not pertinent to what I am discussing.

The rest of us are entitled to know what you know, and to consider the facts which you consider as calling for the extraordinary militarism which you so hysterically demand. Again, I ask, where is the foe you fear? The best method for arriving at a conclusion would seem to be to apply a process of elimination.

I believe the gentleman from Massachusetts will agree that no great preparedness is necessary to defend us from an attack by Cuba, Mexico, or any Central American or South American State, nor by Norway, Sweden, Holland, Denmark, or Switzerland, nor for many years to come by China, Persia, or Siam.

As a make-weight to their pro-British propaganda the tories have undertaken to arouse the country to a fear of German invasion. To frighten their crying children into silence they sing: "The Germans will get you if you don't watch out." Having caught the refrain of that silly song the gentleman repeats it here.

For a moment let us discuss the probabilities of a German invasion of this country.

In the first place, I am sure that the Germans, in their own interest, desire to be on friendly terms with us. The very best they can hope for is to come out of the present war in urgent need of credit, raw materials, and markets. [Applause.] They are sensible enough to know that to no other country could they look with so much hope as the United States, which has so large a surplus of what they will need. True, they may have some heartburnings over the truculent utterances of our tories, but in the face of these they would still regard it as more desirable and more expedient to come to us rather than go to England and Russia for what they want.

But, Mr. Speaker, to meet the tories upon their own ground, let us assume the absurd position that as soon as she emerges from the present war Germany will undertake to invade this country. To accomplish it she would have to land a conquering army on our shores. Such an army would have to cross the ocean under convoy of the German Navy, which is not as strong as our own, and disembark her army in the face of the resistance of our Army and coast defenses. Every sensible man knows it could not be done. But let us project the silly proposition further and assume that Germany could land an overpowering army on our shores, and that she desires to do it. Even then she would not undertake it. Germany knows very well that if she should send her army across the ocean for any purpose she would be immediately invaded by Russia and France and despoiled of her territory. [Applause.]

Then, to summarize, I assert, first, Germany has no desire to invade our country, but will prefer to borrow and buy from us and sell to us; second, that she could not if she would land an army on our shores; and, third, if she could accomplish such a feat she would not undertake it, because she knows that upon the departure of her army her country would be overrun by Russia and France.

Mr. Speaker, the tories who assert the possibilities of a German invasion do not believe it themselves, but are simply trying to capitalize the fears of the American people in their attempt to force the United States into the war on the side of the British.

What I have said about Germany applies with equal force to Austria. It is clear, then, that any danger from Germany or Austria can not be the basis of the fears of the gentleman from Massachusetts which impels him to urge such stupendous preparedness.

I again ask what country could endanger our security. Is it France or Italy or Russia? Neither of them is strong enough; and if she were, like Germany, she would not dare send her army so far away from home lest in its absence she should be invaded by Germany and Austria.

Is it Japan that the gentleman from Massachusetts and others, who demand such hasty and costly preparedness, fear? Japan, like Germany, has a navy much inferior to ours. It is not strong enough to convoy an army to our coast.

So, now, Mr. Speaker, I have made it clear that not one of the countries which I have named could successfully invade the United States, even with no more military preparedness than we now have.

There is only one more country to be considered. That is Great Britain. I do not believe that she has any more desire to invade the United States than has any of the other countries which I have mentioned. Neither do I believe she could accomplish it if she tried. Her navy is strong enough, but her army is not.

I, however, am not one of those who feel that we should gauge our preparedness by what we believe to be the designs of other countries toward us, but by the possibilities in the event any of them should entertain hostile designs.

I do not believe any country alone could successfully invade us, nor do I believe any combination of countries could be formed with enough strength to accomplish it except Japan and Great Britain. As I have already said, I do not believe that either of these countries have such designs. I have also said we should not rely upon what we believe to be the friendly designs of other countries, but put ourselves in a position to defend our country should they betray hostile designs. In the case of Japan and Great Britain there is one disturbing circumstance. I refer to the treaty in force between them which requires either to support the other in war. I regard that treaty as very unfortunate, and believe it has been the cause of many grave fears by the people of other countries.

If Japan, contrary to what we believe to be her temper, were to undertake hostilities against us and had the support of the British, our situation would indeed be critical. In such an eventuality our condition would be all the more unfortunate in that we should have to fight against the billion dollars' worth of arms and ammunition which we have sold to the British in the last year. This would certainly be to us a great handicap.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of an embargo on the exportation of arms and ammunitions lest we might unwarily strengthen the arm of a future adversary.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a good deal of interest to the remarks of my friend from Missouri, and I would like to ask him one question in all good faith, and I hope he will consider it pertinent.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. If it is pertinent, I shall be glad to answer it.

Mr. McKENZIE. I understand the gentleman is strongly in favor of an embargo on munitions of war. The question I desire to ask the gentleman is whether or not he would favor including in that embargo horses and mules from the State of Missouri?

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Speaker, I will refer the gentleman to any standard dictionary to see whether horses, mules, wheat, corn, beef, and pork or any of those things fall under the definition of arms and ammunition. Remember I did not say "munitions." I said "ammunition." I meant precisely what I said, and I do not now include in that any other thing except arms and ammunition; that is, guns and things to shoot out of them.

Mr. McKENZIE. I beg the gentleman's pardon if I made a mistake in asking the question——

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Oh, no.

Mr. McKENZIE. But I have always understood that artillery is of but little use unless you have horses and mules with which to transport it over the country.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Oh, Mr. Speaker, that is begging the question. Arms and ammunition are valuable even where there are no mules and horses. Gasoline engines can be used to haul them, and they can be transported in other ways. But lest some tory makes capital out of what I have here said, and claims that we are trying to keep our farmers from selling their food supplies and our manufacturers from selling their articles, I want it to be clearly understood that the embargo I propose applies only to those things that are strictly contraband of war. I mean precisely what is contained in the words, as I have used them, an embargo on arms and ammunition, and I do not include horses, mules, and other things that may be used for war or in peace.

Mr. KELLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. For a question pertinent to what we are discussing.

Mr. KELLEY. I was interested in the statement of the gentleman that he thought acts of this sort would lessen the military establishment of our own country, and I was rather curious to know how it would.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I think I must depart from the discussion of my subject far enough to express my regret that I have devoted 15 minutes to stating a proposition that nobody understands. What I meant to be understood as saying was this, that if we sell a billion dollars' worth of arms and ammunition to a foreign country which may hereafter, unfortunately, become our adversary, we shall have to make just that much more arms and ammunition for ourselves before we are equal to the country we have thus supplied.

Mr. KELLEY. I may say to the gentleman that I was rather impressed with the argument of the President when he was here—his argument to the contrary.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I believe there is another reason why we should establish an embargo on arms and ammunition. As long as they are manufactured in this country the logical effect of it is that the United States is made the basis of operations from which belligerents assault one another. Go into the factories which are making these blood profits and you will find a British or a French officer looking over and inspecting these arms and ammunitions, taking careful note of the American methods, becoming more familiar with the American method of preparedness than are some gentlemen on this floor. The United States is to-day in these ammunition factories simply the basis of operation by which one belligerent is carrying on the war against another, and that in the face of a statute which says that our shores shall not become the base of operations for any belligerent in any war to which we are not a party.

Again, look at the people who are indulging in the manufacture of arms and ammunition. I was appalled the other day when I had called to my attention the rise of the stock in some of these concerns. An ex-Representative said to a present Representative: "If you had bought that stock a year ago every $100 you put in would now make $1,000." Take the Du Pont Powder Co. In 1914 their stock was selling for $122. In 1915 it was selling at $1,000.

Another feature of this thing is that these people who maintain these ammunition and gun factories are prominent people; they are powerful, they are influential, they are the men who furnish advertisements to large newspapers, they are men who can get entrée into newspaper offices. They are the men who can shut such speeches as I am delivering out of the public papers and carry columns of things such as were uttered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER]. It raises in the country and influential class of people engaged not only in the manufacture of arms and ammunitions, but, I grieve to say, it also engages in the business of manufacturing markets for the unholy stuff they produce.

The gentleman from Massachusetts had much to say in disparagement of hyphenated German-Americans. Who is not proud of hyphenated Americans? There have been pure Americans who forged their names into the pages of American history. Among them Powhatan, Tecumseh, Osceola, Sitting Bull, and Geronimo. But the people who built our Commonwealth, molded our Government, fashioned our institutions, and developed our civilization were the hyphenated Americans. In the younger days of our Republic our guiding spirits were the Anglo-Americans. Then we have had the Irish-Americans. Who can conceive what the Irish-American has done for America? It would be an invidious discrimination to name any of them to the exclusion of the others, and yet the time is far in the past when the tories of Boston gave Irish-Americans cold comfort. We Missourians all feel proud of the Irish-American when we pass through

Statuary Hall and see the statue of our one-time United States Senator, Gen. James Shields, at different times a Senator from three States and a general in the Union Army in the war between the States. That old Irish-American helped to make this country great. We have had Franco-Americans, Danish-Americans, Swedish-Americans. Even Afro-Americans have played their part. Who shall say that Fred Douglass and Booker Washington were not blessings to the generations in which they lived? We have had our Scotch-Americans, who have wrought well, and I am glad that the President has not hesitated to catalogue himself as a hyphenate. In his Columbus speech a few days ago he said with some pride that he was a Scotch-Irishman.

Why does the tory utter with hissing hatred the term German-American? Of all of the hyphenated Americans, who has been more industrious, honest, law abiding, or patriotic than the German-American? In what line of human endeavor has the German-American not played a leading part? When the Civil War broke upon us the German-American was in the forefront of the contest, battling for the Union. Had it not been for the Germans Missouri would have gone with the Confederacy. In that event the southern boundary of Iowa instead of the northern boundary of Arkansas would have been the battle line. More than 200,000 German-Americans enlisted under the Stars and Stripes in that war. Go into any State of the Union and in every vocation you will find the German-American playing a leading part.

Oh, these hyphenates. As time rolls on we will be prouder and prouder that we have the German-American in this country. [Applause.] Out in my State we give our daughters in marriage to German-American sons and take the daughters of German-Americans in marriage to our sons. We join our fortunes with theirs and with pride and affection we mingle our blood with theirs. Why should they be the victims of so much calumny here now? Will somebody point to any German-American in this country who has expressed a sympathy for Germany as against the United States? The most he has done is to express a sympathy about a matter in which the United States is not concerned, about a war to which the United States is not a party. What German could look back upon such a history as Germany's, and remember the glorious deeds of that glorious people and not feel a just pride and heartfelt sympathy for his fatherland in the hour of her sorrow? I am an Anglo-American. Every drop of blood that courses through my veins came from England. But, Mr. Speaker, I am constrained to say that no nobler civilization ever blessed the world than the German. God bless the German-American.

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. For a pertinent question of what I am discussing.

Mr. FOCHT. The gentleman believes in a sufficient and ample preparedness, does he not?

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I do.

Mr. FOCHT. Does the gentleman believe that any foreign foe that wants us should come and get us, and that our preparation should be for defense and not invasion?

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I believe that if any foreign foe wishes to come here and get us, we should see that it does not take us.

Mr. FOCHT. In other words, that we should take them.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. No; I do not say that. I will state my own position.

Mr. FOCHT. The gentleman is opposed to any foreign invasion of this country, and that our defense should be amply prepared for it.

Now, I want to call attention and ask the gentleman to amplify some portion of his generally splendid address, and that is in regard to the finances of Europe. I think the gentleman recalls that Napoleon said, "Give me three things and I will have the universe at my feet," and those things were "money, money, money!" Now, I understand that Europe is bankrupt, that the rest of the allies are on the pay roll of Great Britain, and that Great Britain is coming here borrowing on her bonds and securities; and since money constitutes the sinews of war, how are they going to prosecute any war against us while they are financially broke? [Applause.] In other words, several years ago when Europe was at her maximum strength on land and sea we heard nothing about this most lavish proposed preparedness. Now, when Europe is on her back, broke and bankrupt, and at her minimum strength, it seems to me much of this fear at this particular time is groundless. [Applause.]

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I thought the gentleman interrupted me for a question, but it turns out he has not; nevertheless I must express to him my gratitude for putting so much better than I could the very thing I was thinking. I agree with him, and if I had time I should like to discuss the impropriety of taking the people's credit of this country and loaning it out to the foreign countries who are engaged in war. [Applause.] We should, rather, lend it to our own people to support their own industries and carry along prosperity for ourselves.

BRIDGE ACROSS OHIO RIVER AT STEUBENVILLE, OHIO.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Speaker, I now call up the bill H. R. 3593, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] asks unanimous consent for the consideration of a bill which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3593) to authorize the Ohio-West Virginia Bridge Co. to construct a bridge across the Ohio River at the city of Steubenville, Jefferson County, Ohio.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Ohio-West Virginia Bridge Co., a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of West Virginia, is hereby authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Ohio River to and into Cross Creek district, in the county of Brooke, in the State of West Virginia, from the southern end of the city of Steubenville, in the county of Jefferson, State of Ohio, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

Also, the following committee amendments were read:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "Virginia," insert the words "its successors and assigns."

Page 1, lines 7 and 8, after the word "River" in line 7, insert the words "at a point suitable to the interests of navigation."

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, is there a similar Senate bill?

The SPEAKER. The Senate bill is identical, with the exception of these amendments.

Mr. MANN. It is a similar bill?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. MANN. It does not require unanimous consent if the Speaker will lay the Senate bill before the House.

The SPEAKER. The trouble about that is this, namely, that the conditions do not come within the rule. The House committee has reported a bill that is not on the calendar. At the same time the gentleman from West Virginia asks leave——

Mr. MANN. He asks leave to consider the Senate bill in the House——

The SPEAKER. Yes. The bill S. 2409 in lieu of this House bill, which has been reported. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. MANN. Let us hear the Senate bill read first.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act (S. 2409) to authorize the Ohio-West Virginia Bridge Co. to construct a bridge across the Ohio River at the city of Steubenville, Jefferson County, Ohio.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Ohio-West Virginia Bridge Co., a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of West Virginia, is hereby authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Ohio River to and into Cross Creek district, in the county of Brooke, in the State of West Virginia, from the southern end of the city of Steubenville, in the county of Jefferson, State of Ohio, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman should offer the amendments, if he intends to do so.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not have to have unanimous consent. The Clerk will report the House amendments.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman offers amendments to this bill which were reported by the House committee to the House bill?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] offers them as his amendments, individually. The Clerk will report both of them.

The Clerk read the first amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "Virginia," insert the words "its successors and assigns."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the Senate bill by inserting, after the word "River," line 7, the words "at a point suitable to the interests of navigation."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the House bill be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the House bill will be laid on the table.

There was no objection.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. HENSLEY, by unanimous consent, was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of W. J. Rosselot, no adverse report having been made thereon.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR WATERWAYS.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent at this time that I may be allowed to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FREAR. I desire to be notified, Mr. Speaker, when I shall have consumed 50 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Very well.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Speaker, I desire, so far as possible, to answer any questions that may be asked. This has been my custom in the past. But I wish first to get my statement before the House as clearly as I can, and it will take all of the time at my disposal to do that. I shall be ready to answer questions at the conclusion of my remarks. At this time I trust I shall not have interruptions.

It is needless to say, Mr. Speaker, that on the subject of waterway waste I differ in judgment from Members who are alone interested in particular projects, and, of course, that is a matter of regret on my part, but it can not be helped. Everyone must consider the subject according to his own best judgment. That is what I have endeavored to do.

Before undertaking a discussion of different waterway projects and the allotment of $50,000,000 given by Army engineers in 1914 and 1915, I wish to call attention to some remarks made January 7 by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND]. Let me say that he and I are personally very good friends, and the House recognizes in him an honorable and a very able man. He made some statements in his speech that I desire to have thoroughly inquired into so the country may know all the facts.

His statement, which is before me, is not an unusual statement, because we hear it from waterway lobbies and we have had it from the gentleman's own State before. It comes to us from various sources, from waterway journals, and from some public men, that the railways are interested in the fight being waged against waterway waste. The gentleman from Missouri put the charge specifically the other day, for which I thank him. In order to determine whether or not the charge of railroad interference with legislation be true—because it can not be decided here—I have drawn a resolution to ascertain the facts, and I trust the House will investigate the truth or falsity of allegations now made upon the floor of the House.

PERSONAL AFFILIATIONS.

So far as I am individually concerned, my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], will vouch for the fact that in past years we both were engaged in helping to draw the railroad-regulation laws that were passed by the State of Wisconsin. We were also among those who helped pass those laws through both houses of the Wisconsin Legislature after a long and bitter fight. I do not think the charge of railway partiality will lie personally against me. I never received a dollar from a railroad in my life, but, on the contrary, have been called upon in past years to prosecute suits against them. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] does not know the facts, nor does this House, but an official investigation will determine the truth. Possibly with equal propriety I might challenge the gentleman's position and assert that he appears here as a personal attorney for a steamboat company, or that he is a stockholder or owner of a transportation company, or interested in a great land reclamation project on the Missouri River. I do not say so. I do not believe it to be a fact; neither does the House believe it is so. It is in no way a personal matter between the gentleman from Missouri and myself, for I feel sure both desire to have an investigation held, to determine the truth of his serious charges. I have drawn this resolution, providing first, that the Judiciary Committee of the House shall conduct an investigation to ascertain if the railways have in any manner, by propaganda or otherwise, inspired the opposition that was offered to two waterway bills last session; further, to find if the railways have taken any position upon any legislation now or heretofore pending before the House or the Senate. Not only that, but in order that this may be a thoroughgoing investigation——

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I understand the gentleman does not wish to be interrupted?

INVESTIGATE THE LOBBIES I SPECIALLY NAME.

Mr. FREAR. Not until the conclusion of my statement. I shall then be glad to be interrupted. In order to ascertain other important information, I ask that the resolution which I offer at this time shall include what is known as the Missouri River lobby—I do not know whether any Member present has any knowledge of it—a lobby which has an interest in 500,000 acres of land, that are worth from $100 to $125 an acre, reaching a total value approximately of $60,000,000, according to the official records.

Next I desire that the same resolution shall include activities of the Upper Mississippi Reclamation Association, which has 780,000 acres of land that it desires to reclaim at Government expense, or partially so, land valued at $80,000,000 according to the official records. I have here an invitation received this morning naming me as a delegate to some reclamation convention that is called to meet at Cairo on January 19. It comes from one of these numerous waterway "congresses" that I have failed to embody in my resolution.

I desire next to have the Federal Congress investigate activities of the Mississippi River levee lobby. I have shown to the House in the past that eight railroads paid $40,000 to that lobby for propagating its peculiar work, and I submitted in the RECORD last session a subscription list from what purported to be a photographic copy of the original.

I also ask that the resolution include the activities of the Alabama Water Power Co., which owns 96 per cent of all water powers in the State of Alabama—a company which now has its lobby here and had it here during all the last session, a lobby which seeks $18,700,000 of Government funds with which to build a 150-foot dam down at Muscle Shoals on the Tennessee River, and for other purposes. We drove that project out of the bill last year, but we are now notified from the RECORD, inserted in both the House and the Senate on the 7th instant, that the Georgia Legislature demands we pass an appropriation for the Muscle Shoals project. I am particularly desirous of ascertaining if the charge is true that the Alabama Water Power Co. has set apart a large fund for lobby expenses, according to common report.

I further desire, in addition, to have my resolution reach the Atlantic Dredgers' Association, which I have shown to the House in the past has secretly divided up among dredgers the Government contracts for dredging. I have disclosed that fact by their own communications, and also that its members are contributors to some of these waterway lobbies I have described.

I desire also to have this resolution include—and I have so drawn it—the activities of the Waterways "Congress," I believe it is called, which was in session in Washington a few weeks ago, and which conducted back fires against Senators and Members who opposed waterway projects here at the last session of Congress. I placed the facts in the RECORD at that time. I have drawn the resolution so that Congress can ascertain all the facts. Here is the statement of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] and the resolution:

[Statement of the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BORLAND) Jan. 7, pp. 627 and 629 of the RECORD.]

* * * * * * *

Nobody knows better than the railroads that if they can get Congress to withhold appropriations for a single year every shipper who has patronized the boat lines will be driven back into their arms. Any ambitious statesman who wants to run for President of the United States on a railroad platform should begin by a submarine attack upon the waterways.

* * * * * * *

At this crisis, when water transportation is becoming a substantial factor, it is much easier for the railroads to cripple it and put it out of business by preventing appropriations in Congress for the continuation of the work. If they succeed even for a single year in causing an abandonment of the work, shippers whose whole commercial interests are at stake will be compelled to come back to the railroads and a confidence in water transportation as a permanent factor will be destroyed. This is the bug under the chip of the whole waterway fight. Doubtless the railroad policy is a short-sighted one, and doubtless it would be better for them as well as for the country at large to recognize the waterways as a permanent addition to the transportation facilities of the country; but just now every railroad politician and railroad paper is busily shouting "pork," to frighten the advocates of river improvement; or "preparedness," to charm them away from a continuance of the waterway policy.

* * * * * * *

Resolution.

Whereas on January 6, 1916, charges were made on the floor of the House that railway companies were instigating the fight waged during the Sixty-third Congress, and were interested in the opposition presented during this session against waterway waste, which charges, in justice to all parties concerned, ought to be fully investigated; and

Whereas House resolution 612, Sixty-third Congress, second session, specifically charged that the Atlantic and Gulf Coast Dredge Owners' Association has been actively and improperly engaged in securing the passage of river and harbor bills; and

Whereas House resolution 613, Sixty-third Congress, second session, specifically charged that a lobby organization known as the Rivers and Harbors Congress was actively and improperly engaged in promoting the passage of improper river and harbor appropriations; and

Whereas the same resolution specifically charged that the Mississippi River Levee Association is a lobby supported in part by railroad contributions, and is actively and improperly engaged in securing the insertion of improper items in river and harbor bills; and

Whereas numerous other lobbies have been specifically named in the public press as actively engaged in improperly securing the insertion of particular appropriations in annual river and harbor bills: Therefore

Resolved, That the Judiciary Committee of the House be instructed to bring before it any and all witnesses having or assuming to have any information regarding the connection of any railway company, directly or indirectly, with the opposition to the passage of river and harbor bills during this or any other session, or any railway that has had connection, directly or indirectly, with any other bills;

That such committee shall further investigate the activities of a Missouri River lobby that is alleged to have an active interest in securing appropriations for the reclamation, at Government expense, of 500,000 acres of private land along the Missouri River, valued, according to official records, at $60,000,000;

That said committee shall further investigate the activities of the upper Mississippi Drainage Association, that is alleged to have an active interest in securing appropriations for the reclamation, at Government expense, of 780,000 acres of private lands along the upper Mississippi River, valued, approximately, at $78,000,000, according to testimony contained in official records;

That said committee shall further investigate the activities of the Mississippi River Levee lobby that is alleged to be supported in part by railway contributions and is further alleged to have an active interest in securing appropriations for the reclamation, at Government expense, of private lands along the lower Mississippi River, valued at hundreds of millions of dollars, according to testimony contained in official records;

That said committee shall further investigate the activities of the Alabama Power Co., which is alleged to have an active interest in securing, by installments, an appropriation of $18,701,000 from the Government, through the river and harbor bill, for the erection of 150-foot power dams, and including a Government loan to such company extending 100 years, with interest at the rate of 3 per cent per annum;

That said committee shall further investigate the activities of the Atlantic and Gulf Coast Dredge Owners' Association, which is alleged to have improperly supported waterway lobbies, and to have undertaken secretly and improperly to distribute Government contracts among different dredging concerns doing business with the Government;

That said committee shall further investigate the activities of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress lobby that is alleged to improperly urge the passage of extravagant waterway bills by instituting back fires in the various States against Members of Congress who are opposed to such bills; and

That said committee be instructed to report at the earliest possible date any facts developed from such investigation which may have any relation to appropriations for projects now being urged upon the Sixty-fourth Congress.

WATERWAY WASTE.

Mr. Speaker, we have paid out of the Government Treasury over $850,000,000 for our waterways, and I make the assertion that any man who gives study to the subject will become convinced that over one-half of that amount has been wasted. I believe this to be a conservative statement.

I further state at this time that practically two-thirds of all the money appropriated for waterways every session goes into the rivers and creeks of this country, whereas the inconsiderable commerce of these rivers and creeks has decreased from 80 to 95 per cent on the different projects during the past 40 years.

On the closing day of the Sixty-third Congress it placed $30,000,000 in the hands of Army engineers, in addition to $20,000,000 given to them six months before for waterway distribution. I desire to discuss this $50,000,000 allotment by the Chief Engineer, and also to refer to our waterway legislative methods.

Speaking of a former bill passed by Congress, Chairman SPARKMAN, of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, said in a speech last January:

> It was characterized as an iniquitous measure, a "steal," and as having been framed, constructed, and completed upon the despicable principle of division and silence.

With this he disagreed, but to the same effect was the remark in debate of a distinguished Senator from South Carolina, now in Congress, who denounced a river and harbor bill as a "humbug and a steal."

With these reflected opinions of annual river and harbor bills the country seems to agree; but it may not know that, although wasteful bills aggregating $92,000,000 were defeated last session, the $50,000,000 substitute allotments of 1914 and 1915 by the Chief of Engineers deserves equal condemnation. Great waste characterized that allotment, and, although a saving of $42,000,000 in the total appropriations by a defeat of the two bills is a matter of public congratulation, those who contributed to the defeat will realize a sorry result if content to accept a temporary saving while the wasteful and scandalous legislative practice remains undisturbed. I fully appreciate the tremendous power behind the system. It includes many well-financed waterway lobbies, the self-interest of Members in caring for their own districts, in regular political perquisites, in jobs for thousands of men now employed by Army engineers, and in millions of dollars annually paid dredgers and other contractors. It vitally affects landowners along the lower Mississippi and Missouri, who expect to realize hundreds of millions of dollars, in the aggregate, through advanced values of lands reclaimed at Government expense. The annual river and harbor bill is also backed by real estate and water-power lobbies which demand Government aid.

It is, in fact, a great pork barrel, largely affected by political pressure that accommodates countless private interests which now profit at the expense of the Public Treasury.

ARMY ENGINEERS' APPROVAL.

When Congress began squandering public money on wasteful waterway schemes a few years ago the record shows that Senator Burton, the country's greatest waterway authority, sought to check waste by having Government engineers approve all projects. It was an experiment, and in order to erect some slight barrier against greed, subordinate officials were appointed to determine great commercial projects and enormous expenditures. Men who had no commercial or business training and no direct responsibility to the people were chosen to prevent Congress from yielding to local pull. From the record of wasteful projects now approved by Army engineers we realize the powerful pressure that has been brought to bear upon them and we discover that their approvals are now used to justify many scandalous projects which would not otherwise pass Congress.

It is a disappointing experiment because we find proposed waterway waste in 1915 was twice as large in volume, if not in character, as at any time before engineers' approvals were required by Congress. This does not reflect upon the personal honor of engineers individually or collectively, because the blame rests with political influences that have broken down the independence of subordinate officials. No thinking man can close his eyes to conscienceless jobs now masquerading under the guise of waterway improvements. Nor can we get rid of these jobs without the consent of engineers who are confronted with the same influences that put them over. If the present system is discreditable and notoriously wasteful, why not change it? It is with that purpose I desire to offer some observations in order to suggest lines of independent investigation for those who believe we ought to cut loose from a bad system.

INFLUENCE ON FREIGHT RATES—STONE AGE STATESMEN.

Any attempt to sift worthless projects from waterway bills is hooted down by a few stone age statesmen and lobby agents who affect to believe that millions of dollars in Government money now annually thrown away on private-land reclamation, private water powers, and deserted rivers, in some indefinite way will serve to reduce freight rates for the public at large; that those who oppose wasteful waterway bills are thereby preventing a reduction in railway tariffs. No well-informed man will so argue to an intelligent audience, and it is significant that railways now contribute liberally to waterway lobbies to secure Government-built railway, water terminals, and other private privileges. Under existing law any undue loss in income on one branch of the railroad must be made up on the rest of the system to secure reasonable rates guaranteed under the Constitution and yet the Government is asked to waste millions on favored communities to be paid out of taxes contributed by other communities.

Men who oppose waterway waste are among those who have demanded strict railway regulation.

Speaking personally, as before stated, with my colleague [Mr. LENROOT] and other State legislators I was identified with the passage of railway-regulation laws which were secured in Wisconsin after a lively fight lasting several years. Having the greatest waterway commerce of any State in the country, with one exception, and with the two greatest lakes and greatest river in the world washing its borders, Wisconsin is profoundly interested in genuine waterway development, but she will never come to the Government Treasury under the pretense that railway freight rates are to be lowered by such means.

Her railway commission and the Interstate Commerce Commission have abundant powers to control such rates and have exercised those powers effectually. The same situation is true in practically every State that cares to use the constitutional rights it possesses.

POWERFUL WATERWAY LOBBIES ON HAND.

On the third day that this Federal Congress was convened by law, a river and harbor lobby that styles itself a "congress" second only to the Federal Congress, held its annual meeting in this city, called together by a sensational lobby folder, entitled "If the war against waterways wins." Declared to be a "mutual bribery" association by the New York Board of Trade and Transportation, this lobby conducts a public and secret campaign that threatens every Member of Congress who opposes its notorious methods. It calls its meetings at the beginning of every session, demands of Congress $50,000,000 or more annually for a "policy, not a project," and its officers and members insist they take an active part in making up annual waterway bills and in determining the distribution of public funds. Orators with questionable projects to advance or axes to grind are heralded by its press bureau for weeks in advance. Few others appear before the lobby meetings.

In any other country or in any State of this country such a gathering would receive public condemnation and its methods would inevitably drive it out of existence. Not so at Washington, where the lobby makes its demands and throughout the year conducts a publicity bureau which furnishes "copy" to the press and inaugurates back fires against Members who revolt against its methods or the annual bill it assumes to help frame.

A LOBBY THAT SHOULD BE INVESTIGATED.

I introduced a resolution in Congress last session to investigate this "mutual bribery" lobby. Original evidence now in my possession was offered to show that, directly or through subsidiary lobbies, the dredgers, railways, and other interests that have a direct financial claim on Government grabs, contribute secretly toward the lobby's support. In some instances this lobby equally divided with its collectors the subscriptions paid by gullible supporters. Intrenched from the Capitol Building to the Southern Building it instigates back fires on Members of Congress to compel support for "pork barrel" bills. Officers enjoying many distinguishing titles from known lobby officials, to Ex-Chief Bixby, United States Army, a regular lobby attendant, all deserve credit for wasting a hundred million dollars and more of Uncle Sam's money on questionable projects during the last two or three sessions.

Providing a public investigation can be secured, as proposed by my resolution based on charges made by the gentleman from Missouri, my offer to furnish original evidence against this lobby is renewed, while in the meantime those interested in studying the lobby's real purposes and secret activities will find food for reflection in pages 15896 to 15911 in volume 51 of the RECORD. It is unnecessary to prove that the "river and harbor congress" has no proper place in legislative work, because from its own official admissions it is a "mutual bribery" organization, as stated by the greatest public transportation board in the country. No one desires to rob it of that distinction, and I will briefly refer to its notable achievements in distributing "pork" among the States.

Public and private citizens of undoubted probity have lent their names and presence to the lobby under misleading and persuasive arguments that by so doing they were performing a local duty and advancing legitimate waterway legislation. At this time I do not care to add anything to the previous exposure of disreputable lobby methods, secret sources of contributions, and back fires which it inaugurated last session, nor do I propose to waste time over fulminations from the lobby "congress," as it desires to be styled. Nor will I bandy words with those who advocate "mutual bribery" methods.

ONE HUNDRED MILLIONS OF ANNUAL WATERWAY "PORK" DEMANDED.

Expert testimony from its officers as to the lobby's power over Congress and its accomplishments were fully presented in the RECORD of October 8, 1914. I will only briefly refer to one or two significant utterances.

PORK DISTRIBUTED ACCORDING TO CONTRIBUTIONS.

One of the cardinal principles of the Rivers and Harbors "Congress" is that "nothing given, nothing got." By paying 0.001 per cent of Federal appropriations to the support of the Rivers and Harbors "Congress" every community has the supporting arm of Mr. Fox, Mr. Ellison, Mr. Thompson, Mr. Davenny, and other officials of this second "congress." On pages 60 and 62 of its 1911 report appears a list of appropriations given to the different States of the Union amounting, in all, to $178,616,897 from 1907 to 1911, inclusive.

In two columns the members of the "second congress" are impressed with the relation between that body and the amount of Government appropriations for each separate State. I quote literally from the listed method of comparison and cite a dozen States or more to show the proportionate grabs that are held out invitingly to gaze by the Rivers and Harbors "Congress" officials.

	Amounts subscribed to the support of National Rivers and Harbors Congress, by States, 1906-1911, inclusive.	Amount of appropriations received by States, in rivers and harbors bills, 1907-1911, inclusive.
Pennsylvania (east)	$4,295	$4,837,745
Connecticut	2,115	2,318,000
Massachusetts	2,850	1,451,733
Maryland	1,755	2,778,265
New Jersey	2,735	3,484,895
North Carolina	2,538	2,259,614
South Carolina	1,137	1,237,290
Virginia	4,306	4,082,454
Georgia	8,281	4,102,889
Florida	1,620	5,188,670
District of Columbia	1,530	1,243,000
Alabama	6,090	6,952,000
Louisiana	9,505	3,820,292
Texas	8,825	9,193,309
Mississippi River	.....	21,842,775

Mississippi River (1914), $10,500,000 or nearly one-half of the six years' total.

UNFAIRLY DISTRIBUTING THE PORK.

New York and Florida receive more than the average State, excepting that the Mississippi River lump sum would swell the adjacent States over $21,000,000, if counted. Florida has many small waterways, like the Kissimmee and the Oklawaha, and is the home of influential Members at both ends of the Capitol, who determine the fortunes of the annual river and harbor bill.

Doubtless it appeals to lay members to realize that by the investment of $1 in the "second congress" $1,000 will be forthcoming from the Federal Congress. It is in harmony with the views of Secretary Ellison and with the purposes set forth so eloquently by its constitution.

To become entitled to generous Federal appropriations as a harvest for a small per cent investment, the following annual dues are provided for membership in the "National Rivers and Harbors Congress of the United States," as it is styled by its officers:

	Annual dues.
Individuals	$5
Firms or corporations	10
Organizations of less than 400	25
Organizations over 400 and less than 600	50
Organizations of 600 to 1,000	75
Organizations of 1,000 or more	100
Waterway associations	100

A system of graduated contributions for which graduated appropriations are in effect assured.

SECRETARY REDFIED'S LITTLE JOKE.

According to a positive demonstration from its own official reports, the rivers lobby "congress" has relieved the Federal Congress from all responsibility for the distribution of "pork" among the various States.

This is the lobby addressed by Secretary Redfield, who declared that there is no such thing as "pork."

Yet "Capt." Ellison, official secretary of the "congress" lobby, is quoted by the official organ to have evoked applause with the sentiment—

> We send Congressmen here to legislate for the Nation, theoretically, but actually to get all he can for us, and if he does not get our share, and then some, we do our best to replace him.

Ellison holds a pistol and says, "Hands up, or deliver the cash." He also holds an "honorary life" certificate in the lobby "congress."

SECRETARY ELLISON INITIATES SECRETARY REDFIELD.

On December 8, 1915, Secretary Redfield welcomed the "congress" lobby to Washington, as stated, and in performing that peculiar courtesy he said that a weakness in the lobby's usefulness lay in the habitual "though untruthful" use of the word "pork." This statement without comment is also respectfully referred to a great Democratic leader, still in public life, who has denounced the annual pork barrel as a "humbug and a steal"; also to the New York Board of Trade, that described the lobby addressed by Secretary Redfield as a "mutual bribery" organization; and last, but not least, to the lobby officials, whose pork-securing service is set forth in their 1911 report, pages 60 to 62.

It may be hard to fix responsibility for Treasury deficits, waterway bills, or *Eastland* disasters, but to deny a self-evident

fact must be accepted by Ellison and his associates as a piece of Redfieldian humor. Let us hope that our joking Secretary, as chief executioner, will now proceed to hang the pork barrel as high as Haman.

WHAT SECRETARY THOMPSON WANTS.

Secretary Thompson, who runs things at the "congress" lobby headquarters in the Colorado Building the year round, goes other lobby officials one better in his speech before the annual meeting, in December, 1914. The press quotes him as saying, by way of public correction:

The fact is that our president is a Senator and took his seat in that body a year ago last March. We amended our constitution in 1912 so as to strike out the recommendation of $50,000,000 a year. We did not strike it out because we are the kind of chumps who believe that $50,000,000 a year is too much, but because we believe the safe, sane, and wise policy would be for the Government to spend $100,000,000 or more every year on this great work.

The permanent record might properly substitute "grab" for "great."

Thompson says "we," including President RANSDELL, Fox, et al., struck out $50,000,000 and now believe $100,000,000 annually is the proper amount.

Later in these remarks it will appear that $5,000,000,000 is not an excessive amount for waterways, according to the judgment of Secretary Thompson, who, however, may reserve the right to double his limit in order to make sure of the Mississippi land reclamation project, even as he has jumped his demands from $50,000,000 to $100,000,000 annually.

OPPOSITION IS AGAINST FRAUD AND WASTE, NOT WATERWAYS.
CONGRESS SHOULD INVESTIGATE ALL LOBBY INFLUENCES.

It is needless to repeat what was stated last session, that I have no conscious prejudice against any individual nor against any waterway project other than may be justified by the official engineers' reports. Those who question motives for opposing the wasteful river and harbor bills or criticizing the allotments made by the Chief of Engineers are invited to join with me in the demand for an investigation. I have asked an opportunity for placing all evidence squarely before the House and the country, confident in the belief that from facts and records in my possession it would bring about a better understanding of the secret influences and prodigious waste which accompany annual river and harbor bills. The public has a right to test the good faith of proponents and opponents of pork-barrel methods, and that result can not be reached by charges and recriminations, but by concrete facts, which I am prepared to submit against the river and harbor lobby and the present waterway legislative system whenever an investigation can be secured.

We are not concerned in ascertaining in whose district or State questionable waterway projects may be located. The question is one of fact whether or not criticisms are well grounded, and I yield to every Member who feels called upon to defend any project the same sincerity of purpose which I claim for my own action. Members may have fallen heir to hopeless waterway projects that, under existing methods, will remain to burden posterity long after all of us shall have passed away. It is unimportant to fix legislative responsibility for the existence of such projects, because the only question to determine is whether we shall continue expenditures for worthless ventures or extravagant payments for projects entirely disproportionate to commercial needs, according to official reports.

WHO PAYS THE BILLS?

Every project is maintained by the Federal Treasury. The people of Iowa, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Illinois, New York, Texas, or California have equal interest in the proper expenditure of public funds, because such funds are raised by war taxes, income taxes, and internal-revenue receipts contributed proportionately by every State. It can be no more just for the Government to build 150-foot dams to create water power for an Alabama concern on the Tennessee or for a Georgia water-power company on the Etowah than to build other dams the height of Niagara Falls in New York, Montana, or Idaho, for the benefit of the General Electric Trust in those States. Neither is it just for the Government to reclaim private lands for the use and private benefit of Mississippi or Louisiana or Missouri landowners unless we generously furnish free fertilizer for worn-out farms in New England States and elsewhere. In fact, what is the distinction between buying up bankrupt canals apparently to render first aid to Pennsylvania's financially injured and extracting pine stumps free of expense for the farmers in Minnesota, Wisconsin, or Michigan?

With striking inconsistency the Government has thus far refused aid to State highways; it has refused to loan money to farmers or needy citizens at low rates, notwithstanding scores of rural-credit bills have been considered, but Army engineers have approved a $10,325,000 gift and a $8,575,000 100-year 3 per cent loan to a $50,000,000 private water-power trust at Muscle Shoals, which now owns 96 per cent of all the water-power rights of Alabama. Stranger than the Army engineers' action, a preliminary appropriation was inserted into the last river and harbor bill for this project after its defeat in the House and before its defeat in the Senate.

A BILL TO PREVENT WATERWAY WASTE.

These matters I desire to discuss in an impersonal way in order to present the existing wild and scandalous scope of waterway expenditures. If we are to continue the rapidly growing waste, extravagance, and misapplication of public funds, then there must come a day of reckoning when those who defend such expenditures will be held responsible.

Whatever criticism may be fairly lodged against any project or the system fastened upon us through our own apathy, every intelligent observer believes that patriotism and honesty of purpose prevail in these Halls to-day as firmly and generally as ever before. If victims of pernicious legislative practices whenever local interests are involved, we know individual action is often inspired by local demands for a fair share of public pelf. Can we seriously question the empty value of a doubtful political asset that has actually become a liability, or the duty of every Member to unload unjust individual burdens onto a high-class board created to act impartially for the general good?

With this purpose in view, I have presented House bill 6821 for your consideration in an effort to secure systematic and scientific overhauling of our waterways by impartial and competent men. It proposes a capable board commissioned to develop waterway traffic wherever practicable and to prevent extravagant Government expenditures for useless projects. I do not claim for the bill all that may be offered to make it most effective, but I do say it is a definite proposition which seeks to give relief, and it invites thoughtful attention from every friend of legitimate waterways and of economical administration. I will attach it as an exhibit to my remarks because of its value as a public economy measure when once passed.

INDISPUTABLE EVIDENCES OF ENORMOUS WASTE.

We are advised strong influences are to be put forth by powerful lobbies to rush through another $50,000,000 wasteful appropriation. Every dollar so wasted reduces the amount available for genuine waterways and legitimate purposes of government.

When reported, the bills are rolled through the House with expedition, and five minutes' time for debate is often the limit afforded in exposing waste disclosed by single projects that may reach many millions of dollars, and it should be remembered that many continuing projects are utterly worthless.

For this reason I desire at this time and prior to the presentation of the regular bill to show by indisputable proof that the $50,000,000 given by Congress last session to Army engineers for allotment, in lieu of the $92,000,000 bills defeated, was in fact largely wasted on useless continuing waterway projects that have been repeatedly exposed and are condemned by the official reports which apologize for their continuance. Further, that an engineer's recommendation may be, and frequently is, as bad and weak in character as anything ever set aside by presidential vetoes or denounced in Congress as "humbugs and steals."

"WATERWAY" APPROPRIATIONS A LOCALITY ISSUE.

I have been advised that the fight against vicious waterway bills should be made a political issue, but that is impossible. The pork barrel is a locality issue, pure and simple, and it is high time those who pay the rapidly growing bills, that already aggregate $850,000,000, should demand an accounting of stock.

Expert statisticians advise us that Northern States, because of their greater population and wealth, pay or contribute approximately 95 per cent of all taxes and Government revenues compared with Southern States. Army engineers' reports show that probably 95 per cent of all actual commerce carried over our waterways is to or from Northern States, yet I believe it can be demonstrated that a dozen Southern States which furnish about 5 per cent of the Government's revenues and only about 5 per cent of the country's commerce, in effect receive over half of every river and harbor bill, which with sundry civil bill waterway items now averages over $50,000,000 annually.

Herewith is an interesting statement, which I have not personally verified, but I believe is correct:

States.	Total corporation income tax collected.	Total individual income tax collected.
Alabama	$177,127.39	$84,633.40
Mississippi	73,516.09	34,664.59
Arkansas	89,149.52	38,177.09
Louisiana	316,364.74	209,813.20
Texas	622,646.16	425,631.57
North Carolina	257,825.38	123,553.96
South Carolina	118,032.23	43,369.72

States.	Total corporation income tax collected.	Total individual income tax collected.
Georgia	$320,617.52	$119,983.61
Florida	108,141.60	121,368.22
Virginia	430,379.24	197,559.27
Tennessee	244,305.05	165,904.45
Oklahoma	273,203.26	133,685.76
Kentucky	467,638.45	163,191.46
Total	3,498,946.63	1,861,536.30
Total corporation income tax collected		3,498,946.63
Total, 13 States		5,359,982.93
New York	10,221,206.65	17,417,537.60
Massachusetts	1,853,057.41	2,683,084.53
Illinois	2,983,527.31	2,670,630.34
Pennsylvania	4,725,139.26	4,642,557.08
Ohio	2,538,058.60	1,489,401.11
Total	22,320,989.23	28,903,210.66
Total corporation income tax collected		22,320,989.23
Total, 5 States		51,224,199.89

These receipts are for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915.

In other words, the above list shows 13 Southern States that are liberally cared for in every river and harbor bill and 5 Northern States that paid into the Public Treasury about $10 for every dollar contributed by sister States from the South. The statement has no relation to legitimate waterway improvements, but in "pork-barrel" appropriations it indicates where the "pork" comes from.

In a bill devoted to sectional interests no other result can be reasonably expected. Twenty-seven of the leading committees of the House have chairmen from Southern States, and they, together with a majority of the regular Democratic majority coming from that section, control committee recommendations and appropriations by the River and Harbor Committee.

Promises of sectional influence to be openly exerted on the next $46,000,000 bill have also been frankly admitted, as will appear later on, and the only question seems to be what are we going to do about it? What will the people say, who pay 95 per cent of the revenues, maintain 95 per cent of the commerce, and then give over half of $50,000,000 annually to southern projects, many of which are unrelated to genuine navigation. If we must have pork, is there no polite rule of honor in legislative kleptomania as to its distribution? Even the celebrated jury once mentioned by Mr. CALLAWAY refused to convict a culprit for stealing a hog because every member of the jury had received a slice, but that judicial precedent would not be urged here, because authoritative history records that the jury equally divided the corpus delicti. In the case of waterway bills, constituents of three-fourths of the jury furnish 90 per cent of the pork—all excepting the snout and tail—while the remaining three jurymen demand more than the other nine contributing jurymen combined. This is not measuring equities, but appetites.

A HELPING HAND FROM THE "LEVEE" AND "CONGRESS" LOBBY.

Sectional influence is also far-reaching when the river lobby that claims to have an Italian hand in drafting the bill finds its brains and energy in members of the lower Mississippi levee land-reclamation organization. Strangely enough, the levee lobby officials also happen to be officials and manipulators of that other lobby organization styling itself a "river and harbor congress." "Levee" officials and "congress" officials, practically the same men, tried to get from the last Federal Congress, and nearly secured, for their Mississippi River land-reclamation project, through two bills reported to the Senate, the tidy sum of $16,450,000 for the lower Mississippi, south of the Missouri, while hundreds of misguided, famishing birdlings, who chirp before the annual lobby congress for waterway worms, are only helping to enlarge the fat Mississippi mother birds. Pulling chestnuts out of the fire becomes a fine art when all lobbies and lobbyist contribute to the landowners' reclamation grab along the Mississippi.

WHERE THE PUBLIC MONEY GOES.

Judging from the past, I desire to indicate where the next wasteful "waterway" appropriation will probably be distributed and further to furnish conclusive evidence on which subscribers to the lobby fund previously mentioned have a right of action against the lobby "congress" for fulfillment of its 1915 subscription contract. Bear in mind, during this discussion that the present Chief Engineer, who determines all waterway questions and who allotted $50,000,000 last session, was a struggling lieutenant colonel in the Army a half dozen years before he was elected to the office of Santa Claus. He shares honors and responsibilities with the lobby for all distributions.

Of the 240 projects to which Chief Kingman in 1915 allotted $26,258,472, the Mississippi, Missouri, Ohio, Tennessee, Cumberland, and Beaufort Canal were given $11,813,000, or 45 per cent of the total, according to his statement given out April 1, 1915.

Out of 300 projects contained in the defeated 1915 bill (H. R. 13811) reported by the Senate committee aggregating $38,000,000, the same six river projects above mentioned were awarded $17,795,000, or approximately 47 per cent of the total.

Including items for the Ohio contained in the sundry civil bill, these 6 projects out of 300 in the bill and 240 in the allotment were awarded over one-half of all waterway appropriations for 1915.

In other words, Chief Kingman considered these projects of overwhelming importance, and distributed the remaining 55 per cent among 234 projects, one-half of which were other rivers with insignificant commerce.

WHERE THE COMMERCE IS FOUND.

According to an analysis that will be hereafter offered, several times the aggregate actual waterway commerce carried by the above six streams is handled by either Buffalo, or Boston, or Cleveland, or Philadelphia Harbors. Over ten times the total actual commerce carried on those six rivers is handled at the Superior-Duluth Harbor, while New York's inner harbor, that received $300,000 from the allotment, annually handles twenty times the total commerce of the six rivers that received $11,813,000 from Chief Kingman in 1915.

Waterway improvements in the South, whether located in Virginia, Louisiana, or Texas, should properly be matters of national, not State or local concern. Hampton Roads, New Orleans, or Galveston Harbors are as important to preserve as the harbors of Boston, Philadelphia, or those of the Great Lakes. If any river or canal enjoys State or interstate traffic sufficient to make it a real artery of commerce instead of a shriveled useless vein, it surely is equally entitled to Government aid, whether situated among Southern or Northern States, because a broad policy of internal improvements is of national benefit—when of national importance.

But reckless, wasteful giving of Government funds to favored localities for private ends or local use is scandalous and demoralizing, and no argument is needed to show we have no right, legislatively or morally, to divert public funds to such uses. Some harbor improvements and a large majority of our so-called canal, river, and rivulet improvements are shown to be of insignificant value or no actual value either to the Nation or the State. They are conspicuously matters of local and private interest, urged by local constituencies and made possible only through the present system of political influence which is notoriously exercised in this and similarly framed bills. While improvements for legitimate waterways and open river channel work should find favor, they are necessarily delayed or prevented by raids upon the Federal Treasury for political projects.

At this point I append a table taken from allotments to 240 projects and to which I may later refer.

Engineers' allotment 1914 and 1915 of $47,586,000.

[Twelve projects that received 50 per cent of the total.]

Rivers.	Twenty million fund.	Thirty million fund.	Total.
Mississippi	$5,250,000	$5,815,000	$11,065,000
Missouri	950,000	1,100,000	2,050,000
Ohio [1]	1,769,000	3,915,000	5,684,000
Tennessee	223,000	501,000	724,000
Cumberland	210,000	378,000	588,000
Ouichita	300,000	136,000	436,000
Aransas Pass	470,000	180,000	650,000
Sabine Pass	240,000	100,000	340,000
Brazos	230,000	240,000	470,000
Black Warrior	768,000	48,000	816,000
Cape Fear	185,000	323,000	508,000
Beaufort Canal		400,000	400,000
Total	10,595,000	13,136,000	23,731,000

[1] The Ohio River was also given $3,200,000 in the 1915 sundry civil bill.

Of two hundred and twenty-odd projects given the remaining 50 per cent from both allotments, about one-half were trafficless rivers and a large number were southern projects, which, together with the above 12 projects, have a combined actual commerce of less than one-half the waterway tonnage of Buffalo, or Boston, or Cleveland, or Philadelphia, or several other lake and ocean harbors that could be named.

"WE MIGHT BETTER BUY THE FREIGHT AND BURN IT."

Due apologies are tendered a great waterway expert for using his striking statement for the above caption. Permit me to

further offer at this time an estimate of the cost to the Government for furnishing waterways to float actual commerce on a few of our large projects:

	Per ton.
Ohio River (excluding soft coal, $50 to $70 per ton)	$5.00
Ouachita	8.00
Upper Mississippi	12.00
Lower Mississippi	35.00
Arkansas	20.00
Hennepin	36.75
Missouri	40.00
Muscle Shoals	41.00
Aransas Pass Canal	80.00
Brazos	80.00
Red	100.00
Muscle Shoals (proposed)	150.00
Big Sandy, Ky	350.00

Other rivers, some of which have an average haul of from 30 to 50 miles, are equally expensive luxuries to a war-tax burdened people. An analysis of "commerce" statistics will be offered in the course of these remarks to show the inducement presented by Army engineers for recommending present wasteful expenditures.

IS WASTE AND FRAUD GENERAL?

Following a four-day fight last session under the five-minute rule against the last river and harbor bill, I met the gentleman from Kansas, Mr. Murdock, then one of the leaders of the House, and he said to me, "Many of us have voted for such measures for 10 years and more, kicking them around, without realizing before what big frauds they have grown to be."

A day or so later one of the ablest men in the country, who also voted in the House with Murdock against the last river and harbor bill, called attention to the naval appropriation bill of over a hundred million dollars, then before the House, remarking, "There is as much waste and graft in this bill as there is in the river 'pork barrel.'" Substantially the same remark was made by a rear admiral of the Navy, who approved the fight against the last two waterway bills, condemning waste and fraud in the river and harbor bill and in the naval bill in equally strong terms. High officials have pointed to the same proportionate waste in public-buildings bills.

In view of such statements, among many others, from highly reputable Members of the House and country, I believe it is my duty, so far as I can, to present facts that should cause the most confirmed pork grabber to stop, look, and listen in these days of righteous indignation against fraud and waste, and to demand a thorough investigation.

When the 1914 river and harbor bill was before the House it carried over $43,000,000 in a few good but many extravagant or worthless projects. No roll call could be secured, and the bill went through with a whoop and a laugh. It was and is an annual joke bill and is now double in amount and just as bad as when TILLMAN called it a "humbug and steal" over a dozen years ago.

When the Senate committee reported the same House bill, some of the worst new projects exposed in the House were stricken out, including Mattawan Creek, Kissimee Creek, and Oklawaha Creek, carrying present and future appropriations of about $1,000,000. But the Senate committee added many other projects, so that when reported out to the Senate it carried over $53,000,000 in addition to $6,990,000 appropriated by the sundry civil bill. New projects that would eventually add $33,000,000 more, or about $93,000,000, were included for waterways in the 1914 bills.

It is recent history that the scandalous 1914 bill was defeated in the Senate and a $20,000,000 substitute passed, which sum was placed in the hands of Army engineers for allotment. It is also familiar history that most of that amount, according to statements on the floor by members of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, was given to southern States that boast little actual waterway commerce.

ANNUAL PORK BARRELS THE FASHION.

Four months later, at the regular session, the House passed another river and harbor bill of $34,000,000, in round numbers, greatly reduced in amount, but twice the size of our old-fashioned genuine improvement bills. This time we secured a record vote in the House against the bill, after killing the initial appropriation for a scandalous $18,700,000 Alabama water-power project and exposing many other wasteful and worthless items. The Senate committee added $4,000,000, in round numbers, to the $34,000,000 House bill, in addition to $4,000,000 given by the sundry civil bill. For a second time, a bill then reaching $38,000,000 was killed and a $30,000,000 substitute was passed by Congress, again to be allotted by Army engineers. The aggregate of the two defeated bills and the sundry civil bill reached over $102,000,000. The two substitute bills as passed carried just $50,000,000 apart from sundry civil items of about $10,000,000, or a saving of about $42,000,000 from the two Sixty-third Congress waterway bills, and the Chief Engineer was authorized to apportion the $50,000,000 substitute among the most needy projects. The last allotment of $30,000,000 was placed in his hands on the closing day of the Sixty-third Congress, and attention is called in passing to this last allotment.

SENATOR BURTON'S SERVICE.

I would be remiss in a public duty if I failed at this time to give credit to those who bore the brunt of the recent waterway fights and won two unprecedented victories in the Sixty-third Congress. It requires moral courage of a high order to confront colleagues with whom one has worked for many years and to point out legislative wrongs committed in the name of public service.

That courage was evidenced in the last Congress by the distinguished Senator from Ohio, who fearlessly faced unjust gibes and criticisms with unaffected forbearance and by superior knowledge, marvelous endurance, exceptional powers of debate, and masterful presentation of existing wrongs proved to the present generation that high ideals in statesmanship still exist. Senator Burton's fight against two vicious river and harbor bills, aggregating over $92,000,000, will live in congressional history long after merchant-marine and other struggles have been forgotten. Faithfully supported by Senator KENYON and a small group of fearless associates, he led the opposition during days and nights of continuous session, resisting assaults upon the Federal Treasury waged by selfish interests.

History records that their memorable fight has saved to the country over $42,000,000; but far surpassing in importance any mere question of dollars and cents was the notable defeat of vicious legislation. Whatever may be the fate of wasteful waterway bills which are to follow in this and future sessions, the exposure of waterway sophistry and defeat of its accompanying chicanery brought about by Senator Burton's great effort will live as the crowning achievement of his congressional career.

The Senate and the country has lost the ablest waterway expert of the country through Senator Burton's voluntary retirement. Now that the opposition to waste has suffered a severe loss through his departure, the bars are again to be let down. One hundred new Members of the House are expected to be anxious to show results by securing to each constituency a piece of pork, and we are to be confronted with an old-time bill, larger than ever before. So says the lobby, which speaks authoritatively in its hour of triumph.

HOW LARGE WILL THIS YEAR'S BILL BE?

The vicious bill of 1914, which was killed in the Senate, carried $43,289,004. Over $10,000,000 more was added to it before it was reported out to the Senate for discussion and defeat.

In view of this fact, it is interesting to note that after visiting President Wilson in reference to the coming waterway bill the Washington Times of December 1, 1915, only a few days ago, says:

> Chairman SPARKMAN called to explain what was desired by his committee. He said $46,000,000 was needed to complete work already begun. Last year the appropriation was cut to $30,000,000 by Congress, and it is understood this year the administration forces will urge still further reduction. SPARKMAN said after the conference that his committee would not delay in its efforts to get these appropriations in spite of the administration's desire to have its national-defense program taken up in Congress first.

No one familiar with the genial chairman of the committee will believe he was correctly quoted, because it will take approximately $46,000,000 to complete the fanciful Ohio canalization project alone, and there are over a hundred other pending hungry projects, including the $20,000,000 Missouri River reclamation scheme and the limitless private land reclamation lower Mississippi project, that may take several hundred millions in addition to about $100,000,000 already spent on the lower river; but more of that later on.

WHAT THE NEXT BILL WILL CONTAIN.

In order that we may also appreciate the prospective character of the new river and harbor bill, I quote briefly from an interview with Chairman SPARKMAN, of the committee, published in the Washington Star on March 12, 1915, shortly after the close of the last session, wherein he is quoted as saying:

> If revenues improve, the next river and harbor bill will cover a number of important new projects. The committee may visit the Muscle Shoals water-power project in Tennessee and other places on that river May 10 and the Sacramento and Feather Rivers in California in July or August.
>
> The Muscle Shoals project, already recommended by Army engineers and urged by Senator elect UNDERWOOD, the retiring Democratic leader of the House, and other Members of the southern delegations, contem-

plates a Federal appropriation of $18,000,000, reimbursable to the Government, with a view to comprehensive development of the water power. The Government's proposed share of expense in the Sacramento and Feather Rivers project is $5,800,000, although the whole project involves $30,000,000 expenditure. Other projects pending, which will be considered when the bill is taken up, include the purchase of the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal for $8,000,000 and the $5,000,000 canalization development of the upper Cumberland River above Nashville.

ACTIVE AID FOR THE COMMITTEE.

Pursuant to the foregoing prediction, Washington now swarms with "waterway" lobbyists hailing from all points of the compass, including not only the $50,000,000 "mutual bribery" lobby but also the Ohio River lobby, the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal lobby, supported by the Atlantic inland waterway lobby, the upper Mississippi drainage lobby, the Alabama Water Power Co.—$18,700,000 for Muscle Shoals—lobby, the Texas inland waterways lobby, the Missouri River lobby, and many other insistent lobbies, while enthroned over all is the powerful Mississippi River reclamation lobby that annually gets the largest slice out of every waterways "barrel." All are here or have served notice they will be here to help Congress frame the bill.

Just what will be presented by the committee only time will disclose; just what will be its battered but swelled shape when it passes both Houses no man can tell; but the engineers' allotment of the last $30,000,000 bill is worth considering at this time for the reason that all projects are attempted to be justified by their supporters because first given the Chief Engineer's approval.

Before presenting what I believe to be conclusive evidence of incompetence and repeated violation of the spirit of the law on the part of the Board of Army Engineers, I desire to refer to the last river and harbor bill substitute, passed March 3, 1915, which reads:

NOTORIOUS PROJECTS CONDEMNED.

SEC. 15. That the following projects now under improvement shall be reexamined in accordance with the law for the original examination of rivers and harbors, with a view to obtaining reports whether the adopted projects shall be modified or the improvement abandoned.

Then follow 10 projects, beginning with the inland waterway from Norfolk to Beaufort and ending with the Missouri River. Incidentally I hope to address myself to the Missouri River project in a few moments; also, incidentally, the Missouri River was thereafter rejected upon reexamination by the engineer called upon to examine it.

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman does not want to be inaccurate. The Missouri River was reported against by the district officer, but his report was reversed, and I suppose the gentleman knows that the report reversing it is in the hands of Congress.

Mr. FREAR. I prefer that the gentleman would not interrupt me. I accept his statement, however, without question. Neither report has been received by Congress from the engineers.

Mr. BORLAND. I interrupt only because I know the gentleman wants to be accurate.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CALLAWAY].

Mr. FREAR. This one time.

Mr. CALLAWAY. I wonder if it would be possible for us to have the report of that engineer that they dismissed out there and reversed?

Mr. FREAR. I thank my friend from Texas for the suggestion. That was the question I was about to present to the House. Strange as it may appear, on the 22d day of April, 1915, the gentleman who rejected the Missouri River project—Col. Deakyne—made his report, which has been in the hands of gentlemen who support the Missouri River project, but Congress has not had it up to this time. I have tried unsuccessfully to secure it from the River and Harbor Committee, of which I am a member. I have assumed that there is such a report, because newspaper notices are to that effect. The gentleman states that that report was overruled by the Board of Army Engineers. I understand so by newspaper reports. I have no information other than that.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. FREAR. I desire not to be interrupted, because I have a great deal of ground to try to cover.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I should like to ask about that report. The gentleman has made a rather interesting statement. Did he inquire at the Engineers' Office?

Mr. FREAR. Oh, no; I inquired where it ought to be—in the hands of the Rivers and Harbors Committee.

Mr. BORLAND. The report is in the hands of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, of which the gentleman is a member, and they have sent it to the Public Printer and it is now in the hands of the Public Printer.

Mr. FREAR. I desire that this shall not be taken out of my time, Mr. Speaker. I do not wish to be interrupted.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. FREAR. I have been to the clerk of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, and he said he had no report, although it was made many months ago. He said it had not been presented yet. I so understood him, although this report was made by Col. Deakyne April 22, or over eight months ago.

TEN QUESTIONABLE PROJECTS.

I quote from the same $30,000,000 allotment a provision demanding resurveys of the 10 projects named, as follows:

Inland waterway from Norfolk to Beaufort Inlet, N. C.
Coosa River, Ga. and Ala.
St. Lucia Inlet, Fla.
Brazos River, Tex., from Old Washington to Waco.
Red River, La., Ark., Tex., and Okla.
Ouachita River, Ark. and Okla.
Arkansas River, Ark.
Tennessee River, Tenn., Ala., and Ky.
Fox River, Wis.
Missouri River, Mo.

And the Chief of Engineers is directed to make a report upon any other projects, river or harbor, the further improvement of which under present conditions is undesirable or in which modifications of the plans or projects should be made.

The foregoing provisions were inserted in the Senate substitute of $30,000,000 for 1915 and were agreed to by the House in lieu of the $38,000,000 bill reported by the Senate committee.

The best waterway expert in the country, Senator Burton, framed both substitute bills, aggregating $50,000,000, adopted by Congress in 1914 and 1915, respectively, and framed section 15, just read. His high standing, judgment, and long public experience entitled his opinion to great weight at the time the 1915 substitute was presented to the Senate, at which time the following significant statement was made by him:

AN INDICTMENT AGAINST ARMY ENGINEERS BY THE COUNTRY'S BEST WATERWAY EXPERT.

Certain steps have been taken by the insertion in this substitute of section 15, in which it is directed that the following projects now under improvement should be examined in accordance with the law for the original examination of rivers and harbors, with a view to obtaining reports whether the adopted projects should be modified or the improvement abandoned. Then follow an enumeration of 10 projects, which are probably the worst in the list now under improvement, and a general provision that the Chief of Engineers is directed to make a report upon any other projects, either river or harbor, a further improvement of which under present conditions is undesirable or in which a modification of the plans or projects should be made.

We have confidence that the section will be carefully complied with by the Corps of Engineers; that they will examine de novo each one of these 10 projects, and if further improvement is undesirable, they will say so; and that if there are other improvements of minor nature, not mentioned in this list which require reexamination, that reexamination is to be made. I am frank to say that I do not altogether feel satisfied with the apportionments which were made by the engineers under the act of October 24, 1914, the first $20,000,000 substitute bill. The following are some illustrations of what was done:

Contentnia and Smith Creeks and Neuse and Trent Rivers in North Carolina, for which appropriations were opposed, carried in the original bill a combined appropriation of $41,000, of which amount $27,000 was allotted. The Cape Fear River, above Wilmington, carried in the original bill $91,000 and was allotted $70,000. (In 1915, $173,000 was allotted for this same project.)

The Flint River received $18,000 for the proposed $25,000.

The Chattahoochee carried $120,000, and received $65,000.

The Coosa received in the allotment $40,000.

The item for the St. Johns River, $300,000; in the allotment it got $220,000.

St. Andrews Bay was provided with $65,000 in the bill, and got the full amount in the allotment.

The bill gave the Choctawhatchee $25,000; the allotment, $20,000.

The Black Warrior was down for $750,000, and got the full amount.

The item carried for the Yazoo River was $10,000, while the allotment gave it $30,000.

The Big Sunflower was originally provided with $90,000, and in the allotment received the full amount. The item for the upper Brazos, one of the most strenuously opposed items, was $275,000, yet in the allotment it received $200,000.

In the case of the Trinity, one of the worst items in the bill, but slight deference was paid to public opinion. Out of an original item of $255,000 the allotment was $203,000.

The Missouri River, Kansas City to the mouth, an absolutely indefensible project, got an allotment of $850,000.

TEN COUNTS IN THE INDICTMENT AGAINST ARMY ENGINEERS.

After this pronounced protest by our greatest waterway expert against the $20,000,000 apportionment made by Army engineers in 1914, and an explicit demand for a reexamination of worthless projects, the Chief Engineer, through the publicity bureau of the river and harbor lobby, furnished to the press on April 1, 1915, just 30 days after the passage of the $30,000,000 1915 substitute bill, a full statement of his apportionment of the new fund, from which I quote allotments for several projects that were explicitly condemned in the Senate as among the "worst on the list."

Chief Kingman's allotment to 10 questionable projects.

	1915	1914
Waterway, Norfolk to Beaufort	$400,000	None.
Coosa River	106,000	$40,000
St. Lucia Inlet	None.	None.
Brazos River	200,000	200,000
Red River (above Fulton)	40,000	40,000
Ouachita River	136,000	320,000
Arkansas River	193,350	46,000
Tennessee River	501,000	233,000
Fox River	20,000	10,000
Missouri River	1,000,000	850,000
Total	2,596,350	1,739,000

OVER $5,000,000 FOR 10 QUESTIONABLE PROJECTS.

To further show the disregard of our Chief of Engineers for the wishes of Congress or of a law solemnly passed it is proper to state that on January 1, 1915, balances on hand unexpended for these 10 questionable projects reached $2,655,000, which with the 1915 allotment aggregated $5,251,350 to be expended on projects approved by Army engineers but condemned in no uncertain way by Congress. Let us examine further into this remarkable allotment.

The list of 10 projects for which resurveys were ordered by law and protests recorded were given by engineers nearly one-tenth of the 1915 allotment of $26,258,000 reported April 1, 1915. Peculiarly enough, $2,576,350 or over 99 per cent of the allotment on these 10 projects was for southern streams that had been denounced in Congress in unmeasured terms less than 30 days before. Notwithstanding that caustic arraignment and legislative demand for resurveys of these projects, the Chief Engineer's allotment for such projects was approximately 50 per cent greater in 1915 than in his condemned allotment made in 1914.

Before discussing the attitude of Army engineers I desire to add a few other questionable allotments from the April 1, 1915, gifts made by our Treasury guardians:

Five more questionable projects in Kingman's (1915) $30,000,000 fund.

Mississippi River (a promoting land reclamation project)	$5,815,000
Ohio River (a $64,000,000 canalization project)	3,640,000
Missouri River (a 500,000-acre land reclamation project)	1,100,000
Beaufort Canal (among the most worthless of all)	405,000
Cumberland River (so bad it was three times reported against)	378,000
Total	11,338,000

Another picture from Kingman's (1915) allotment.

New York inner harbor (the greatest in the world)	$300,000
Boston Harbor	135,769
Buffalo Harbor	187,375
Cleveland Harbor	92,000
Total	715,144

New York inner harbor received 1 per cent and the Mississippi 22 per cent of the last allotment.

These four harbors handle fifty times as much actual commerce as the five rivers and canals first named. They handle presumably twenty times as much actual commerce as any 10 Southern States with the "five questionable projects" included, and yet the free silver ratio of 16 to 1 is substantially the proportionate allotment given by Chief Kingman to questionable or worthless projects over four genuine waterways.

When New York, Ohio, and Massachusetts find out where Congress and Kingman place pork which these three States largely supply, it will be interesting to note their respective emotions.

OTHER QUESTIONABLE ALLOTMENTS BY GEN. KINGMAN—A DOZEN MORE COUNTS IN THE INDICTMENT AGAINST ENGINEERS.

Pamlico and Tar Rivers, N. C., allotted $35,800, the full amount requested. Commerce has diminished 70 per cent in the past 12 years. Five hundred and ten stumps, 16 saw logs, 1 scow, and 1 old house were recovered from the river by the Government in 1913. That was its largest traffic, according to the Army engineers' report, page 1965. Imposing commercial statistics, on analysis, are found to comprise over 88 per cent floatable timber.

Cape Fear River, N. C. Upper river $173,000, the full amount requested. Cape Fear River, N. C., below, $150,000, or 70 per cent of the full amount requested. Unexpended balance on hand January 1, 1915, for the river was $176,506. Expenditures to June 30, 1914, reached $5,805,790. Practically a half million dollars was used in 1915 to stimulate the dredging fleet to activity on Cape Fear River. Needy projects are subject to North Carolina's first call at the hands of Army engineers. Why?

Winyah Bay, S. C., $70,000, or more than called for by the 1915 bill. Balance on hand January 1, 1915, $33,802. This 13 miles of waterway has cost $2,980,664 and yet lost 30 per cent of its commerce last year. Army engineers have given it a good hypodermic to keep it going through 1915.

St. Johns River, Fla., $370,000, the full amount requested. Balance on hand January 1, 1915, $111,381. Amount already expended, over $6,500,000. Commerce is 40 per cent floatable lumber and ties. Florida projects are first in number and amount in all waterway bills. Florida also has first call at the hands of Army engineers. Why?

Tombigbee River, Ala., $48,800. Total requested, $64,500. On hand January, 1915, including Black Warrior, $417,544. Amount already expended, $9,901,295. Commerce on Tombigbee, 1913, excluding timber and stone, was 16,031 tons (p. 2199). This project has great water powers and political powers within reach and received three-quarters of a million out of the preceding $20,000,000 allotment.

Pearl River, $11,000. Amount requested, $24,000. On hand, $12,985. Loss in commerce last year, 42 per cent. All commerce is timber, sand, and gravel. Twelve thousand six hundred and fifty-one snags and obstructions were removed by the Government in 1913, or over 400 daily (p. 2219). The "snag" commerce is bravely maintained by the Chief of Engineers' allotment.

Big Sunflower, $104,000. Received $98,000 in Engineers' October allotment. Balance on hand January 1, 1915, was $99,500, or $200,000 made available for a commerce 70 per cent of which is floatable timber and gravel. Thus far appropriated and allotted, $644,983. "The existing project has no effect on freight rates" (p. 889).

Galveston to Port Bolivar, $40,000, full amount requested; $27,237 amount on hand. Loss in commerce last year, 40 per cent. How much would it take to wipe out the balance?

Galveston to Texas City, $50,000; full amount requested. This is a $7,000,000 project, which shows Texas is not entirely forgotten.

Three Texas canals: (1) Galveston-Brazos River section, $15,000; full amount. Commerce in 1912 was 614 tons. (2) Brazos-Matagorda section, $30,000; full amount. Commerce in 1912 was 600 tons. (3) Arkansas Pass-Cavallo section, $30,000. Commerce in 1912 was 380 tons. (These are the official engineer's figures.) What is $80 per ton to an Army engineer who has $50,000,000 to spend?

Tennessee River, $501,000 out of $672,000 requested. This project was denounced in the Senate on March 2, 1915, as one of the worst of the list. It was rejected twice by Army engineers. It has absorbed many millions and gets another half million to help keep the dredging fleet in motion.

Some of these projects named are worthless and all have received extravagant allotments from a precious war-tax fund. Other projects, some of which are probably worse than any of those enumerated, will be discussed before I conclude in order that we may know where more of the $50,000,000 allotment was placed by the Chief Engineer.

WHO IS TO BLAME FOR WASTE?

Fifty million dollars allotted last session by this official was largely wasted. Not even the President of the United States has such power or discretion in times of peace, and yet the Chief of Engineers is only following political partition methods inaugurated by Congress. Old Dobbin with his blinders never excited more pity or ridicule than is attracted to political naval stations, political Army stations, political Federal buildings, and political waterways. Private water powers, private land reclamationists, private real estate schemers unite with dredgers, contractors, and other notorious waterway lobbyists in demanding money at the expense of the public purse.

Outside of Dobbin's blinders the public scoffs at the exhibition, and inside the blinders we wink at it. With coast defenses pitifully weak, we divide naval funds to cover several Atlantic coast political yards, inaccessible to battleships and where experts declare two or three would answer. Forty-nine political military posts are maintained to protect our people from wild Indian uprisings within 49 different constituencies. How can we pretend to regulate private business by law when we conduct public business in an unbusinesslike way and how can we hope for honest administration of public affairs in subordinate places when confronted with our own acts of omission and commission.

After repeated exposures of back-scratching methods, of appeals to patriotism in order to put forth wasteful projects, of corrupt, secret lobby methods, we should accept our share of responsibility for wasted funds, for it is unjust to make

goats of subordinate officials. But as Army engineers have been quoted in defense of every questionable, vicious, and wasteful project demanded in Congress, it becomes necessary to acertain just what value is to be placed upon engineers' approvals.

THE RECIPE FOR SECURING A WATERWAY PROJECT.

Let us concede at the outset that Army engineers are experts in military training. They are the pick of West Point, prepared for military responsibilities, yet instead of being employed on works of national defense, for which the Government educated them, their days and countless millions are spent on muddy creeks and worthless waterway schemes. Is it not time to pause and inquire into the reason for this absurdity? What functions of government or what public service is involved in surveys of crooked creeks and dry runs? Will the champions of "preparedness" demand that 60 engineers be relegated back to the Army and to their proper duties?

Dredgers, contractors, and other beneficiaries want work for private profit. They start things and urge local communities to get something from the Government for nothing. The local commercial or boosters' club, aroused to action, says to Representative Gettum from Grabville, "Bring home the money or don't come back." Every Representative is confronted with the utterance of Ellison, secretary of the $50,000,000 waterway lobby, "Get what is asked or get out." So Representative Gettum begs the committee for a local survey. The committee shifts responsibility by putting the project up to Army engineers for approval. The engineers survey and reject. Mr. Gettum shouts for help and reelection while engineers reexamine Mud Creek and again repudiate the job. Under pressure he then corrals his State delegation, reaching to nine Congressmen and two Senators in the Cumberland River case. Statesmen show Army engineers where to jump off. The board reflects; the board sees new light and somersaults and approves. Then Mr. Gettum presents his approved contract to the River and Harbor Committee. Our committee finally agrees with Gettum—who has nine votes in his pistol pocket with two more in the upper watch pocket—and so we eat persimmons, declaring them good though puckery. Solemnly we are now pointed to the engineer's approval, and all doors to legislative criticism thereafter are forever closed. We pretend to expect that our subordinates, the engineers, will withstand pull, pressure, and power. Constituencies, animated by secret agencies, seek questionable aid from their Representatives, and we pass it on to the engineer. How does he acquit himself?

INSINCERITY AND INCONSISTENCY—HOW ENGINEERS PILE UP ENORMOUS DEBT BURDENS.

For years Congress has been lectured continually and justly in engineers' reports for wasteful methods in making insufficient piecemeal appropriations for specific projects. How often is Congress criticized for spreading appropriations over rapidly increasing number of wasteful projects recommended by our critics, the engineers.

Instead of making contracts for the completion of important and necessary projects, reports show Congress has been deservedly reprimanded by Army engineers for piecemeal, unbusinesslike practices. Heretofore we have dodged the issue because we knew the engineers were right and the practice indefensible.

In other words, before meeting the necessities of New York Harbor or other actual waterways we must continue small slices of public plunder for Jamaica Bay's real estate project on Long Island or for some New Jersey fertilizing factory lustily howling for money for a privately used harbor. Scuppernong Creek and Cape Fear River's annual grab of a few hundred measly thousands or Richmond's inner harbor real estate scheme are used as a foil for San Francisco Harbor's actual needs, while aid for Chicago's water front may be made contingent upon adoption of a Muscle Shoals $18,700,000 water-power holdup or a notorious $8,000,000 annual grab by the Mississippi land-reclamation lobby. All requests are taken into the fold by the legislative factotum that hands out soothing sirup, a little here, a little there, to stop distress. Hundreds of interests are cared for annually, but no project is completed. Engineers have repeatedly called attention in their reports to this unbusinesslike spectacle offered by statesmen chosen to represent a Government's best interests.

Yet I desire at this juncture to discuss an unprecedented Treasury raid, eventually reaching possibly to one hundred millions or more, for which Army engineers are directly responsible.

CONSOLATION PRIZES FROM THE CHIEF ENGINEER—STARTING EVERYTHING, FINISHING NOTHING.

By the last two substitute bills we gave our engineering critics unrestricted power to distribute $50,000,000 for waterways. We did this in order to defeat two objectionable bills aggregating $92,000,000. Although Army engineers had recommended double the amount we placed in their hands, Congress tightened the strings before turning over its purse to about one-half of the amount recommended. We were therefore assured by engineers that many worthy projects would necessarily suffer from lack of funds to cover needed work. In other words, every dollar of the last $30,000,000 allotment placed in their hands had many legitimate pockets gaping before it from New York to San Francisco, yet after wasting millions on scores of notoriously worthless waterway projects we find the Board of Engineers plunged in to the limit by giving to itself $500,000 of this precious allotment fund for new surveys.

Ignoring a hundred waiting projects, aggregating $100,000,000 already adopted but not yet begun, the chief first divided approximately $26,258,472 among good, bad, and indifferent projects, as shown by the apportionment. After retaining over $3,000,000 for contingencies, our office boys, improvident and irresponsible constructors of a new pork barrel, went Congress one better by grabbing over an unparalleled grist of over 200 new surveys, which may eventually reach anywhere from a hundred to a hundred and fifty million dollars more in obligations for new projects. Think of the program, when in addition to nearly $400,000,000 in present waterway obligations, $500,000 is to be spent in these war-tax times by engineers in order to discover a hundred or more new mud ponds and crooked creeks. Have I made the situation plain? If not, study engineers' reports to learn what wasteful methods of piecemeal appropriations Congress has pursued for years, and now find our wildest dreams of waterway madness surpassed by these same engineer critics.

Chasing over the country from Podunk Inlet, in Jersey, to Cowpasture Creek, in Virginia, or Texas, surveying proposed real estate and land-reclamation ventures and private water-power schemes, giving extravagantly to wasteful projects they have been directed to reexamine and report on, ignoring legitimate military duties, the Chief of Engineers has provided a 1916 campaign of canal entanglements and crooked-creek invasions that challenges the attention of European strategists. Every new survey under present conditions becomes an indictment against wasteful methods embraced by engineers who have taken from the precious $30,000,000 allotment fund a half-million dollars for consolation prizes.

TREMENDOUS WATERWAY OBLIGATIONS.

To understand the full effect of withdrawing $500,000 for new surveys, it must be understood that about half of a total expenditure of $850,000,000 has been spent by the Government on our "waterways" within the last dozen years. In addition to this extravagant sum, future obligations have been incurred, as follows:

Projects now under way, which require a further sum of	$250,000,000
New projects adopted will require	101,000,000
Over 200 surveys in 1915 bill, possibly	150,000,000
Total	501,000,000

It was stated last session that 40 to 70 per cent of all surveys have been sometimes approved by Army engineers, and, judging from new projects awaiting appropriations, projects will average about a million dollars each. Some are small and others reach many millions. With new projects and new surveys the Government now is invited to embark on expenditures for new projects of $250,000,000, out of a total obligation of a half billion dollars, or an increase of 50 per cent in the number of projects adopted. In a riotous waste of public money through the convenient agency of Army engineers is it not worth while to pause until the American people catch their breath after paying their last war taxes?

BRIDGE BUILDERS ON THE THRONE.

Does it not appear that we have made a hopeless muddle of their duties and of ours by placing military bridge builders and pontoon constructors in absolute control of hundreds of millions of public funds, including $50,000,000 during the Sixty-third session of Congress?

When did engineers gain knowledge or experience to fit them for determining commercial needs or waterway possibilities of a community or hundreds of communites? Read their reports and learn the miserable showing that has been made by a great army of clerks, dredgers, contractors, and other beneficiaries, reputed to number 25,000 or more, wasting millions of public money annually as it slides through the fingers of the Chief of Engineers and his associates.

We may well believe younger Army engineeers are high-class men, who object to responsibility for this record of ingratiating humbuggery charged up against Gens. Bixby, Kingman, and the Board of Engineers. I do not question the honesty or capability of younger officers, but their superiors have had their heads turned by an astounding shift of public authority from Congress to their shoulders.

What a humiliating spectacle is presented to Congress when we see the Chief of Engineers distributing spoils through a

complete control of projects, surveys, and public funds. What a pitiful picture of legislative weakness when Congress surrenders its constitutional prerogatives and eagerly divides the allotments given by engineers and river lobbies that claim to hold the spigot which distributed a $62,000,000 flood of war-tax currency for waterways during the Sixty-third session of Congress. No wonder the country figuratively holds its nose annually until the barrel is rolled out of sight.

GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION OF PRIZES—COUNTS IN THE INDICTMENT FOR MISREPRESENTATION.

When the last $30,000,000 allotment was made by the Chief of Engineers a placating statement accompanied it in the press, wherein the public was informed that of $26,258,472 distributed, New York received most of the allotment and Michigan had the second largest helping. By geographical sections we were told the North and Middle Western States were allotted $12,967,000 and Southern States $10,483,000, and so everybody ought to be happy.

These figures are deceptive, but accepting them at their face, we are reminded that six months before, in October, 1914, the same engineers allotted over one-half of the $20,000,000 (1914 appropriation) to southern projects, and quickly followed it up with $10,483,000 more on April 1, 1915, which indicates where a balance of political influence is to be found. A more miserable apology was never offered for a geographical distribution of political pork. New York Harbor handles probably two dozen times as much commerce as all the actual waterway commerce of the South put together. New York's great inner harbor gets about $300,000 from the allotment, or less than St. Johns River, Fla., which carries comparatively an insignificant actual commerce. Buffalo's actual commerce is about 20,000,000 tons, or probably several times the total actual commerce of all southern waterways combined. Buffalo gets $187,375, after having been rejected from the preceding October allotment. This is less than one-half of $400,000 given to the Brazos River, Tex., in the two engineer allotments, although the Brazos reports only 1,080 tons of actual commerce, or 1 ton to 20,000 tons when compared with Buffalo. Texas has several important chairmanships, Buffalo none, so 20,000 to 1 may be a new Democratic allotment ratio.

SPECIOUS EXPLANATIONS.

Michigan was declared to hold second place by the Chief of Engineers in his allotments, but such result is reached by crediting St. Marys River to Michigan. This river is a short waterway connecting the Lakes, and carries over 75,000,000 tons of annual commerce between States, or ten times the combined actual southern waterway traffic, and yet this link between lakes is strangely accredited to Michigan. Senate Document No. 492, Sixty-third Congress, charges over $32,000,000 spent between lakes to the State of Michigan. Why? As well credit the Panama Canal traffic and $400,000,000 expense to the Panama 10-mile zone. Why did not the engineers so report the Mississippi or properly charge to Louisiana $20,000,000 spent at the river's mouth? Who revises the engineers' reports? Who juggles the Louisiana figures, and why?

After giving over one-half of the $20,000,000 1914 appropriations to southern projects, our Chief of Engineers seeks to explain a $30,000,000 1915 geographical distribution, and in so doing apparently omits to include in the apportionment as southern projects any part of the $1,300,000 given to the lower Missouri and Mississippi below the mouth of the Missouri or any part of the $3,610,000 given to the Ohio River through lower Mississippi River traffic. Nor do these amounts cover some $5,000,000 more for the same projects included in the sundry civil bills that were passed. Eighteen North Carolina projects with an unimportant combined actual tonnage received about $900,000 out of the allotment in 1915. Twenty-four familiar Florida items received $840,000 for a commerce that rivals North Carolina's in insignificance, while Texas, with its 18 projects, gets over a million dollars; and, counting the preceding allotment of October, 1914, Texas is the proud possessor of $2,500,000 from the Sixty-third Congress due to the liberality of Army engineers. Aside from Galveston Harbor, its actual waterway commerce, as shown by the reports of Army engineers, compared with expenditures invites scrutiny.

Glancing over the list of influential Members of the last Congress in both Houses, it is not difficult to understand how these three States scraped about $5,000,000 out of the two barrels, although their combined actual commerce is probably less than one-quarter that of either Buffalo, Boston, Philadelphia, or other ports than can be named.

WHO BOOSTS THE BARREL?

Possibly some disinterested defender—some man who has never been or never expects to be a beneficiary of the present system of "division and silence"—will rise to justify; but before he undertakes to do so I desire to submit some more specific facts of public concern found in the Chief Engineer's report for 1914, of the keg the chief built.

THIS IS THE MALT THAT LAY IN THE KEG THE CHIEF BUILT—MAKING SCIENTIFIC CHANNELS FOR TRAFFICLESS STREAMS.

Of $850,000,000 thus far poured into our rivers and harbors, so far as it affects public interests or legitimate navigation, possibly two-thirds has been wasted. Not one dollar in ten would have been expended if local communities especially concerned had been compelled to contribute a reasonable part of the expense shouldered onto the Government. That is a test for other local improvements, including highways, one frequently required in European countries when government aid is given, and one we may profitably adopt in our waterway expenditures. If placed in an independent bill, with the pork-trading features eliminated, not one dollar in ten would have been appropriated by Congress.

Nearly 20 per cent of the entire $850,000,000 expended by Uncle Sam for rivers and harbors, or about $150,000,000, has been thrown into the Mississippi River alone, while actual commerce on the river has dropped to 5 per cent of the traffic recorded 50 years ago, when Government expenditures on the river were unknown. After spending a king's ransom and enough to pay the President's salary for 2,000 years to come, we awake to find that the Mississippi River navigation and Mississippi River commerce is a joke. We also learn that the Mississippi River lobby now back of the $50,000,000 annual pork barrel is cloaking its efforts to get extravagant appropriations for the Mississippi lower river land reclamation project by demanding wasteful appropriations and votes for every inconsequential creek and waterway in the country—clamoring for "a policy not a project"—but regularly demanding $10,000,000 to $12,000,000 for the Mississippi River, of which 80 per cent goes to the lower river. Condemned by the Mississippi Valley press and experienced engineers, this land-reclamation scheme is a big Ethiopian in the waterway woodpile worthy of investigation.

How are such wasteful and extravagant appropriations excused by the chief who makes annual reports to Congress?

BETWEEN ST. PAUL AND MINNEAPOLIS.

Take the great river appropriation referred to, that of the Mississippi. From the "head of navigation," Minneapolis, the river has a tortuous, unnavigable stretch to St. Paul, 10 miles below. Based on the Chief of Engineer's recommendations, $2,589,000 has already been appropriated for this 10 miles of river, or at the rate of a quarter of a million dollars per mile. Of this stretch the Chief of Engineers says, page 935, in his 1914 report:

> The construction of the lock and dam may develop a passenger traffic between St. Paul and Minneapolis and is expected to reduce the freight rate on flour and grain.

He further says:

> The only traffic on the river in 1913 consisted of excursion steamers to Minnehaha Creek, below Lock 1 (p. 2483).

With $149,567 on hand in January, 1915, the Chief of Engineers recommended a $235,000 appropriation for this project in the 1915 bill. When that bill was defeated he allotted $65,000 on April 1.

The fact is notorious that after 20 years' improvement and an expenditure of over two and one-half million dollars on this 10-mile stretch of river not one ton of commercial freight has ever been hauled from St. Paul to Minneapolis or from Minneapolis to St. Paul by river, nor has a solitary lonesome passenger ever taken the trip on an excursion boat or otherwise in the recollection of the oldest inhabitant.

On the other hand, presumably 75,000 passengers travel daily between those two cities on eight railways and two interurban lines connecting the cities, paying a dime to be carried from the farthest extremity of one city to the remotest corner of the other, 20 miles distant. Probably 175,000 tons of freight on the average are daily carried by transcontinental trains between the two cities, and yet, after spending over two and one-half million dollars on a 10-mile stretch of river, without securing a single passenger or one ton of freight, in 1904 Army engineers have promised a passenger and 250,000 tons of annual freight traffic, and so gave $65,000 more to this patent commercial farce.

A WATER POWER FOR NAVIGATION.

During the past half century the Twin Cities have grown from straggling villages to a half million people and more, and during about all that period the only regular upper-river excursion craft reported has been a diminutive ark called *Hiawatha*, which accommodates a handful of excursionists during the short river season, but it never goes farther than Minnehaha Creek, 4 miles below Minneapolis. *Hiawatha's* smokestack resembles a rusty stovepipe stuck through the roof of a settler's cabin, while the original Hiawatha never had it on his venerable namesake for suffering during "cold and cruel winters" when tied up, forlorn and useless, at the St. Paul wharf.

On this "passenger" business the Government has spent $2,589,000, exploiting the venerable *Hiawatha* and a water-power project near Minneapolis. Who is to be benefited by the subterfuge? Think of the stupendous farce set forth on page 2442, which records no terminal facilities at Minneapolis and no commerce, but prospective increase in waterway commerce of 250,000 tons—and not a ton in sight for a half century.

How did the Chief of Engineers put such statistics over Congress, and why did Congress wink at the humbug, and what was the real purpose of spending $2,589,000 of the taxpayers' money for a lock and dam below Minneapolis? Was it to get plenty of money lower down on the Mississippi and on a hundred other southern streams and creeks that $2,589,000 was given to this St. Anthony water power? How are the people of Minneapolis, of Minnesota, or of the country to be served by this Treasury haul, for which the Chief of Engineers is primarily responsible, with his passenger and freight buncombe estimates? It is nine-tenths completed. Shall it be abandoned? Who shall say? If not, what steps have been taken by Congress to utilize this water power? In other words, who gets it, and why did the Government build it?

ST. PAUL TO ST. LOUIS—ANOTHER COUNT IN THE INDICTMENT.

The next stretch on the Mississippi River is from St. Paul to St. Louis, and the Chief Engineer, on April 1, 1915, apparently in order to hand over nearly $5,000,000 to the lower river in 1915, threw a round million into this part of the upper river. In January, 1915, $444,274 remained on hand for this section, according to Senate Document No. 953, Sixty-third Congress. What justification was offered for spending nearly $2,000 per mile in one year on this stretch of the river? What commerce is served?

Keeping in mind that actual commerce on the river has probably decreased 95 per cent during the past few years, during which time $20,000,000 of Government funds has been dumped into this 600-mile stretch during that period, let us see how the Chief of Engineers excuses an allotment in 1915 of an even million in addition to the balance on hand and in addition to approximately $30,000 per mile already spent on this project. Examine his statement of commerce, taken from page 2437 of the Chief Engineer's report for 1914. It will not be found easily in the index.

The report says the quantity of freight carried by all boats, including the rock and brush used in Government work and also including logs and lumber floated down the stream, is as follows, and then follows a table, of which 772,392 tons hauled 9,445,576 ton-miles, valued at $781,897, is for material used by the Government in improving the river.

Upper Mississippi River freight statement for 1913.

Designation.	Short tons.	Ton-miles.	Valuation.
Logs	64,489	30,245,340	$315,271
Rafted lumber, shingles, etc	13,570	4,400,147	190,001
Miscellaneous freight	1,294,864	12,229,310	31,417,968
United States material	772,392	9,445,576	781,897
Total	2,145,315	56,320,373	32,705,137

Classified freight traffic, 1913.

Articles.	Amount.		Valuation.	Average haul.	Ton-miles.
	Customary units.	Short tons.			
				Miles.	
Apples	160,000 barrels	11,505	$200,218	34.4	395,959
Automobiles	5,703	6,034	9,545,950	3.8	23,014
Brick	192,190 pieces	981	3,052	7.3	7,157
Brush	656,644 cubic yards	82,450	170,191	20.6	1,700,694
Cement	4,305 tons	4,305	34,378	9.9	425,790
Coal	26,236 tons	26,236	90,400	13.5	354,401
Corn	119,090 bushels	3,463	77,431	6.4	22,144
Farm produce	13,565 tons	13,565	359,319	23.5	318,900
Fish	6,539 tons	6,539	666,600	9.8	62,486
Gravel	268,103 cubic yards	398,179	195,242	9.1	3,621,435
Hay	2,615 tons	2,615	44,269	5.4	14,122
Lath	3,056,000 pieces	1,018	10,575	317.2	322,989
Live stock	58,954 head	28,713	5,218,730	6.6	190,202
Logs	8,904,380 feet b. m	98,268	463,631	316.2	31,074,221
Lumber	19,167,689 feet b. m	30,408	467,775	138.0	4,195,827
Merchandise	17,101 tons	17,101	2,107,830	126.9	217,089
Oats	3,550 bushels	55	1,775	1.0	55
Rock	535,143 cubic yards	708,066	562,077	11.3	7,976,674
Sand	430,173 cubic yards	562,040	209,143	4.7	2,653,545
Shells	11,428 tons	11,428	246,229	42.9	490,801
Shingles	622,000 pieces	65	1,866	1.3	85
Teams	23,501	26,609	6,540,900	1.7	46,537
Wheat	11,500 bushels	382	12,347	7.9	3,015
Wood	21,847 cords	34,248	108,213	16.4	560,865
Miscellaneous	71,042 tons	71,042	5,366,996	231.0	1,642,366
Total		2,145,315	32,705,137	26.2	56,322,373

A comparative statement of upper river commerce is also offered by years, during which period between $20,000,000 and $25,000,000 have been expended by the Government on the advice of Army engineers. While the 1913 commerce was only about 35 per cent of that floated in 1885, it will be ascertained upon analysis that over nine-tenths of the 35 per cent floated in 1913 is bogus commerce, or, assuming the 1885 commerce reported to have been legitimate, in 28 years river freight fell approximately 96 per cent.

Mississippi River: Mouth of the Missouri to St. Paul, Minn.

[From reports of the Chief of Engineers, War Department.]

	Tonnage.
1885	5,607,196
1886	3,200,000
1887	3,500,000
1888	3,750,000
1889	3,500,000
1890	4,200,000
1891	3,300,000
1892	3,750,000
1893	3,200,000
1894	2,975,000
1895	3,000,000
1896	2,250,000
1897	3,200,000
1898	2,800,000
1899	2,900,000
1900	2,400,000
1901	2,125,000
1902	1,900,000
1903	4,545,129
1904	4,534,539
1905	4,089,318
1906	3,847,319
1908	2,581,857
1909	1,916,114
1910	1,836,035
1911	2,081,566
1912	1,830,294
1913	2,145,315

[From reports of the Chief of Engineers, War Department, 1904, vol. 2, p. 2157, and 1913, vol. 2, p. 2385.]

	Tonnage.
Average tonnage for years 1877 to 1903, inclusive	4,615,376
Tonnage in 1912	1,830,294
Decrease	2,785,082

Referring to the 1913 statement, let us briefly examine the items, which show some remarkable facts.

ENGINEER'S STATISTICS OF COMMERCE (?).

"Commerce" reached 2,145,315 tons in 1913, so the Chief of Engineers reports. Tons of what? Let us see:

	Tons.
Brush for river construction work	82,450
Gravel dredged from river	398,178
Rock for river work	708,000
Sand dredged from river	562,000
Logs that have floated for 50 years	98,268
Lumber and wood barged	64,408
Animals ferried across river	55,322
Automobiles ferried across river	6,034
	1,974,980

All could be floated in 2 or 3 feet of water, leaving 170,335 tons of questionable commerce remaining, which was hauled on an average of 26 miles or thereabouts.

What a legislative travesty when eleven-twelfths of the commerce for which $1,000,000 was allotted by the Chief of Engineers is of that character. Who weighed the brush? Who weighed the logs? Who weighed the rocks, gravel, sand, and so forth, used in the river work? Where was it carried and for what purpose? Was it floated 1 mile or 10 miles? Who knows? Why measure Government material for river work, anyway?

A WONDERFUL SYSTEM IN VALUING "COMMERCE."

The Chief of Engineers says that 26,609 tons of horses were carried a mile and a half across the river and their value was $6,540,900, or one-fifth of the total. Other live stock carried across the river, he says, was valued at $5,218,730; and then, to cap the climax, this report adds that 6,034 tons of automobiles ferried across the river were valued at $9,545,950.

Nearly two-thirds of all the glowing commerce valuations on the upper Mississippi, including Government sand, rock, and gravel, turns out to be animals and automobiles ferried across the river.

Again, how much of the remaining 170,000 tons was repair material or Government supplies out of a total 772,000 tons reported? How much was duplicated before it could boost a million-dollar allotment for the upper river?

QUADRUPLICATIONS OF SAME FREIGHT STATISTICS.

Last session Chairman SPARKMAN was asked by Mr. CALLAWAY in debate if river tonnage passing different places was not often included in the Chief of Engineers' reports, and if it was not duplicated, to which the chairman frankly responded: "Oh, yes; it is duplicated, triplicated, and quadruplicated in some cases." With that indefinite rule of estimate, if

170,000 tons, not of Government materials but of actual commerce, still remained, but was quadruplicated in computation, it would actually amount to less than 45,000 tons, for which $1,000,000 was given April 1 by the generous Chief of Engineers, with an additional $1,000,000 annual interest charge for past expenditures. Yet the little harbor of Ashland, in my own State, handled 5,623,000 tons during the same year, excluding 35,000 tons of logs, while the Superior-Duluth Harbor handled 46,875,416 tons, or about 1,000 tons to 1, if river estimates were quadrupled by our guardian of the Treasury, the Chief of Engineers.

What shall be said of an official who demands $1,000,000 annually for traffic that has decreased to an insignificant fraction of what it was 30 or 40 years ago? Comparatively no expenditures were then made on the upper river; $1,000,000 annually now. What value can be attached to such flimsy statistics which serve as a basis for an expenditure of a million dollars annually?

From $6 to $16, depending on the basis of estimate, is the annual cost to the Government for every ton of actual commerce on the upper river, including river ferriage, and of that remaining "commerce" 22 per cent was shells and soft coal floated a few miles in barges. We could have built a permanent bridge in 1915 across the river with that million dollars or bought a hundred ferries, if need be, or could have built and stocked 50 miles of Government-owned railway, with something to show for the investment. Again, at $2,000 per mile we could have built a fine highway from Minneapolis to St. Louis. Better still, and up to date, we could annually buy a half dozen Ford trucks to carry all the actual commerce on the river and turn a good part of the remaining nine hundred and ninety-odd thousand dollars back into the Treasury to help lighten war-tax burdens and save a depleted Treasury from bankruptcy. But scores of dredgers and contractors would have been without occupation. Reasonable channel work on the river is needed, but who can excuse this great waste?

In a public speech at St. Paul August 3 last, Senator Burton declared the present St. Paul to St. Louis stage of water of 4½ feet is greater than the Elbe's, and yet our river is without commerce. What has become of the $20,000,000 spent on the upper Mississippi River? Who divided the money and who is behind the lobby that is now wildly shouting for more? Where is the commerce? Twenty million in 40 years for dredgers while we were losing our commerce.

NO COMMERCE PRESENT OR PROSPECTIVE.

Last session the bogus river commerce on the upper Mississippi was exposed. On that occasion I was here criticized by Representatives from St. Paul and Minneapolis because of assumed disloyalty to my own section of the country. In other words, it was proper to denounce worthless southern expenditures, providing we overlooked northern waste. When it was demonstrated that Mississippi River commerce is a myth, the House was gravely assured that an experimental trip was to be made in 1915, and commerce would be rejuvenated by Mr. Bernhard, a New Orleans barge owner, who, figuratively, could make water run up hill. Two barge lines had proved disastrous failures in recent years, but another commercial Ajax had been discovered, and he proposed to revolutionize economic laws.

Picture the situation. The Twin Cities receive or ship, possibly, several hundred million tons of commerce annually. The Government contributes nothing toward the expense, but, on the contrary, the Interstate Commerce Commission and State railway commissions are authorized to prevent freight extortion by controlling railway charges. On the other hand, before one dollar was ever expended on the river, over 40 years ago, several hundred boat arrivals occurred annually at St. Paul, but after an expenditure by the Government of some $20,000,000 on the upper Mississippi River, commerce is comparatively non est, while nothing larger than a logger's batteau or an Indian canoe ever tried to get up to or go down river from Minneapolis.

The Chief of Engineers gives bogus commerce reports and rainbow promises to justify continuing extravagant expenditures; but this year St. Paul tried to enlist business men in furnishing freight for the Bernhard barge proposition, and I quote from a report to show how the mountain labored in order to bring forth a diminutive mouse. Ponder over this tremendous folly and ask yourselves what lunacy commission would report as of sound mind any business man guilty of the feeble judgment Congress has displayed with an annual investment of $1,000,000 in this upper Mississippi River project. Every year it nestles in the barrel recommended by Chief Kingman and his army of dredgers and contractors. Why? Is it to offset the $7,000,000 annual lower river grab? Remember the following report is of possible, not actual, guaranteed river commerce, in anticipation of which Representatives waxed eloquent on this floor when the bill was before the House last session. I quote from the St. Paul Dispatch of August 12, 1915, but have a fuller statement of the report, which only emphasizes the folly attending an expenditure of twenty millions on the upper Mississippi River:

[From the St. Paul Dispatch, Aug. 12, 1915.]

DEMAND IS SLIGHT FOR RIVER SHIPPING—ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE COMMITTEE FINDS 20 FIRMS USING WATER FREIGHT.

A report made to-day by a special committee of the Association of Commerce shows little demand at this time for river transportation. An estimated tonnage of 10,464 inbound and 2,472 outbound for one year was made to the committee by 20 out of 64 business firms.

36 DO NO RIVER BUSINESS.

Thirty-six of the 64 firms said they could do no business by river transportation.

Eight shippers said they may be able to use the river, but were unable to make any definite statement. Several of the largest firms did not reply to the communication sent to them by the committee.

REPORT FOR A YEAR.

The tabulated report for a year showed from foreign ports by way of New Orleans 1,124 tons of freight would come in and only 7 tons go out. From Pacific and Atlantic ports, by way of New Orleans, 4,200 tons will come in and 1,715 go out.

Along the Mississippi River 2,704 tons could be picked up and 165 tons sent to the way points. From St. Louis to St. Paul the inbound is estimated at 606 tons and the outbound at 360. Pittsburgh and other points on the Ohio would send 1,830 and take 225 tons from St. Paul.

TOTAL TONNAGE 12,936.

The total tonnage is estimated by the 20 concerns at 12,936. This is the estimated amount of the business and not an estimate of all St. Paul firms.

For October 160 tons can be brought in by river and only 3 tons sent out.

The committee which made the investigation is composed of H. T. Quinlan, J. W. Cooper, C. E. Tuttle, C. H. Bigelow, C. J. McConville, Charles Patterson, H. S. Sommers, J. A. Seeger, J. A. Gregg, and J. Clair Stone.

Can anything be added to this tragic statement of a $20,000,000 expenditure for a waterway that will float about 12,000 tons of commerce for St. Paul annually out of a hundred million tons and over handled by the Twin Cities? Some open-river expenditures ought to be made to provide for the small existing local freight, but $2,000 per mile annually is a notorious waste of money directly chargeable to the Chief of Engineers.

Yet from his reports we are told, according to a contributed manuscript which will later be considered—

Some gas cars were ferried across the river
To swell freight statistics, more coin to deliver,
And a three-million water power "to aid navigation"
Is the outside limit of imagination.
Who charges that Congress divides up the malt,
While blaming the board for all of the fault
That's laid to the keg the chief built?

ANOTHER SPECIFIC INDICTMENT—SILVER STIMULANTS FOR THE MISSISSIPPI NEAR ST. LOUIS.

About $17,223,000 of Government funds have been dumped into the 200-mile stretch of the Mississippi reaching from the mouth of the Missouri to the mouth of the Ohio. After spending over $86,000 per mile on this part of the river, Senator Burton, the greatest waterway authority in the country, says we had spent more money on this 200 miles of river than the Prussian Government had spent on the entire length of the River Rhine during all the centuries that have passed. Traffic on the Rhine ordinarily reaches 45,000,000 tons annually, or many hundred times the traffic reported on this 200 miles of the Mississippi. Yet the Chief of Engineers gave $300,000 on April 1, 1915, in addition to $297,260 balance on hand, or about $3,000 per mile in 1915 to keep dredgers busy on this notoriously wasteful project.

It has been a popular amusement with disgruntled pork advocates to try and discredit the distinguished Senator who night and day held his feet, aided by Senator KENYON and other courageous men, until the Sixty-third session waterway humbugs were defeated; but from an unexpected source Senator BURTON is corroborated in his statement of monumental waste along this part of the river. All the faith of waterway lobbyists and river enthusiasts in recent years has been pinned to J. H. Bernhard, the boat builder, who has predicted a rejuvenation of river traffic. Every citizen devoutly hopes Bernhard's prophecy will be realized, but in a discussion by Mr. Bernhard, found in the proceedings of the American Society of Engineers for 1915, occurs this remarkable statement, that is respectfully dedicated to the horn of plenty controlled by Chief Kingman:

To-day the Mississippi from St. Louis to its mouth affords a channel which is the best to be found in any stream in the world * * * and see its emptiness. An 8-foot channel is all that the most efficient service requires. The Government works unremittingly to develop waterways only to see the water-borne traffic grow less as the years go by.

Still the average "river man" will insist the poor condition of the channels keeps our inland waters idle. This is preposterous; the Rhine could never compare with the Mississippi in its advantages for transportation; its channel is narrower and shallower, more changeable, the current is swifter, and ice is known in the winter over its entire navigable length, yet in 1913 more than 97,000 vessels passed the Dutch and German frontier on the Rhine.

Further along Bernhard submits from official reports a statement of 37,529,153 tons carried on the Rhine in 1913, and it is safe to say this did not include sand, gravel, rock, and brush used in river work or automobiles and cattle ferried across the river, as reported by our own official Government statistician, Chief Kingman.

Senator Burton and Bernhard agree that you can not get commerce on water by idly wasting money in digging shifting, deeper channels. It takes men with freight to make commerce, and they obstinately refuse to ship by water. Yet we are spending $3,000 per mile on this 200 miles in 1915 by virtue of Chief Kingman's allotment.

AN $80,000,000 ARGUMENT.

Seven hundred and eighty thousand acres of land are to be reclaimed between Rock Island and Cape Girardeau. When reclaimed it will be worth from $50 to $150 per acre, according to estimates. That is a plum worth striving for, and the Government is now being strenuously urged by powerful influences to do the job. It beats "navigation."

A ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY MILLION INVESTMENT.

In order that a clear understanding may be had of startling conditions on the Mississippi River, where we are now annually dumping from seven to ten million dollars, I offer three tables taken from official records of river freight handled at the largest river port on the Mississippi. No through lines run on the river either above or below St. Louis. The absolute worthlessness of Army engineers' reports on "commerce" will be further demonstrated, but the Merchants' Exchange report, at least distantly, relates to actual commerce. After making allowance for duplications resulting from reshipments and observing that the bulk of all freight was presumably soft coal received from the Ohio River, it will be well for the country to ascertain what we are getting for $150,000,000 already spent on the Mississippi, with an annual interest charge of about $5,000,000, apart from seven to ten millions more in annual gifts of new, crisp Government currency for dredgers and contractors, raised in part by direct war-tax assessments.

COL. TOWNSEND'S CONFIRMATION—A REMARKABLE STATEMENT THAT COMMANDS ATTENTION.

Before presenting the Merchants' Exchange illuminating table of commerce I desire to quote briefly from a speech made by Col. C. McD. Townsend, Army engineer and president of the Mississippi River Commission. Incidentally the address was delivered before the $50,000,000 annual river lobby that recently held its annual round-up in this city. He said, page 215, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sixty-fourth Congress:

St. Louis for the past 50 years has been the principal origin or terminus of the traffic on our western rivers, and its records summarize their tendencies. Its river commerce attained its maximum of 2,120,000 tons in 1880, and has since steadily declined to 153,000 tons in 1914. In contrast it may be stated that the commerce at Sault Ste. Marie, the outlet to Lake Superior, in 1880 was 1,300,000 tons, and attained a maximum of 79,000,000 tons in 1913. The commerce of New York Harbor exceeds 125,000,000 tons.

Shipments and receipts of freight at St. Louis by rail and specified rivers, 1890–1913.

[Compiled from the St. Louis Merchants' Exchange reports.]

SHIPMENTS.

Year.	Upper Mississippi River.	Lower Mississippi River.	Missouri River.	Ohio River.[1]	Total by river.	Total by rail.	Grand total.
	Tons.	*Tons.*	*Tons.*	*Tons.*	*Tons.*	*Tons.*	*Tons.*
1890	22,547	543,805	10,035	.....	601,862	5,270,850	5,872,712
1891	18,630	445,150	19,280	.....	512,930	5,216,228	5,729,158
1892	51,595	392,635	29,455	1,000	502,215	5,969,754	6,471,969
1893	54,230	342,785	12,775	.....	436,900	[2] 5,554,593	5,991,493
1894	52,190	281,635	4,075	.....	363,080	4,780,256	5,143,336
1895	30,780	241,155	5,505	.....	303,355	5,349,327	5,652,682
1896	31,510	508,960	1,355	.....	572,410	5,400,728	5,973,138
1897	36,225	406,315	.....	.....	469,365	6,137,265	6,606,630
1898	33,805	339,435	300	.....	399,583	7,079,319	7,478,902
1899	33,675	151,135	.....	.....	203,205	[2] 8,266,393	8,469,598
1900	36,675	187,385	1,225	.....	245,580	9,180,309	9,425,889
1901	23,392	158,493	7,185	.....	209,271	10,653,065	10,862,336
1902	23,130	174,517	4,840	.....	[2] 224,266	11,035,586	[2] 11,259,852
1903	44,855	146,498	2,345	.....	212,207	12,971,173	13,183,380
1904	21,775	46,320	2,620	.....	82,565	13,731,194	13,813,759
1905	25,730	35,295	4,705	.....	80,575	15,225,973	15,306,548
1906	36,000	34,905	3,565	.....	89,185	17,672,006	17,761,191
1907	25,155	35,550	3,095	14,700	78,500	18,296,416	18,874,916
1908	27,280	30,285	5,320	9,855	72,740	15,700,158	15,772,898
1909	16,695	21,140	.....	10,170	48,005	17,153,097	17,201,102
1910	12,510	24,815	.....	11,100	48,425	20,187,270	20,235,695
1911	11,270	38,150	415	17,630	67,465	17,974,337	18,041,802
1912	9,025	24,330	.....	9,940	43,295	20,368,613	20,411,908
1913	8,830	20,000	7,284	11,470	47,584	22,129,175	22,176,759

[1] From 1907 to 1913, inclusive, the tonnage given under the head of the Ohio River includes the Illinois, Cumberland, and Tennessee Rivers also.
[2] Corrected.

Shipments and receipts of freight at St. Louis, etc.—Continued.

RECEIPTS.

Year.	Upper Mississippi River.	Lower Mississippi River.	Missouri River.	Ohio River.[1]	Total by river.	Total by rail.	Grand total.
	Tons.	*Tons.*	*Tons.*	*Tons.*	*Tons.*	*Tons.*	*Tons.*
1890	128,960	222,075	21,350	102,500	663,730	9,969,291	10,633,021
1891	90,865	209,095	25,065	63,890	592,140	10,098,729	10,690,869
1892	135,435	212,545	13,065	96,930	687,200	11,229,005	11,916,205
1893	111,710	216,300	8,000	33,490	599,405	10,408,039	11,007,444
1894	111,400	219,195	5,480	35,375	583,510	9,512,910	10,096,420
1895	78,170	239,690	3,270	35,440	508,830	10,489,344	10,998,174
1896	61,165	345,105	1,245	62,640	671,765	10,763,116	11,434,881
1897	51,435	311,540	250	26,915	576,670	11,921,279	12,497,949
1898	33,910	311,915	790	37,130	506,586	12,962,850	13,469,435
1899	45,410	238,140	565	39,440	466,610	14,805,872	15,272,482
1900	50,070	274,445	2,725	2,700	512,010	15,375,441	15,887,451
1901	68,470	233,885	3,860	57,315	462,805	17,433,523	17,896,328
1902	38,005	248,905	6,030	59,890	416,920	18,060,809	18,477,729
1903	32,705	160,085	1,415	111,435	340,410	21,580,403	21,920,813
1904	25,405	132,585	2,685	102,400	295,370	23,319,871	23,615,241
1905	31,190	107,520	3,580	125,755	289,850	23,915,690	24,205,540
1906	31,140	106,670	2,485	160,120	327,670	27,292,617	27,620,287
1907	21,440	91,325	3,655	173,155	289,575	29,156,094	29,445,669
1908	19,245	70,165	4,365	199,405	293,180	23,577,922	23,871,102
1909	24,305	67,395	160	159,730	251,590	27,075,248	27,326,838
1910	13,390	54,450	240	75,410	143,540	31,538,865	31,682,405
1911	37,480	62,060	490	201,800	301,830	28,965,658	29,267,488
1912	24,060	45,875	910	151,580	222,425	31,108,026	31,330,451
1913	27,735	11,275	5,380	166,735	211,125	32,221,676	32,432,801

[1] From 1907 to 1913, inclusive, the tonnage given under the head of the Ohio River includes the Illinois, Cumberland, and Tennessee Rivers also.

Total receipts and shipments at St. Louis by rail and by water for years given.

[From reports of the Merchants' Exchange, St. Louis.]

Year.	Total by water.	Total by rail.	Grand total.
	Tons.	*Tons.*	*Tons.*
1880	1,831,385	8,852,204	10,783,589
1890	1,265,592	15,240,141	16,505,733
1900	757,590	24,555,750	25,313,340
1905	370,425	39,141,663	39,512,088
1910	191,965	51,726,135	51,918,100
1911	369,295	46,939,995	47,309,290
1912	265,720	51,476,639	51,742,359
1913	258,709	54,350,851	54,609,560

FOUR MILLION WANTED FOR MORE LAND RECLAMATION.

To show what Missouri and Illinois Members are up against I quote briefly from proceedings of the Upper Mississippi Drainage Association as reported in the Globe Democrat of November 9 last:

The chief topic under discussion was a plan to obtain Government aid in completing levees between Rock Island and Cairo. This can be done, according to statements made at the meeting, with $4,000,000. It was pointed out that $60,000,000 has been appropriated by the Government for work south of Cairo and a very small amount for the river north of Cairo. It was decided to ask the next session of Congress to appropriate $1,000,000 a year for this work.

Sure. But why stop at $1,000,000 or $4,000,000, when the lower Mississippi has had more than $60,000,000 and nearer $100,000,000 from the Government largely for land reclamation? Why not demand that for every dollar spent on the lower river reclamation work and every dollar spent on the Missouri River reclamation work an equal amount should be spent on the upper river? In short, why not throw open the Federal Treasury doors and take over every land reclamation and private water-power project in the country? If one gets a grab, why not all? Incidentally this is the 780,000-acre reclamation project covered by the resolution just offered.

IS NOT COL. TOWNSEND'S JUDGMENT SOUND?—IT CALLS A HALT ON 58 RIVER PROJECTS. WHY NOT?

Again, I quote from Col. Townsend's remarkable address before the river and harbor lobby which was extended in the RECORD of December 11, 1915. Therein he says:

Specifically the writer would not abandon any navigable stream in the Mississippi Valley that has been partially improved, but would leave 58 of them in their statu quo, confining operations to snagging and the maintenance of existing works and would concentrate appropriations on opening up a channel of the capacity of that existing on the lower and middle Mississippi to Chicago and Pittsburgh * * *.

If the facilities thus afforded by the Government are utilized, the upper Mississippi and the Missouri Rivers should then receive attention.

Col. Townsend calls a halt on the upper Mississippi and the Missouri River improvements until the $100,000,000 Ohio and $275,000,000 lower Mississippi projects are finished, and if these streams are ever utilized (?) then go on with the remaining 58 projects, including the Missouri and upper Mississippi. He is amply sustained in his demand for a halt on the 58 projects, but our rivers will not be "utilized" for reasons set forth by

Col. Townsend in that same address. He proposes a channel to Chicago, when Army engineers have shown the utter uselessness of digging a 14-foot canal to accommodate lake vessels, 98 per cent of which draw over 14 feet. In fact, Col. Townsend's inconsistency only demonstrates the eagerness with which men strive to see their own projects advanced, and, based on absolute lack of commerce on the lower Mississippi, we must infer Col. Townsend's job influences his judgment.

A NAVIGATION COMEDY IN THE LOWER MISSOURI.

In order to continue a study of engineers' statistics, I leave the lower Mississippi project temporarily and take up another remarkable illustration of advanced mathematics now found on the Missouri River, which Col. Deakyne condemns and which Col. Townsend, of the Army engineers, asks to have left in statu quo. While passing this deserted waterway, we are permitted to revel in "commerce" delusions. Attention is given this project, because after spending $20,000,000 of Government money during 50 years, on the recommendation of Army engineers, on the different sections of the Missouri River down to the mouth, they have launched us into an additional twenty-million-dollar expenditure, or thirty millions, in a game that has no limit, but now reaches $35,800,000 on the Missouri. Let us see what we are to get for $75,000 per mile for 400 miles. I quote from the Chief of Engineer's 1914 report, page 2513:

COMMERCIAL STATISTICS—LOWER MISSOURI RIVER (MOUTH TO KANSAS CITY).

Season of navigation, year 1913: Opened March 15; closed November 30.

Vessel classification.

Classes.	Number.	Net registered tonnage.
Registered:		
Steamer	6	554
Gasoline	4	114
Total	10	668
Unregistered barges	5	3,350

Freight traffic.

Articles.	Amount.		Valuation.	Average haul.	Rate per ton-mile.
	Customary units.	Short tons.			
				Miles.	
Grain	253,940 bushels	6,701	$195,303.38	123	$0.0091
Hay		114	2,049.66	106	.0156
Feed and flour		334	9,538.88	8	.0670
Oil	46 barrels	12	345.00	8	.0483
Manufactured iron and steel.		1,655	897,790.50	291	.0089
Live stock	4,800 head	945	137,039.20	31	.0403
Salt	148 barrels	22	259.00	9	.0510
Sand and gravel	1,735 cubic yards.	2,513	1,646.00	9	.0557
Brick	4,800	16	56.90	9	.0349
Cement	534 barrels	107	1,152.90	26	.0346
Lumber	75,360 feet b. m	183	2,976.60	13	.0333
Other building material		15	1,088.00	10	.0415
Railroad ties	128,908	10,312	62,697.50	14	.0085
Produce		196	22,370.40	125	.0114
Wood	591 cords	847	2,135.60	9	.1002
Miscellaneous		13,579	2,520,734.80	237	.0093
Logs and lumber rafted	43,000 feet b. m	107	473.00	150	(1)
Sand and gravel barged	238,136 cubic yards.	309,577	71,555.00	1	(1)
Total		347,235	3,929,212.32		

[1] Owner.

Total ton miles, 5,173,170.

Of this imposing commerce over 312,000 tons of "sand" was hauled about 1 mile in 1913. Nine-tenths of the "traffic" was barged 1 mile. Study the table in order to get a fair understanding of humbug statistics handed Congress by Army engineers and of a vanished river traffic.

In January, 1915, Senate Document No. 953, the engineers had on hand for this project $1,290,048. On April 1, 1915, the river and harbor lobby sent to the press the Chief Engineer's allotment, wherein $1,000,000 more was given for this 400-mile stretch on the Missouri. Instead of a 6-foot channel being required, a 2-foot channel will float the insignificant commerce, according to experienced river men, and for that river's commerce $2,050,000 was allotted by Chief Kingman out of the $50,000,000 turned over to him by Congress.

Deducting from the above table sand and 11,159 tons of ties and wood barged about 10 miles, leaves 24,000 tons of questionable commerce for which the Chief of Engineers gives $1,000,000 in 1915, or over $40 per ton 1913 expense for the waterway, including maintenance and interest on prior expenditures. Speaking of this Missouri River project on March 2, 1915, one month before the allotment was made, Senator Burton said:

You may spend $20,000,000—yes, $30,000,000—on this project, and in spite of that enormous amount the traffic will diminish, because you are facing a condition that no policy of river improvement can reverse—the loss of that class of river traffic and the utilization of other agencies for the carrying of freight. I wish it were not so, * * * but I am tired of "rainbow chasing," and that is what this is. It is much worse than "rainbow chasing"; it is pure, bald, unmitigated waste.

After this remarkable denunciation of a bald, wasteful project shouldered onto taxpayers by "rainbow chasing" engineers, and after positive legislative notice directing a resurvey of this "pure, bald, unmitigated waste," and with a million dollars balance on hand to throw into the mud, our Chief of Engineers triumphantly dumped in another million on April 1, 1915. Two jitney busses would have carried all the actual commerce and saved $998,000 of war-tax revenues during 1914.

Was TILLMAN to blame when he said the bill is a "humbug and a steal"? We know it is farcical and we do more than wink at it. With positive knowledge that the waste is twice as large as in the days when TILLMAN exposed the humbug, we approve it, Mississippi, Missouri, and all, with every other worthless project that the bill contains.

Concerning this waterway mockery, I quote from a Minneapolis paper's editorial of August 21 last this significant statement:

A BREEZE IN RIVER-IMPROVEMENT CIRCLES.

The Missouri River cities and especially Kansas City, are very much agitated over the adverse report of Col. Herbert Deakyne, of the Engineer Corps of the Army, on the expenditure of more money to improve navigation on that river. Col. Deakyne is the Government engineer in charge. He has made his surveys and reports that it is entirely feasible to provide a 6-foot channel from the mouth of the Missouri to Kansas City and that the expense will not overrun the estimate of $20,000,000. But attached to his report as an engineer is his recommendation to the Government that further work on the Missouri be discontinued, because in his opinion the railroads are now so well regulated through the Interstate Commerce Commission that river navigation is not necessary.

What has happened as to the Missouri might happen as to any other navigable stream. Col. Deakyne might be transferred to the upper Mississippi some day and decide that there was not business enough existing or prospective to justify river improvement.

KINGMAN WASTE VERSUS COMMON SENSE.

For fear the engineers may awaken to a like farce perpetrated on the upper river near Minneapolis, we are advised Col. Deakyne will not be welcomed on the Minneapolis lock-and-dam project. This possibility need not cause idle fears. Whatever belated intelligence was exercised by Col. Deakyne in reporting what everyone on the Missouri has known for years, Chief Kingman will set aside his report. That is the power and custom of Chiefs of Engineers, including especially Gen. Bixby, as disclosed by their own reports. The Missouri was pronounced of doubtful value by the 1915 bill, passed March 3, 1915.

Gen. Kingman on April 1 gave $1,000,000 for the questionable project which Col. Deakyne condemned 22 days thereafter. Is not that food for thought on the part of every disinterested man who must verify Deakyne's conclusions after glancing over the engineer's reports for recent years?

WHERE THE MONEY GOES.

To show specifically why $1,552,650 was recommended by Col. Deakyne for land-reclamation purposes in 1915, and $1,000,000 paid by Chief Kingman, I quote from page 2510, report 1914, on this 400 miles of the Missouri, along which Army engineers estimate 500,000 acres will be saved, valued at $100 to $125 per acre—land belonging to private interests deeply interested in this $20,000,000 project:

During the coming fiscal year it is proposed to carry on work with the funds for which allotments have been approved in the completion of contracts now in force and in work by day labor and Government plant, as follows:

97,500 linear feet standard revetment, at $10	$975,000
11,000 linear feet concrete revetment, at $10	110,000
21,950 linear feet 3-row standard dike, at $15	329,250
Maintenance of improvement	25,000
New plant	13,400
Snagging and repairs to plant	50,000
Surveys and superintendence	50,000

Other work will be done if appropriations are made.

This work is expected to result in greater permanence and depth of channel in the improved sections and greater ease of navigation.

APPROPRIATIONS AND ALLOTMENTS (ON THIS PRESENT PROJECT).

June 25, 1910	$1,000,000
July 25, 1912	800,000
Aug. 24, 1912	600,000
Mar. 4, 1913	2,000,000
Oct. 2, 1914	850,000
Total of appropriations	5,250,000

A $60,000,000 LAND-RECLAMATION PROJECT.

One million four hundred thousand dollars was demanded for 25 miles of revetment and diking in 1915, and $1,000,000 was

given by Gen. Kingman to confine a mile-wide river in places to a 1,200-foot channel, and incidentally to reclaim private land valued at sixty-odd million dollars.

Maj. Schulz disclosed an Army engineer's secret troubles along the Missouri when he said, according to the official record—

If I get a small amount of money, $50,000 to $60,000, for that stretch of river, every locality and almost every Congressman writes for the work right on their particular spot, and there I am.

The mental strain is easier when $1,414,250 is distributed "for that stretch" annually. Schulz is gone and Deakyne, who recommended nearly a million and a half for 1915, and then recanted—he, too, is gone, banished. A half million acres is to be saved at Government expense by Chief Kingman, according to the reports. What do you think of the system?

I believe the Missouri River is rightfully classed as a southern project, not because of geographical location, but from the fact it is closely related to the lower Mississippi, is recognized largely as a similar land-reclamation venture, and is supported in committee and in Congress by some of the most influential men in the majority party. It may also explain why Gen. Kingman gave $1,000,000 more to a project first rejected because "pure, bald, unmitigated waste," and why he will overrule the report of Col. Deakyne, and why, if so, he ought to be subjected to a thorough public investigation by his superior officers.

MISSOURI COMMERCE STEADILY DECREASING.

Since the opening of this Sixty-fourth session two learned and bulky briefs in favor of reinstating the Missouri River project have been placed on my desk.

Therein it is urged that Col. Deakyne conceived a prejudice against the new $20,000,000 project based on the poor commercial showing for the year 1913. (Brief, p. 24.) Apart from the fact that actual commerce on the Missouri River is reported to have decreased in sympathy with the Mississippi River over 90 per cent during the past half century, it is notable that the insignificant commerce in recent years and reported for 1913 (p. 2513, 1914 report) decreased 30 per cent during the last year reported (see p. 2811, 1915 report). My analysis and comparisons have been based on the 1914 report, but from the last one just handed me I note in defense of Col. Deakyne's prophecy the following significant loss in an insignificant commerce out of over 10,000,000 tons alleged to have been handled by Kansas City in 1914:

Tons of reported commerce.	
1905	343,435
1913	347,235
1914	240,550
Loss (30 per cent)	104,685
Actual commerce.	
1905	18,182
1913	24,000
1914	19,000
Loss (20 per cent)	5,000

A loss of 30 per cent in officially reported commerce and of 20 per cent in actual commerce, deducting sand and flotable timber, during the last year reported is more convincing than voluminous briefs. Col. Deakyne was a prophet, although 19,000 tons, or ten times that amount, is a pitiable showing on a $20,000,000 investment during the last 30 years. Deakyne urges us to drop the $20,000,000 new project. Why not do so?

COMMERCE?

I have given a full table reported by the engineers for the 1913 commerce and will give the principal items of deduction for 1914, taken from page 2811, 1915 report:

			Tons.
Total tonnage reported			240,550
Sand and gravel barged one-half mile	tons	211,421	
Sand and gravel, 9 miles	do	2,286	
Railroad ties rafted 18 miles	do	6,041	
Railroad ties, 9 miles	do	334	
Wood, 12 miles		1,091	
			221,173
Excluding sand, gravel, ties, and wood			19,377

It takes a courageous man to count as commerce 213,707 tons of sand barged less than a mile, but an Army engineer can do it.

A significant part of this statement is that the average grain haul for 1914 was 115 miles, showing conclusively that the much-boasted grain traffic between Kansas City and St. Louis after an expenditure of over $20,000,000 is pure gammon. The distance between these cities is 400 miles in round numbers, and apparently not one ton was shipped from Kansas City to St. Louis. An insignificant amount, 5,290 tons, is reported with an average haul of 115 miles; but what under heavens permitted engineers to recommend a $35,000,000 expenditure for this river to accommodate a little local freight, hauled a few miles, when Kansas City claims it has been shipping 10,000,000 tons of commerce annually by rail? Again, an S. O. S. call for a keeper from some feeble-minded establishment is momentarily expected.

HOW MUCH IS THE COST?

Before I pass from this phase of the Missouri River project, I understand there is a difference in understanding as to the amount that has been expended on the Missouri River by the Government. I am free to confess that the average engineer's report is as clear and intelligible as a Chinese puzzle, but after considerable digging into ponderous records there has been reported to the River and Harbor Committee by its assistants the following items:

For general improvements	$15,450,000
Appropriated under new project	6,250,000
Balance due on new project	14,100,000
Total when the present project is completed	35,800,000

You will find this accurate—$35,800,000.

The Missouri River has cost the Government over $21,000,000, and when the present project is completed the Government will have spent $35,800,000 for that deserted river.

Mr. BORLAND. Does the gentleman want to be corrected now?

Mr. FREAR. I will accept any correction.

Mr. BORLAND. I will say the gentleman is as incorrect in that as the gentleman is in those other statements.

Mr. FREAR. In what particulars?

Mr. BORLAND. There has been appropriated, up to the 4th of March, 1914, on the present project——

Mr. FREAR. Take 1915. I was referring to the last report.

Mr. BORLAND. 1914; the gentleman's figures do not reach any further back.

Mr. FREAR. Oh, yes; June 30, 1915, is the last date.

Mr. BORLAND. There has been appropriated up to the 4th of March, 1914, $4,400,000 on the present project. There was appropriated previous to 1902 about $9,000,000 on the Missouri River, most of which, or much of which, was dissipated by doing exactly what the gentleman——

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Speaker, I object to an argument. I object further because the gentleman is entirely wrong. My own statement is correct.

Mr. BORLAND. In October, 1914——

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. BORLAND. Just a moment.

Mr. FREAR. No; I must object to the gentleman's occupying my time any further. And I ask that this not be taken out of my time.

Mr. BORLAND. But I can answer——

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Speaker, I object to the gentleman's answering at this time within my time. I extended him——

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I call the gentleman from Missouri to order.

Mr. BORLAND. I thought the gentleman yielded——

Mr. FREAR. To a question, and then I told the gentleman distinctly I did not yield to an argument. The gentleman is entirely wrong. Look at the statement in the hands of every member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. They all know.

THIRTY-SIX MILLIONS FOR WHAT?

Mr. Speaker, in support of my statement of expenditures on the Missouri River by the Government I refer to pages 2822, 2823, 2824, 2825 of the 1915 report, which shows expenditures on the Missouri to June 30, 1915, reach $19,789,104. I believe this includes several duplications, but these are the figures to which my attention has been called as the correct statement of expenditures already made on the Missouri River. To this should be added $2,236,907, balance unexpended (p. 1065, 1915 report) and $14,100,000 balance of the $20,000,000 unappropriated. If these figures are correct, the project will reach over $36,000,000, as disclosed by the tables.

Whether or not the statement is just exact, what a miserable, paltry showing is made on the river where 19,377 tons is all that was carried less than a couple of hundred miles, on the average, out of 10,000,000 tons handled at Kansas City in 1914. And what a tragic tale of waste when $19,789,104 has been poured into the rat hole by these Army engineers who, with $2,236,907 on hand, overruling Deakyne, demand $14,100,000 more for finishing the project. Is it not awful?

The only man who smiles during this war-tax-paying season is the "show me" Missourian who owns a few of those 500,000 acres, worth $60,000,000, that the Government is reclaiming.

POSITIVE EVIDENCE OF $300,000 ANNUAL LOSS—THE GOVERNMENT SHOULD BUY THE FREIGHT AND BURN IT.

Mr. Speaker, one of the ablest dissections of the lower Missouri River, $35,000,000, waste appears in the Journal of Politi-

cal Economy, No. 10, December, 1915, from the pen of Prof. H. G. Moulton, of the University of Chicago.

For the sake of argument, he concedes all the rainbow chasing arguments and then, assuming the actual commerce of 1914 of 19,000 tons will some day grow to 800,000 tons, Mr. Moulton points out that the saving in freight charges of 20 per cent on the average would be only about $200,000 annual gain for Kansas City shippers. Col. Deakyne's estimate of $500,000 for annual maintenance and $600,000 annual interest, reaching a total annual lower Missouri charge against the Government Treasury of $1,100,000, is then presented to offset the $200,000 supposed saving to those favored shippers. No intelligent man dreams that a river commerce of 18,182 tons in 1905 and 19,000 tons in 1914 will reach 800,000 tons or 100,000 tons of actual commerce for 10 centuries to come at the present rate of progress. It is equally noteworthy that the proposed Government investment, now reaching $35,800,000, on the Missouri may be approximately $40,000,000 by the time the present project is completed.

Prof. Moulton takes the subject seriously, but the 200 delegates from 10 States called together August 17 by the lobby "congress" that distributes all the pork according to its own modest admissions, included, presumably, delegates interested in the $60,000,000 land-reclamation project on the lower Missouri or the Rock Island to Cape Girardeau $80,000,000 land-reclamation project on the Mississippi or the $2,000,000,000 land-reclamation project on the lower Mississippi, all of which are being financed by our war tax burdened people in order to help private interests. Prof. Moulton's contribution is valuable, but Army engineers do not analyze "unmitigated waste" of Government funds when listening to the voice of political might.

I like to get testimony first hand, and here we have a statement that appeared in one of the leading papers of the country on August 21, 1915, immediately after the hearing held in Kansas City. It is an Omaha, Nebr., statement, appearing in the Chicago Tribune, and gives an interesting side light on the Missouri River:

AN ELOQUENT SERMON FROM OMAHA

MISSOURI RIVER IS A GRAVEYARD OF STEAMBOATS—SNAGS IMPEDE NAVIGATION DESPITE GREAT SUMS SPENT BY GOVERNMENT.

OMAHA, NEBR., *August 21, 1915.*

While Kansas City, Omaha, Sioux City, and other cities are trying to revive steamship traffic on the Missouri River, and are asking Congress for appropriations to deepen the channel, the skeletons of 295 steamboats are rotting in its sands and, according to Government statistics, two-thirds of them were lost on snags and trunks of trees in the channel. Only 4 of the 295 whose histories are known met their fate on sand bars.

"Remove the snags from the river and the steamships will have no trouble," say old river captains and pilots.

The Government has already spent large sums on the Missouri River. The records of the Missouri River Commission show that $7,150,000 was expended by that body from 1884 to 1902. Of this amount $3,280,201 went for "the effective, progressive, and systematic improvement of the river," as expressed in the commission's report.

GREAT SUM FOR EXPENSES.

Nearly $1,000,000—$855,765—was expended for a plant, for office work, and for the expenses of the commission and incidentals.

And after all this treasure had been poured into the Missouri the traffic was insignificant. In 1901, the last year for which the Missouri River Commission compiled statistics, only 72,339 tons of freight were carried on the river below Sioux City and 37,349 tons above the city.

Of the 72,339 tons below Sioux City but 8,443 tons were hauled by steamship; the rest, wood and railroad crossties, were rafted.

In 1915 there is just one steamship on the river between Sioux City and Kansas City. She is the *Julia*, of 10 tons, and she plies between Omaha and Decatur, 60 miles. The United States Government spent many millions of dollars in order that the *Julia* might operate. On her last trip the *Julia* brought one passenger—the first and only steamship passenger to land in Omaha in 30 years.

Can anything be stronger than this arraignment of the project by those who live on the river and know the facts? Read it twice, it shows what Army engineers have done for a grateful people.

However, one passenger in 30 years is a thousand per cent better than no passengers in 30 years between St. Paul and Minneapolis—after an expenditure of $2,500,000 in "developing a passenger traffic," on the advice of Army engineers.

AN ECHO FROM THE LOBBY.

In an oration before the "river congress" lobby, a Missouri River champion omitted to explain just why the Government is spending $1,414,250, as officially reported, for revetting and diking some twenty-odd miles of private lands this year, under the guise of helping navigation on the Missouri. Also, what became of $855,765 used by the Missouri River commission for expenses? Will political influence overrule Engineer Deakyne, who revolted against the scandalous waste? Chief Kingman is the czar.

COL. TOWNSEND PROTESTS EMPHATICALLY—ANOTHER ECHO FROM THE SAME LOBBY.

Col. Townsend, chairman of the Mississippi River Commission, an Army officer, at that same lobby meeting, read a carefully prepared speech in which he declared the Missouri River and 57 other Mississippi Valley projects ought to remain in statue quo without continuation of projects until it is ascertained whether or not the Mississippi River, as a test river, will be or can be utilized for commerce.

Which do you rely on, Townsend and Deakyne, or local Representatives from Missouri, who plead for a $60,000,000 reclamation project for "navigation"? Will you waste $14,100,000 more for reclamation?

Again, we have higher authority than anything Deakyne has offered, and Deakyne, as I understand, is a man of unquestioned judgment and honesty of purpose, and has no interests in this. Deakyne condemned the project last April. He declared the Government should stop wasting money on the hopeless Missouri River. He was apparently sick of defending a reclamation project any longer.

Col. Townsend, at the head of the Mississippi River Commission, spoke in Washington last month, as stated. I wish I had time to read his report to you. He wants the Missouri River and the other rivers to be kept back in statu quo, because they are all deserted.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has consumed 50 minutes.

Mr. FREAR. I would like to spend 10 minutes in answering questions, after I conclude my remarks.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the gentleman have 20 minutes more.

Mr. SWITZER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. Will the gentleman from Wisconsin allow me to propound one question?

Mr. FREAR. I surely will, at that time.

The SPEAKER. Is there any objection to the gentleman from Wisconsin continuing for 20 minutes in addition to the 10 minutes that he already has?

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, he asked for only 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The proposition is to extend the gentleman's time 20 minutes. He already has 10, which will let him have 30 minutes more.

Mr. BORLAND. I suggest that there are a good many people interested in this.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FREAR. Here is a Missouri River paper, published at Sioux City, on the Missouri River. I might not want to speak in the tone that these editorials are couched in, but it is emphatic and specific and refers to statistics that have been offered to us by the Kansas City boosters.

This is from the Sioux City Tribune of November 22, 1915, and it must be familiar with the facts. It does not mince matters. It affords food for thought, coming from an unprejudiced witness living on the Missouri and familiar with the facts, we may well believe:

MISSOURI RIVER TRAFFIC INVESTMENTS.

The Missouri River "pork-barrel" crowd is still at work—harder than ever. They have succeeded in accomplishing one thing—getting the transfer of Col. Deakyne, the United States Army engineer who filed a report saying further expenditure of money "improving" the Missouri River under the pretense of restoring river freight traffic would be money wasted.

This, of course, is quite a lot. It serves as warning to Army engineers that they must make reports in harmony with the "pork-barrel" crowd instead of reports in harmony with facts if they expect to hold their positions and stand in line for promotion. * * *

However, the Missouri "pork-barrel" crowd has moved on to Washington, to the headquarters of the Rivers and Harbors Congress, a lobby so large and powerful that it has come to be known as the "third house" of Congress. It is relating how "over $34,000,000 of river-traffic investments" are demanding the "pork" for the Missouri River. Foolishly it itemizes these "investments."

An analysis of the itemized list shows that of the $34,688,000 listed as "investments" in Missouri River traffic $10,000,000 is credited to New Orleans Harbor improvements which are being made for ocean traffic. Of the remaining $24,688,000, just $125,000 represents actual investments. The rest shows up in items like these: "Proposed barge line," "proposed bond issue for terminals," "boat line proposed by private funds," and "estimated proposed bond issue."

This is a sample of the way the country is being deceived. There are no actual investments of any consequence in river traffic, because capital knows river traffic is absurd and impossible. If river traffic were as profitable a competitor to railroads as "pork-barrel" advocates make it out to be, the navigable rivers of the country would be crowded with river steamboats just as they were in the early days, for the rivers are surely as navigable now as they were then. The whole proposition is a fraud.

COL. DEAKYNE AND CAPT. DREYFUS—AMERICAN AND FRENCH MILITARY METHODS NOT UNLIKE.

What influence caused Chief Kingman to banish Col. Deakyne, whose official reports disclosed that the Government is spending $20,000,000 for revetting and reclaiming private land on the Missouri? Why not send Col. Riche to Alaska, because Riche ridiculed spending $10,000,000 on the wasteful Trinity project, and also tried to prevent Chief Kingman from giving $1,750,000

to the Alabama Water Power Co. for "flowage"? All to no purpose. While searching for the power that removed Deakyne we should also learn what power caused Chief Kingman to give $470,000 out of his Sixty-third Congress allotment to the wasteful Brazos that floats 1,080 tons of commerce annually—50 per cent more than to New York's great inner harbor, the largest in the world. What power caused Chief Kingman to give $320,000 to the Ouichita and Arkansas Rivers after the House and the House committee had acted adversely on these projects? He raised the gift over 1,000 per cent—but why? What power caused Chief Kingman to urge $100,000 in his last report for the Red River, when the only tangible commerce consists of 240,042 deadheads and other obstructions removed in 1912 and 1913? What influence caused Chief Kingman to recommend $18,700,000 of Government funds for the Alabama Water Power Co. 150-foot dam at Muscle Shoals, and also that the Government build a 150-foot dam for the Georgia Power Co. over on the Etowah?

WHY NOT MAKE DEAKYNE CHIEF ENGINEER?

I desire to refer at some length to these and other projects during my remarks, but I now ask why was Deakyne removed from the Missouri after his denunciation of the wasteful $20,000,000 project, and where is the Deakyne report rejecting the Missouri River project? Several million war-tax-burdened people not included in the State's census are from Missouri and want to be shown just why Deakyne was removed and why his report has been delayed or suppressed. Deakyne tried to protect the Government Treasury. Why not make him Chief Engineer?

AN ARRAY OF UNIMPEACHABLE WITNESSES AGAINST THE MISSOURI.

I understand this last $20,000,000 project on the Missouri was originally rejected by Army engineers. I have quoted among the authorities that join in that verdict or ask for a stay of proceedings Col. Deakyne and Col. Townsend, Army engineers; the Sioux City Tribune, from a flourishing Missouri River city; Prof. Moulton's unanswerable logic as to freight savings; Bernhard's statement on absence of river commerce; the greatest waterway expert in the country, Senator Burton; official reports, showing that 95 per cent of the last money was used by engineers to revet private lands; and, finally, that the insignificant actual commerce of 1913 fell off 20 per cent, down to 19,000 tons, in 1914. These opinions and reports are unprejudiced and presumably are uninfluenced by personal or political considerations.

No man can reasonably question a like verdict would be rendered by any unprejudiced jury of taxpayers, whether located in Maine, Michigan, or Missouri. But while undue influence would impeach the verdict of a petit jury in a $5 pig case, our Army engineers are openly belabored by every known influence from personal interest to political fear on a proceeding wherein the $5 pig has grown to the size of a $35,800,000 porker, if the above witnesses are correct.

ANOTHER MISSOURI RIVER PROJECT—HERE IS THE NEXT ENGINEERS' TABLE OF "COMMERCE" STATISTICS.

Commercial statistics—Upper Missouri River (Kansas City to Fort Benton).

Season of navigation, year 1913: Opened April 1; closed November 15.

Freight traffic.

Articles.	Amount.		Valuation.	Average haul.
	Customary units.	Short tons.		
				Miles.
Grain	786,108 bushels	23,776	$786,000.00	65
Coal		4,166	9,831.76	38
Manufactured iron and steel		499	101,927.00	65
Salt	100 barrels	15	250.00	50
Lumber and shingles		6,029	38,690.00	48
Lumber and piling, rafted		3,960	16,310.00	35
Other building materials		95	1,450.00	54
Miscellaneous		985	85,300.00	80
Sand, barged	88,735 cubic yards	115,685	39,348.00	2
Oil	500 barrels	106	5,000.00	50
Contractor's outfit		9,250	925,000.00	35
Willows used by R. R. Co.	2,000 cords	1,200	4,000.00	10
Total		165,766	2,013,106.76	

Total ton-miles, 2,684,759.

Again we encounter the engineers' traffic humbug. Of 165,766 tons, a familiar item is 115,685 tons of sand reported to have been barged 2 miles. About 10,000 tons of lumber and piling were rafted or barged, along with 1,200 tons of pussy willows, for revetting railroad switches. Page 2527 shows the railway's interest in Gen. Kingman's allotment. Four thousand one hundred and sixty-six tons of soft coal, apparently for Government dredges, was barged 38 miles for a 9,250-ton contractor's outfit (?), valued at just $10 per ton, which was hauled 35 miles.

Making proper allowances for duplications and quadruplications of grain shipped and received on a 65-mile haul, why should anybody waste time in ascertaining "how old is Ann" when this table of "commerce" is within easy reach? Where is the limit of an engineer's brilliant imagination when a Government contractor's outfit is used to bolster up about one-half of the ridiculous table of valuations, and what shall be said of actual commerce? After spending over a million dollars on this stretch of the Missouri River, and with $111,125 cash on hand, Chief Kingman, with a prodigality that knows no bounds, on April 1, 1915, allotted $100,000 more to the upper Missouri. That should keep one contractor busy for several months and pay reasonable dividends on his $925,000 investment.

A couple of motor trucks would have carried all of the "commerce" last year, whereas nearly $200,000 of Government money was blown into the river in addition to a million or more already spent, apparently to protect private landowners and furnish contractors a fairly continuous job.

THE OHIO RIVER COMMERCE—STATISTICAL INDICTMENT OF ENGINEERING METHODS.

We have journeyed down the Mississippi and Missouri, and now the Ohio is reached. What tales of waste and extravagance could be told by waters that once carried millions of tons of actual floating commerce now driven from the rivers. According to old river men, Government dredges, Government barges, and Government boats float most of the "commerce" now carried on these rivers to support an army of Government employees.

It is said by occasional defenders of "pork" and waste that the Chief of Engineers, who formerly posed annually before the $50,000,000 river and harbor lobby, is not responsible for errors in waterway statistics, and an apology states that his "commerce" reports are admitted to contain duplications and quadruplications. However, our Government educated this official at public expense because of aptness for mathematics and has furnished him constant employment for many years, during which time he has given marked evidence of early training. Our bosoms swell with pride when we turn to the table of Ohio River commerce furnished Chairman SPARKMAN. Apart from duplications, the example in arithmetical progression, furnished by adding together lockages reported, gives an insight into a remarkable method of reaching conclusions now pursued by Chief Kingman. With an insignificant through traffic, aside from soft coal, the explanation fails to explain, although a crude estimate for through coal traffic is offered in justification for adding together the lockages. The table and letter, introduced into the RECORD by Chairman SPARKMAN January 19, 1915, are as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, July 27, 1914.

Hon. S. M. SPARKMAN,
Chairman Committee on Rivers and Harbors,
United States House of Representatives.

SIR: 1. Referring to the statement of the commercial statistics of the Ohio River, telephoned to you some time since, I have the honor to inform you that a report just received from the district officer states that the commercial statistics which he reported by telegraph have been found upon careful check to have contained some duplication. A corrected tabular statement of the statistics is herewith.

2. As to the reason for reporting the statistics at only six locks, it may be stated that the particular locks were selected with a view to obtaining as complete statistics as possible, and at the same time to eliminate duplication as much as practicable. Boats with through tows are required to report only at the first lock through which they pass. The item for open-river commerce is the local commerce carried on between the various locks and dams.

Very respectfully,

DAN C. KINGMAN,
Chief of Engineers, United States Army.

Ohio River tonnage, calendar year 1913.

[Through lock and open river.]

	Tonnage.	Valuation.	Passengers.
Lock No. 1	1,982,257.5	$3,720,794.36	86,518
Lock No. 8	224,080.5	1,095,666.92	5,005
Lock No. 18	374,945.0	2,336,645.31	9,421
Lock No. 26	796,629.0	2,926,918.65	17,266
Lock No. 37	1,988,434.0	9,953,466.24	104,078
Lock No. 41	1,537,146.5	6,318,567.53	11,767
Open river	1,509,111.5	14,088,452.70	1,086,897
Ferries	1,401,519.5	36,086,390.07	2,949,834
Total	9,814,123.3	77,026,901.78	4,270,788

A corrected statement of average freight floated on the Ohio, based upon official lock reports, is now presented over Chief Kingman's signature, and invites scrutiny.

When a 63-lock system on the Ohio River has been completed as a monument to congressional waste and engineering complicity "commerce" can then be determined by using 63 as a multiple of lock tonnage. This cumulative method of reckoning is as illuminating as to count the passengers in every car at every street corner in order to determine the total street car traffic. Astounding statistics may thus be produced. Chief Kingman says he has "avoided duplication as far as possible." What is the average haul or tonnage along the river when 1,400,000 tons was ferried across the river? Did the continuous commerce reach 100,000 tons or 50,000 tons, exclusive of soft coal which has floated down the Ohio and Mississippi for a half century at a yearly decreasing rate?

In an effort to excuse a proposed wasteful expenditure of from $60,000,000 to $100,000,000 on the Ohio, according to the varying predictions of Army engineers, our present chief includes in his totals 1,500,000 tons of "open-river traffic" that passes along the river as it always has for 50 years and in much larger quantities before canalization was known and before a dollar was spent by the Government on the Ohio. Was that open-river traffic part of the open-river traffic at each lock? How much freight goes through locks, and how far?

CANALIZATION TO PROMOTE RIVER FERRIAGE.

The limit of imaginary mathematics is reached when to total lockages of freight at a half dozen dams, including open-river traffic, our Chief Engineer adds more "open-river traffic" and finally scores a positive triumph by adding ferriage across the river, which aggregates 2,949,834 passengers, nearly three-fourths of the total number, valued at $36,086,390.07. That odd 7 cents is developed through engineering accuracy. Ferriage valuation is practically one-half of the total value of all tonnage and passengers carried on the river. Assuming that passengers had no value and that freight alone was considered, no further analysis need be made to show the valueless character of valuation statistics submitted by the Chief Engineer to bolster up this $100,000,000 canalization project.

Approaching 2,000,000 tons at one or two different points, over 95 per cent of which is soft coal, sand, and gravel, a traffic rapidly diminishing in quantity and value, leaves the mouth of the Ohio River at less than a million tons of soft coal, so far as can be ascertained, and then drifts slowly down the Mississippi to be recounted at Cairo, Memphis, Vicksburg, and New Orleans. In other words, a few tons of soft coal that reach New Orleans are first counted at a dozen locks on the Monongahela, then at the locks on the Ohio, and then the same coal, used to swell senseless quadrupled statistics, is sent down and recounted at Cairo, Memphis, Vicksburg, and New Orleans, on the Father of Waters.

It is an interesting system; one that only an able engineer could gravely put across with a wealth of misleading statistics and one that is frequently used for duplicating and quadruplicating commerce on other rivers and canals.

In order that a better understanding of Chief Kingman's letter may be had, let us take the tables from which he draws deductions.

OHIO RIVER TRAFFIC AT LOCK 1.

Lock 1 is given 1,982,257 tons. But page 2711 says that is commerce which passed through the lock—"and open river"—at that point. The table further shows that of the impressive tonnage reported, including duplications, 1,946,119 tons consisted of soft coal, sand, and gravel that was always floated down the "open river," leaving a commerce of 36,135 tons, including 11,240 tons of floatable logs and ties, or less than 25,000 tons, that may or may not have required the services of this $100,000,000 lock system.

OHIO RIVER TRAFFIC AT LOCK 8.

Lock 8 and "open river" is given 224,080 tons by Chief Kingman, page 2712. Of that traffic, so reported, soft coal and railroad ties, that for a half century were floated down the open river, reached 207,429 tons, leaving 16,651 tons of cement and other reported freight at that point for which a $100,000,000 lock system is being built under the recommendation of Army engineers.

OHIO RIVER TRAFFIC AT LOCK 18.

Other lock statistics are of the same character. For fear this statement may not be accepted, as based on investigation, I will take the next lock. Chief Kingman's next lock, 18, and "open-river" statistics are found on page 2713. He reports a total "commerce" of 374,945 tons, whereas out of an even 50 items reported, 2 items of soft coal and logs reached 342,836 tons. Just what method was taken for shipping some 7,000 tons of oil and 2,500 tons of lumber, found in the remaining 48 items, the report fails to disclose. One thing is certain amid all this attempt to impress Congress with inflated statistics of open-river and lock traffic, the Government is annually paying bills reaching, with the regular and sundry civil bills, from $5,000,000 to $8,000,000 for the Ohio River alone, for a comparatively insignificant commerce average along the river, apart from soft coal, sand, and gravel, of less than 50,000 tons at given points, as shown by the official reports.

Similar conclusions were reached in the record of April 10, 1914, when other lock statements were analyzed.

WHAT WILL BE THE EVENTUAL COST?

Canalized science v. common sense.

In the debate preceding the defeat of the 1915 bill a prominent Senator called the Ohio River project the "worst of all." It received $1,769,000 from the first allotment, $3,200,000 in the 1915 sundry civil bill, and $3,915,000 allotment from the Chief of Army Engineers April 1, 1915, or $7,115,000 for 1915, in addition to cash on hand—twenty times the amount that was allotted to New York's inner harbor, which handles fifty times the Ohio's actual commerce.

When a $100,000,000 Ohio canalization system has been fastened upon us with its annual interest burden of $3,000,000, and a reasonable maintenance and deterioration charge of $4,000,000 more annually for sixty-odd locks and dams, if the diminishing coal commerce is retained—a violent assumption—the Government will have little tangible traffic to show for its $100,000,000 investment and the annual $7,000,000 charge properly lodged against it.

It is again well to ponder over this extravagance into which we have been led by Army engineers, who seek to defend enormous waste by fictitious commerce statistics. The 45,000,000 tons commerce of the Rhine is probably twenty times the actual commerce of the Ohio, and it appears 95 per cent of the latter is cheap coal, sand, and gravel that requires no special depth of channel, yet seven or eight times the amount spent on the Rhine is slipped through the fingers of our irresponsible Chief of Engineers for a project of no more value to this country than Egypt's pyramids. Does it reduce the price of a ton of coal to a single consumer? Where does it accommodate any actual navigation need apart from floating a few political prospects and fantastic engineering schemes at Government expense? If any commercial house indulged in such investments its officials would be promptly lodged in an asylum to sober off. Is it not about time Congress sobered off and drove out of its counting house those who have persuaded us to adopt such propositions as the 63-lock project on the Ohio River?

A FALLING OFF IN 1915.

From the 1915 report just at hand, page 3015 appears heroic efforts by the Chief Engineer to hold up a decreasing commerce. Yet practically 60 per cent of the valuation was carried by "ferries" across the river.

Again referring to the memorandum mysteriously sent by some unknown authority to which I shall later address myself, we find—

So sixty-four million we throw through dam gates,
Based on fat ferry figures and queer lockage freights,
Even Ford limousines while crossing the river
Help make freight statistics more cash to deliver,
While stray pools of water and Missouri sand
Bag twenty more millions for reclaiming land,
Hand in hand with contractors, whose junk-laden scow
Makes half of the freight for the pork we allow,
Along with a water power for navigation
To give old St. Anthony a gold coronation.
If political pull distributes this malt,
When will Congress decide to call a sharp halt
In filling up kegs like the chief built?

THE LOWER MISSISSIPPI RIVER SCANDAL—A SCORE OF INDICTMENTS IN ONE.

Only a brief reference to this wildly wasteful project can be given. On September 29, 1914, I offered in the RECORD many pages containing definite charges of incapacity and extravagance coming from civil engineers, experienced river men, and residents of the Mississippi Valley, lodged against the present colossal waste on the lower river; also against the Mississippi River Commission, Army engineers, and against the notorious levee lobby. A thorough investigation would determine the truth of explicit charges that were lodged with the committee. Nearly a hundred million dollars of Government money has been spent on the river below St. Louis. Some authorities state the amount to be larger. No man pretends to estimate the permanent value of work done on the river. No recognized authority assumes to know where the end will be found. The river's appetite for gold is growing like that of a gluttonous child, and, lest we forget, this project was fostered and fastened upon us by Army engineers and the powerful river lobby that parades publicly as a "congress," with a "policy, not a project." The cloak that used to get millions annually for navigation purposes has been abandoned. There is no substantial com-

merce, present or prospective. The facts are now well known. The play on our sympathies for flood control aid is another transparent cloak to cover up a huge land reclamation project our Government is financing for private interests.

Notwithstanding the Mississippi River Commission had in its hands January 1, 1915, over $1,800,000, the Army engineers on April 1, 1915, gave $4,000,000 more to that commission in addition to other lower-river appropriations. I will not now offer further opinions as to the character of that work other than to quote briefly from three leading papers published in the valley. The New Orleans Item in a column editorial uses this significant language:

The National Rivers and Harbors Congress conducts a national lobby for the pork-barrel bill. The Mississippi River Levee Association was organized by some railroad interests who do not want genuine and permanent stream control, because it threatens competition with levee board politicians and levee contractors, whose jobs and profits depend upon the perpetuation of the stupid and vicious old system of disjointed levee maintenance under which the people of the valley have been bled and pillaged.

That is a Louisiana opinion from the home of the National Rivers Congress lobby that conducts the pork-barrel bill. It is respectfully referred to Secretary Redfield, who finds no pork.

BRUTAL LOGIC DEMANDS YANKEE MONEY.

The Memphis News Scimitar published a long, searching editorial, from which again I take a brief but pointed extract:

The old brutal logic that we must "get some of that Yankee money down here" is no longer appealing. The Mississippi River Commission has been discredited by its own reluctant admissions. The political levee boards have been discredited by the people and the logic of events. We must have a new and square deal. We must adopt new and better methods. We must put new and better men in charge, and we must make provision to reimburse those whose property the levee system has destroyed.

Will Secretary Redfield take official notice of the old, brutal, pork-barrel logic?

One more brief editorial extract taken from the Memphis Press is significant:

THE PORK BARREL IS AN ENEMY OF NAVIGATION.

We have told our readers on many occasions that the conscience of the Nation was revolting against the "pork barrel." We told them we were crucifying our chances for permanent relief from floods and from permanent reestablishment of navigation when we continued longer to put our faith in the hodgepodge, wasteful, selfish, aimless conglomeration of good, useless, and evil projects annually or biennially labeled the "rivers and harbors bill." The method of the rivers and harbors bill is indefensible and the results of that method pursued through generations are its own damnation. * * * The would-be perpetrators of the pork barrel are the enemies of the comprehensive program, the enemies of real safety, the enemies of revived navigation. It is not going too far to say they are, in effect, traitors to the Republic.

"Traitors to the Republic"; "Wasteful, selfish, aimless conglomeration of projects"; "Must get some of that Yankee money down here is no longer appealing." These are expressions from leading press representatives of the Mississippi Valley, not from uninformed men. I quoted many pages of equally good authority in a September 29, 1914, speech devoted to the river lobby that has just finished its annual open session in this city. For such purposes Army engineers gave $4,000,000 on April 1, 1915, and $3,750,000 in their allotment six months before, or $7,750,000 within six months, to the Mississippi River below the mouth of the Ohio for a land-reclamation scheme, not a project.

A NEW LOUISIANA LOTTERY.

The Mississippi River levee lobby under the direction of its publicity agent, Mr. John Fox, is trying to educate the American public through leading magazine articles for which he arranged, according to a press announcement, last year.

In these articles a writer estimates that overflowed, worthless lands when reclaimed will be worth from $100 to $175 an acre. In return for this fabulous increase we are advised that in the Helena (Ark.) district an average tax of 41 cents per acre on an indefinite acreage has been devised. Of the Yazoo district he says an ad valorem of 17½ mills, and in back counties 12½ mills, is levied. The same authority, World's Work, June, 1915, says, "Louisiana districts pay an ad valorem of 10 mills per acre," while during the same period our Government is war taxing its people from Maine to California for hundreds of millions to dump into the lower Mississippi in order to make increased land values for railways and other private interests. To change conditions that have existed for millions of years and to make a return of $175 or more per acre on a 1-cent-per-acre investment, this new Louisiana lottery, through the river lobby, first finances its venture with $275,000,000 Government war tax as a beginning, and other funds heretofore given, to use a hackneyed but truthful expression, by "God's patient poor." Brass bands junketing trips, free excursions, and glittering pictures based on faded navigation glories are still used to capture the imagination of Presidents and legislators, but while the same old river lottery lobby paints the pictures and gets the cash, the tax-paying public holds the bag.

A HUGE LAND RECLAMATION SCHEME.

Any sane man who desires confirmation of the purpose of the Mississippi land reclamation scheme will find it fully expressed in the following statement from the 1912 report of the Missssippi River Commission, page 3724:

While the levees have a certain degree of utility in the improvement of the channel and are necessary to "promote the interests of commerce" by providing landing places for the interchange of traffic in times of flood and protecting the lines of railway behind them, their immediate and main value is the protection of the alluvial lands for the benefit of their owners.

What need be added to this unqualified admission by an official agent of the parties in interest?

Quoting from the comprehensive brief of Hon. B. E. Moses, of Memphis, he says in this connection:

This so-called protection of the alluvial lands along the Mississippi River is primarily and fundamentally a work of "reclamation," as that term is generally understood. * * * The history of the levee system along the Mississippi River is merely a repetition of the fight of mankind from time immemorial to reclaim for cultivation the fertile alluvial plains of the rivers of the world. The futility of the fight under the past method of "levees only" is apparent and real and has been impressed upon the people of the valley during the floods of the last two years by ruin, starvation, and death, incident to the breaks in the levee system.

The Government is reclaiming lands that were never before used, and for the benefit of private interests. This purpose is not disputed by any recognized authority, so far as I can ascertain.

THE GOVERNMENT'S DUTY AND LIMITATIONS.

Several years ago Congress commissioned some of her ablest men to make a thorough study of the waterway question and to make recommendations. These men, composing the United States National Waterways Commission, did make a careful investigation of waterways, both in this country and Europe. Fresh from that investigation they laid down certain principles of governmental action that condemn the expenditures now being made on the Mississippi land-reclamation scheme. I quote from the report on this question, as follows:

It should always be borne in mind that the waterway improvements made by the Federal Government under the exercise of its authority should be restricted to navigation. Whenever bank protection or flood prevention or the clarification of water is the sole object of improvements the question presents little difficulty in its solution. Such projects are not a proper charge upon the Federal Treasury. * * * In many instances proposed improvements have as their main object the protection or benefit of private property. In such cases there is a distinct benefit conferred upon individuals or localities which is only of a remote or very indirect benefit to the country as a whole. Lands subject to periodical overflow or lands of uncertain value because of the danger of erosion, when improved, are multiplied many times in value, and there is a constant danger that such improvements will be advocated under the guise of river and harbor legislation framed to benefit navigation when the real object is the benefit which will accrue to individuals or localities. * * * The line should be carefully drawn between improvements which, in whole or in part, are for the protection or development of private property and those which are made in the sole interest of navigation.

This report from which the foregoing is quoted was signed by Theodore E. Burton, chairman; J. H. GALLINGER, vice chairman; S. H. Piles, WILLIAM ALDEN SMITH, F. M. SIMMONS, JAMES P. CLARKE, William Lorimer, D. S. Alexander, Frederick C. Stevens, Irving P. Wanger, STEPHEN M. SPARKMAN, and JOHN A. MOON.

Men whose names have been linked with presidential honors and who have unqualifiedly denounced recent river bills; other men who to-day are the leaders of their party in the Senate and who have also opposed recent waterway legislation; others also of high standing in both Senate and House, including the present chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, Judge SPARKMAN, all of these unanimously and emphatically opposed land-reclamation schemes and then signed the waterway report in 1910.

Since that day a "Congress and levee" lobby, by modest admissions of its own officers, has become a greater power than presidential candidates, Senate leaders, or committee chairmen all combined. Army engineers willingly recommend, pursuant to lobby demands, and Congress—ignoring all legislative precedents, words of timely warning, public economy, and common-sense river improvement—throws wide open the Treasury doors to the Mississippi River land-reclamation lobby.

AN ASTOUNDING SITUATION.

Before leaving the lower Mississippi River, we discover that after spending about one hundred millions on the river, the return in continuous actual commerce—apart from a small sand, timber, and diminishing coal traffic, previously counted on the Ohio—is less than will be found on Choptank or Wicomico Creeks. Further, that this enormous river subsidy has been given without any control of freight rates or rights to any service. After squandering such fabulous amounts on a purposeless project and with a two hundred million deficiency confronting Congress,

the Mississippi River lobby demands many more millions in the next river bill.

"STAGGERING" DEBTS PROPOSED BY THIS ADMINISTRATION.

With hundreds of millions of acres in fertile land awaiting development, Secretary Lane, in his annual report, asks for a commission to devise ways and means for raising what he terms "staggering sums" for taming rivers and reclaiming bottom lands.

Secretary Redfield has placed the administration's seal of approval on the river lobby that now demands $100,000,000 annually, according to Secretary Thompson, and which wants $5,000,000,000 for waterways. In fact, Secretary Redfield says there is no pork. All expenditures are proper.

With that program, Army engineers, representing another department, have recommended waterway expenditures already reaching $850,000,000. They now include private water powers, private land reclamation, and endless private beneficiaries in official recommendations.

Preceding administrations may have merited condemnation for waste and extravagance, but when plans are being proposed by Cabinet officials of this administration for burdening the country with "staggering" debts, in addition to "staggering" sums now spent on useless rivers, ordinary taxpayers of all parties will take to the woods or trenches. What means preparedness, public defense, or necessary expenditures when Secretaries Lane and Redfield have found a chance to invest "staggering sums" in abandoned rivers? From a recent Democratic national party platform, adopted at Baltimore, appear the following clearly expressed promise and chosen words:

> We call attention to its record of efficiency, economy, and constructive legislation. * * * We demand a return to that simplicity and economy which befits a democratic government.

"SECRETARY FOX TO MOVE TO WASHINGTON."

The above heading is from Fox's own paper, the lobby organ, for December, 1915. He warns the country as to his intentions. Heaven help us now.

Resolutions passed by State legislatures urging flood control on the lower Mississippi will doubtlessly show up before the House at this session. One was railroaded through the Wisconsin Legislature under suspension of rules by John Fox, publicity agent and expert lobbyist for the Mississippi Levee Association and also publicity agent for the river congress lobby that asks for $50,000,000 annually. In Indiana and many other States he has been industriously steering flood resolutions since the close of last session. Watch for them. They are to be unfairly used to influence your action.

Mr. Fox is the same lobbyist who collected $40,000 from eight railways, as is more fully set forth on page 11710 of June, 1914, RECORD; money secretly contributed to help finance the levee lobby. Although the State legislature resolutions were evidences of shrewd lobby work, financed by secret funds wheedled out of railways and other corporations interested in lands to be reclaimed, they were easily secured from unsuspecting warm-hearted men, because the Uriah Heap arguments went. Crocodile tears for the Mississippi flood sufferers are continually shed by land reclamationists, and are especially heavy before national conventions, where the lobby aids in platform making. For millions of years the river ran undisturbed, excepting when irresponsible Army engineers tried to curb it to narrow limits with disastrous results.

THE GREATEST PROMOTION SCHEME IN THE WORLD.

Then Mr. Fox and his reclamation lobby colleagues conceived the idea of having the Government reclaim from 16,000,000 to 20,000,000 acres of land for the benefit of adjoining landowners. They have succeeded in starting the greatest promotion scheme in the world. It is proposed to bring two or three billions of unearned increment to its promoters and landowners if it succeeds. It would make worthless land increase to hundreds of dollars per acre—if it succeeds—but according to other engineers and many residents along the river it will not succeed further than to bleed the Treasury. A few may reap the golden harvest, but the bubble will burst because of insurmountable conditions. Mr. Fox keeps pulling the heartstrings of his auditors by pictures of poor squatters who are driven out by floods. With full knowledge that the Mississippi is as uncontrollable at flood as ocean tides, a handful of foolish people build on sand and mud bottoms, challenging the laws of nature. Then, through the activities of the lobby, they have Mr. Fox ask Congress to revolutionize nature's laws for their protection. And the lobby, crying lustily for help, fattens its purse at the expense of the taxpayers of the country. Shouting against railroads, the lobby is financed in part by railways owning submerged lands.

A FEW RAILROAD CONTRIBUTIONS.

On June 3, on pages 10591 to 10599 of the RECORD, appear my remarks before the House wherein I pointed out secret efforts to influence Congress on rivers and harbors bills from subscriptions of money to the use of threats against business men. At that time I presented the following subscriptions, running for five years, taken from what purported to be a photographic copy of a typewritten statement made by Col. John A. Fox, secretary and manager of the Mississippi Levee Association:

> It has been estimated that a minimum fund of $30,000 per annum is necessary for this organization to do its work in a complete and thorough manner, and already a considerable portion of this sum has been pledged annually for five years (of $150,000 in all). The subscriptions are as follows:

Southern Railway Co	$1,000
Mobile & Ohio R. R	1,000
Frisco R. R	1,000
Missouri Pacific R. R	1,000
Chi., R. I. & Pac. R. R	1,000
St. Louis & So. West. R	1,000
Illinois Central	1,000
Y. & M. V	1,000
Chicago Mill & Lumber Co	1,000
Caldwell & Smith, Memphis	1,000
International Harvester Co	1,000

> Assurance has been given of other substantial amounts.

As I have before stated, on June 3 I called the attention of the House to contributions made by eight railways for the purpose of aiding in the passage of a river pork barrel. It may be remembered that contributions approximating $150,000 for the five-year period were given in the RECORD, and it was further shown that $40,000 of this amount was guaranteed by eight railroads for the purpose of influencing Congress to pass the bill. At that time I asked why an investigation was not had of this remarkable situation, and I further demanded in my resolution that all interests engaged in lobbying through such bills should be compelled to come out in the open.

A congressional investigation would be wonderfully enlightening in showing what other contributions reached the hands of Col. Fox, who is special director of the Rivers and Harbors Congress and an active publicity agent second to none in the country, as I have offered abundant testimony to prove.

FLOOD CONTROL OR LAND RECLAMATION.

Why should the Government contribute hundreds of millions of public moneys, of "Yankee money," to make billions of dollars in new land values for speculators whose principal contribution is to the lobby fund? Why should not speculators pay for experimental levees, and why should not land beneficiaries be made to stand the expense of such improvements? If not all, why not the greater part?

Why should taxpayers in Wisconsin, the Dakotas, New York, Illinois, Ohio, Indiana, Iowa, and far-away California be taxed to fill the coffers of Fox or any citizen or State legislator who may happen to own Mississippi submerged lands? It is claimed by the lobby that the lower river serves the whole upper valley. That has been a physical fact for millions of years, just as Alaska is always frozen up for several months during every year; but the Government has not yet undertaken to increase the value of Alaska holdings by carrying coal free of charge in order to make the winter climate more salubrious. The Mississippi River reclamation lobby has big stakes in view, and is persistent. That is why the Louisiana Legislature gives to the lobby fund. That is why railroads made a $40,000 gift to the same fund, and presumably many times that amount. That is why Mr. Fox manipulates State legislatures, national conventions, and the Federal Congress as the paid publicity representative of the $50,000,000 river "congress" lobby. The Mississippi River problem should be divorced from land reclamation and legitimate waterway work should be made the limit of Government aid, according to the recommendation of the waterway commission quoted.

ENGINEERS' "COMMERCIAL" STATISTICS.

If time and space afforded, I could quote many other tables of commercial statistics from the 1914 Engineer's Report to show how little value can be placed on either the methods of collection or the data collected. A few of those I referred to during the fight against the last pork barrel. The same floating commerce counted and recounted repeatedly, and saw logs floated to sawmills is a frequent source of misrepresentation of "commerce" carried. Think of the Pascagoula, from which 3,921 stumps and other obstructions were taken in 1913, yet only 10 tons of miscellaneous commerce was carried on the river out of an imposing array of items. Ten tons of flour, salt, and sugar for the sawmill and all the rest timber products. On the Pearl during 1913, 12,000 obstructions were removed for a sawmill commerce that apparently exists to secure Government appropriations.

The Pascagoula and the Pearl were kindly remembered in Chief Kingman's 1915 allotment. Creeks and inconsequential streams of North Carolina, Florida, Mississippi, Alabama, Louisiana, Arkansas, and Texas furnish scores of instances of misleading statistics, where a casual scrutiny on the part of some responsible board of waterways is required if the Government Treasury is to be protected from the kegs of the Chief of Engineers. Time will only permit adding a few other flagrant projects that crop out at every corner, crevice, and crack of the chief's 1915 allotment to the time-honored old barrel.

THREE DISGRACES REACHING $40,000,000—THREE MORE COUNTS IN THE INDICTMENT AGAINST ENGINEERS.

The Coosa, Brazos, and Trinity Rivers will cost the Government approximately $40,000,000 according to present indications. At the present rate of improvement they will not be finished for a half century or more, and when all locks and dams have been built as recommended by Army engineers, their combined commercial value will be measured by a last year's bird's nest.

It is said semiofficially that a Cockney engineer direct from Liverpool, or more likely Limerick, was asked for his opinion of these three waterways, whereupon he heavily observed:

The Trinity, Brazos, and Coosa,
Don't seem to be of much use—ah;
They never can float any kind of a boat,
Because they lack visible juice—ah.

That, briefly, is one trouble with many of these engineering projects. If they had water or prospective commerce, all would be forgiven.

A $60,000 BUILDING IN A $5,000 TOWN.

Before discussing one or two of many projects for which Texas has become famous, I quote, without comment as to the sentiment, from remarks of an energetic Member of this body who has served Texas for a dozen years in the House and holds a high position in the Democratic Party. His remarks, widely published in the press, if authentic, invite consideraton. He is reported to have said:

There are half a dozen places in my district where Federal buildings are being erected or have been recently constructed at a cost to the Government far in excess of the actual needs of the communities where they are located. Take ———, my home town, for instance. We are putting up a post office down there at a cost of $60,000, when a $5,000 building would be entirely adequate for our needs.

There is no doubt the Government is engaged in building many useless, expensive monuments in many States and in this and other Texas districts, for Texas has 16 Democratic Members, several committee chairmanships, and many able men. Other monuments now building in that State at Government expense are locks and dams and future maintenance charges costing many millions of dollars each, that make a $60,000 building in a $5,000 town measure up like a bulging barrel to an arrogant garbage cart, when both are dedicated to the same service.

It is also true that many hard blows opposing valueless waterway projects in Texas and other States have come from Representatives in those States who are familiar with the facts, including, especially, my distinguished friend, Mr. CALLAWAY, whose humorous ode to the Trinity last session is unanswerable.

THE NOTORIOUS TRINITY OF TEXAS—BEGINNING EVERYWHERE, ENGINEERS FINISH NOWHERE.

Take the engineer's own story of this waterway romance that is defended by powerful political pull. On page 812, 1914 report, he says:

No record of traffic over this improvement (the mouth of the Trinity) was obtainable, no replies having been received to numerous letters sent to interested parties with request for statistics.

Observe the method pursued in securing statistics from "interested parties" to justify a $20,000,000 river project now under construction. Of the river proper (p. 854), he says:

The original estimate of cost of this improvement was $4,550,000.

Two pages further (856) he informs Congress:

The total amount expended on the existing project to June 30, 1914, was $1,870,061.84, in addition to $7,000 spent on the original survey. The amount spent during the fiscal year (1913) was $342,929.

The elevator is going up. Again, he says that on June 30, 1914—

The project is approximately 10 per cent completed.

The elevator carries money instead of commerce. Even the Chief of Engineers will concede that if it takes $1,870,061.84 to complete 10 per cent of a project, it will require more than $4,550,000 to complete 100 per cent of the job. It is also instructive to learn that at the present rate of progress this waterway can not float commerce for 110 years to come. Let me briefly quote from page 2343:

There is little or no commerce on Trinity River above mile 6, except the handling of timber products, which extends to about mile 30. (The proposed "improvement" covers 513 miles to Dallas.) No commerce can be expected above Liberty (near the river's mouth) until the river is completely canalized.

Again:

The work of the snag boat above Liberty is of no benefit, except to prevent further deterioration of the channel and to improve the drainage.

We are apparently spending $20,000,000 to improve the river drainage for Dallas. However that may be, the Chief Engineer has an inspiration when he says in the 1914 report, page 2344:

The appropriations which have been made so far by Congress for the Trinity River seem to indicate an intention to provide locks and dams.

PRAISEWORTHY ENGINEERING PERCEPTION.

After 12 years' work and about $2,000,000 in completing 10 per cent of the work, the chief is beginning to see just what he believes he thought was intended when he recommended $4,550,000 at the outset. Quoting further from this remarkable serial story:

The normal flow of the Trinity River for eight months of the year is so small that open navigation between pools is not feasible and until the river is completely canalized—110 years hence—no practicable navigation will obtain.

Apparently for eight months of the year the bed of the stream might be used for a wagon road. Again, the chief, who is recommending possibly $20,000,000 on this project, first estimated at $4,455,000, has a genuine inspiration when he says:

Attention is called that the project can not be completed within the estimate, and that its cost will be approximately three times the original estimate.

While the belated invitation to note a self-evident fact is not overlooked, he should substitute "five" or "ten" for "three."

To show the reckless abandon of engineers, Senator Burton said, in 1914, as to this project:

Why, the Chief of Engineers came before us and was utterly unable to state whether or not there would be water enough to manage the locks and dams. We are going ahead under a project calling for 37 locks and dams on the Trinity, to cost $170,000 apiece. They may cost three times that amount or twice that amount.

A TRINITY TRAGEDY.

Act 1, September, 1914: The Trinity was exposed and condemned in both Houses.

Act 2, October, 1914: The engineers gave $203,000 to the Trinity.

Act 3, March 2, 1915: Congress demanded a resurvey.

Act 4, April 1, 1915: The Chief of Engineers gave $35,000 more to the Trinity.

It is a matter of record that Col. Riche, an Army engineer, once sarcastically proposed to drill artesian wells in the Trinity to aid navigation. He is a member of the board now, and as such tried to save $1,750,000 to the Government from the Muscle Shoals Treasury raid, but was overruled by the board. The most successful drilling now is that unremitting toil pursued on United States Treasury locks. Is it possible that any chapter in the whole volume of waterway waste and incompetency can exceed this $20,000,000 Trinity travesty, approved by Army engineers who handled $50,000,000 of Uncle Sam's cash last session?

Mr. CALLAWAY, of Texas, said on March 24, 1914:

I ford this river, and time and time again I have seen water standing in holes below the points called the head of navigation. In Dallas for months they could not get enough water to supply the necessities of the city and they hauled water there by rail.

Mr. FREAR. Is not that a case like the Kissimee River, in Florida, that ought to be insured against fire?

Mr. CALLAWAY. Yes. * * * I believe I can show you by the wording of the engineers' report that there is no serious intention of ever navigating the Trinity River.

WAR-TAX AFFINITIES FOR ARTESIAN TRINITIES.

Let us hope the poor bleating Trinity will some day be gathered to the fold by its guardians through the agency of a salary-slashing campaign. Superannuated Government clerks, who have been providing a little old-age endowment, will then contribute part of their $1,200 salaries to buy pumps for the Trinity. Haggard Congressmen holding mileage coupons discounted 75 per cent will also help liquidate the Trinity. In fact all Federal officials may begin drilling for preparedness, and for water down on the Trinity.

Sixty thousand dollar public buildings in Hamtown and Porkville will soon loom up on the banks of the nine months dry Trinity. Aye, preparedness is in the air. Latest news from the American seat of war has it that Admiral Stanford, Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, is no longer undecided. Quantanamo and Pensacola were running neck and neck with New Orleans and Puget Sound for the prize, until Stanford heard of the Trinity. Hereafter the Navy will be secure, for our whole fleet of submarines are to be dry-docked in the 37 locks now being constructed down in Texas—one to each lock. No need of pumps to empty the locks. That is the beauty of the arrangement. The docks are guaranteed always dry on the

Trinity. It is the first case on record where docks are naturally and perpetually parched with nothing to pump. We will use rollers for entering and skidways for emptying, for all the machinery is generously greased by lard. Then indeed will the tender Trinity lamb be gathered to the fold by its kind keeper.

Is it not funny the way some Democratic statesmen practice economy, scraping up pork rinds for the Trinity out of proceeds of salary slashings from department clerks? To provide 37 dry docks and 37 dry dams on the Trinity.

The shoes of Sam Houston, Regan, and Mills have indeed grown large during the intervening years.

A BRAZOS BUBBLE—DIGGING ALL OVER CREATION, BUT NEVER SHOWING RESULTS.

Another remarkable Texas canalization scheme is from the Brazos mouth to Waco, a distance of 424 miles. (1914 report, p. 830.)

On page 826 the report says that in 1899 improvements at the mouth of the Brazos were estimated to cost $250,000. In 1900 (the following year) estimates were raised $175,000 because of a storm, and an additional $150,000 was spent before the $425,000 project was begun. In 1913 Congress appropriated $200,000 for a dredge to replace one burned the month before (p. 828), and to show mathematical exactness in the engineer's department, we are seriously informed by the 1914 report that the hull of the dredge is 2½ per cent completed and the machinery 7 per cent completed, whatever that may mean. On the other hand, after spending $618,753 at the mouth of the Brazos for a commerce that diminished 80 per cent from 1912 to 1913, because of busted oil-well bubbles, we search in vain to find when the river project is to be completed. Engineers hesitate to give us any limit on essentials, but are busy mathematicians when it comes to careful discrimination between the ratio of completion on the machinery and on the hull of a dredge, while storms and fires and other acts of God, aided by Congress, all unite to prevent Government contractors from starving.

On page 829 of the 1914 report the Chief of Engineers says $377,566 has been spent on the Brazos above the mouth of Old Washington, a distance of 254 miles. From Old Washington to Waco, 170 miles farther up the river or creek, it appears that over a million dollars more has been spent by the Government. The engineer has given an estimate which is elastic, like estimates on Trinity Creek. In his estimate (p. 831) he believes $2,915,000 will be needed for the 170-mile stretch. No estimate of the total probable expense can be found, and we have already learned estimates are absolutely worthless on the Trinity, a few miles distant. But see what has been accomplished after an expenditure of $2,000,000 on the Brazos.

CHIEF KINGMAN PAID $470,000 LAST SESSION TO THIS DRY RUN.

The report says (p. 830):

No advantage has been taken of the improvement above Columbia—

Thirty-five miles from the mouth.

During 1913 one small boat carried 1,080 tons (estimated). Boat trips were made about once in every 10 days during 1913. The little harbor of Ashland, Wis., in 1913 handled 5,623,309 tons (p. 2854), or five thousand times as much commerce as was floated on the Brazos. Ashland was allotted $15,000 for its actual commerce in 1914 and 1915. The Brazos received $470,000 from two allotments by Chief Kingman, or about $470 per ton for the year. We learn, page 830:

No commerce of any note has developed nor can any be expected until the Brazos River is improved from its mouth to Waco—

Four hundred and twenty-four miles and some 50 years or more hence.

On page 832 the Chief of Engineers says that $500,000, exclusive of $277,878 balance available, can be profitably expended during the year ending June 30, 1916. Three-quarters of a million is a tidy sum for one year.

Out of the $20,000,000 substitute bill passed at the 1914 session in September the Chief of Engineers allotted $20,000 to the mouth of the Brazos and $210,000 to the Brazos River, the full amount of the House bill, while Buffalo, with a commerce of about 20,000,000 tons annually, was denied a single dollar in 1914.

GENEROUS GEN. KINGMAN.

On March 2, 1915, Congress passed the $30,000,000 substitute and in unmistakable terms denounced the Brazos, demanding a resurvey. On April 1, 1915, All Fools' Day, mind you, one month thereafter, and six months after the last allotment of $230,000 had been given to this worthless project, Chief Kingman again gave to the Brazos $240,000 more, or nearly a half million dollars within a period of six months in two allotments for a worthless dry run in summer that is as great a joke among river men and Texas residents as the scandalous Trinity Creek, a few miles distant.

Last January Representative TREADWAY, of Massachusetts, an able member of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, gave utterance to his disgust over the bill then before the House and said of the vicious Brazos project (RECORD, p. 1633):

Probably there is no Member of this House who has had business experience at all, or who has made any financial investments, who has not made mistakes and reached a point where a decision must be made whether he will continue to expend good money in order to protect that which he has already wasted in some bad venture. That is the question which we, as Congressmen, are now confronted with relative to the Brazos River.

A grievous error was made when any appropriation was ever passed to commence such excuse for a navigable project as this. Let us manfully acknowledge that error now, regard the money expended as lost, and cease appropriating Government money in the hope of artificially constructing a river over a hundred miles or more in length. This item should never have been in a rivers and harbors bill. I might add, it is a significant fact that the other greatly criticized item, namely, the Trinity River, where there actually is some water, was not given an appropriation in this bill, whereas the Brazos River carries an appropriation of $210,000.

Any student of waterway legislation, by turning to page 1635, will find a splendid State project analysis of the defeated $34,000,000 bill in 1915 as it passed the House, which I quote at this point because it is authoritative, coming from this able member of the committee:

Amounts appropriated.

NORTH.	
California	$944,000
Connecticut	64,500
Delaware	86,000
District of Columbia	95,000
Indiana	300,000
Illinois	534,000
Maine	155,000
Massachusetts	352,000
Michigan	1,249,880
Minnesota, including sum for Mississippi River improvement	240,000
New Jersey	224,000
New York	2,745,175
Ohio	3,568,000
Oregon	2,444,175
Pennsylvania	1,752,200
Rhode Island	76,000
Washington	77,500
Wisconsin	278,300
Total North	15,185,730
SOUTH.	
Alabama	345,750
Arkansas	61,000
Florida	988,500
Georgia	838,500
Lousiana	122,000
Maryland	45,600
Mississippi River	6,700,000
Mississippi	882,500
Missouri	1,365,000
North Carolina	556,000
South Carolina	125,500
Tennessee	1,309,000
Texas	2,102,500
Virginia	716,000
West Virginia	25,000
Total South	16,182,850
Total North	15,185,730
South over North	997,120

After an expenditure of $2,000,000, Army engineers report 1,080 tons in 1913 as the total traffic for the Brazos, and on the heels of that report and following a legislative condemnation of the project and a demand for a resurvey the autocrat of the pork-barrel allotment dumped $240,000 more into the lap of needy dredgers and contractors, who are digging for water in a lost river bed. Apparently a sprinkling pot is more needed than a dredge on the Brazos.

WATERWAYS AND BUILDINGS IN TEXAS—COUNTLESS PROJECTS THAT HAVE NO END OR PRACTICAL USE.

Many extravagant and practically worthless Texas waterways and buildings owe their notoriety to an opulent Government Treasury discovered by political pull. A $60,000 postoffice building in a $5,000 Texas town is no worse than Chief Kingman's official gifts to Texas favorites, described, and many others reported in his annual romances.

For illustration, Aransas Pass-Pass Cavallo section, Kingman reports a commerce in 1912 of 384 tons (p. 2265). In 1913 he reports 380 tons (p. 2314), or an average of 1 ton per day. Kingman's 1915 allotment was $30,000, or at the rate of $80 per ton, for use of a 3-foot canal started in 1875, restarted in 1907 as a 5-foot $65,850 project, and discontinued in part in 1912 (p. 822). Another Treasury tragedy follows immediately when Guadalupe River in Victoria, Tex., shows a total 1912 and 1913 commerce limited to sand and gravel, apparently from Government dredging operations, and Kingman's 1915 allotment was $15,000. This project was once started at $62,700, but, due to "underestimates" and other troubles, $247,164 has

been expended to June 30, 1914. These two 5-foot useless, deserted Texas "waterways" have received over $443,000 from the Government Treasury and are a fair sample of some other Texas waterways that have absorbed millions of Federal funds.

For fear this statement may be challenged, I again quote from the great expert who has done more for actual waterway improvement than any other man in the country. Speaking of Texas waterway projects generally, he said last year:

I think they are so rank that they smell to heaven, some of them. I really think I could prove to a dispassionate audience that such is the case.

WHAT TEXAS MEMBERS ARE UP AGAINST.

In order to show that other strenuous efforts are being put forth to drain the Federal Treasury for Texas projects, I quote from the Houston Post of November 6:

TO KEEP REPRESENTATIVE IN WASHINGTON.

A fund will be used to keep a representative stationed at Washington during the session of Congress to aid in securing of necessary appropriations. * * * The committee recommended that each city and town and each parish along the line of the inland waterway be urged to send one or more delegates to attend the session of Congress in December and to bring the needs of the waterway to the attention of their Representative, that the president send a personal appeal to each one of the Representatives, and that a representative be stationed at Washington. It was estimated that this would require an expense of $2,000.

PRESENT WATERWAY PLANS WORTHLESS.

Even the waterways "president," Mr. Holland, emphasizes the uselessness of present wasteful expenditures when he said in his annual report:

It is not the appropriations that cause the rivers and harbors bill to be called "pork barrel," but the manner of making the appropriations. For instance, it is no secret that the intercoastal canal at a depth of 5 feet does not meet the demands of the lightest draft navigation for boats and barges—nothing less than 9 feet will make a waterway that will meet the demands of commerce—but we have proceeded on the theory that it is easier to secure the small appropriations and have accepted a minimum of 5 feet with the belief that it could be easily deepened to 9 feet by additional appropriations. However, when the first and second appropriations are added together it will cost the Government more than twice as much as it would have cost had the original appropriation been made on the basis of 9 feet. * * * "Penny-wise and pound-foolish" is what I call it, and until these practices cease we will never have a good Government. * * * The time for decisive action is here; the time for half-hearted pleading is passed. * * * We ask for appropriations for a real waterway of 9 feet minimum depth, not for a makeshift of 5 feet depth.

Then, as an afterthought, he has a genuine inspiration, and says:

The fact is that an inland waterway from Maine to Mexico with a minimum depth of 12 feet is an actual necessity for the protection of the country.

ENGINEERS JUSTLY CONDEMNED BY WATERWAY PRESIDENTS.

No more caustic arraignment of Army engineers has ever been presented to the public. After proving pliable for a concededly worthless 5-foot project, they are advised they have been used as puppets, and a 9-foot project is what Texas now demands and a 12-foot depth on all canals is necessary. The Delaware and Chesapeake wants 24 feet, so why not Texas? Remembering that we have 26 different canal dimensions in this country, according to Army engineers, what more can be said in exposing the incompetency of our engineers and of their plans and estimates? Poor old Mexico, giver of public concessions and political favors to highly civilized American grabbers; may she not point the finger of scorn at public building and waterway projects living in glass houses across the Rio Grande? Political perquisites in democratic forms of government on either side of the border line appear to differ only in minor details.

BIG SANDY COSTS $11 PER TON-MILE.

Actual commerce costs the Government $350 per ton.

Big Sandy "commerce" in 1913 reached 172,403 short tons, but 172,126 tons, or over 99½ per cent, consisted of logs, ties, and lumber that floats. Just 277 tons of miscellaneous commerce floated 33 miles in 1913. Counting interest on $1,717,811 now invested, with depreciation included, at 4 per cent, and a reported annual maintenance of $31,998, the cost to the Government for floating 277 tons of actual commerce 33 miles in 1913 was $100,678.

Engineers quote tables on page 2817, but the following table can be easily understood by those who pay the bills:

Total actual commerce, 1913	tons	277
Average distance floated	miles	33
Actual 1913 cost to Government on investment		$100,678
Actual cost to Government per ton		$350
Actual cost to Government per ton-mile		$11

The Big Sandy was exploited by Army engineers and local interests in order to provide transportation for coal and other "undeveloped resources." It is the same specious argument, supported by the same engineers' estimates, which to-day are given for the Muscle Shoals, the Coosa, Black Warrior, Kentucky, Cumberland, Tennessee, and scores of other worthless canalization projects. The Big Sandy was sure to float millions of tons of coal every year—that was the promise. After 35 years and $1,717,811 spent in development only 12 tons of coal were floated in 1913, and that coal was for "Government" purposes. This is a worse record than is shown by the Hennepin Canal, to which reference will be made. Have I made good the statement that the 10 condemned projects named in the 1915 bill are not the worst that Army engineers recommend?

How engineers have reveled in Treasury millions and how Congress has been duped by men who have furnished a "waterway" that is now floating commerce at a cost to the Government of $11 per ton-mile.

THE COOSA WATERWAY CARICATURE—ANOTHER COUNT IN THE INDICTMENT AGAINST ENGINEERS.

I can not do justice to the Coosa project in the limited time at my disposal. In debate and through the press Senator Burton has repeatedly called attention to this waterway joke, but with the aid of the river and harbor lobby and nursing of Army engineers the Coosa River coos for more—and gets it every year—from a war-tax ridden public.

Page 2175 of the 1914 report shows that $1,982,583 has been expended on the Coosa. In 1915 the appropriations reached $2,482,452. On a project begun in 1876, or 39 years ago, we are informed open-channel work is 27 per cent completed, or in about 100 years more open-channel work ought to be completed. The original estimate of $1,622,190 for this project has long ago gone glimmering and $10,000,000 more will be spent before completion. Even visionary engineers refuse to hazard a guess as to the limit. On pages 674 and 675 the chief says $75,000 for maintenance, $131,000 for improvement in addition to $170,000 then on hand could be spent profitably during the ensuing year. What is the Coosa work for? After deducting floatable timber and stone, sand, and gravel used in Government construction, the actual commerce is too small to measure, for duplications and quadruplications can not aid the Coosa nor the Brazos nor the Trinity "commerce." There must be some tangible traffic on which to build. These waterways do not furnish a beginning, and yet to be an accurate chronicler I must say the insignificant commerce of 1912 fell off 45 per cent, according to the engineer's report, by 1914.

Notwithstanding the Coosa had $97,019 balance on hand January 1, 1915, our generous Chief of Engineers, on April 1, 1915, gave $106,000 more to the Coosa. Remember, this is a project condemned in the last law and is on the list for a resurvey. Why is he so liberal with the people's money? Is it because the Coosa is in Alabama, where the Black Warrior and Muscle Shoals water-power projects, also being financed by the Government, will reach $30,000,000?

THE ALABAMA POWER CO. TRUST.

Before discussing a stupendous private water-power grab perpetrated on the Government under the pretense of aid to navigation, I desire to quote briefly from a gorgeously decorated pamphlet, issued by the Alabama Power Co., to show why the Government should give to the company $18,700,000 for Muscle Shoals in addition to a present expenditure of over $2,000,000 on the Coosa, with unlimited future estimates based on past engineering mistakes.

Quoting from the document, "The Alabama Traction, Light & Power Co. (Ltd.) owns extensive water powers in Alabama and operates at present public-utility properties in six cities."

The company's properties include the following power sites.

	Horsepower.
Coosa River Lock 7	45,000
Coosa River Lock 12	105,000
Coosa River Lock 14	100,000
Coosa River Lock 15	80,000
Coosa River Lock 18	100,000
Tallapoosa River	115,000
Muscle Shoals on Tennessee	400,000
Santty Creek	6,000
Town Creek	7,000
Little River	52,000
Choccolocco Creek	2,000
	1,012,000

It develops that the company also owns pretty nearly everything in Alabama, including 96 per cent of all its water powers. It is also in a fair way to own $18,700,000 of Government funds at Muscle Shoals, apart from a few minor millions of public funds now scattered on smaller projects. The Army engineers have so determined, and the lobby claims to have duped and doped a goodly portion of the Sixty-fourth Congress to consent to the astonishing gift.

Document No. 20, Sixty-third Congress, second session, is devoted to a notorious Alabama water-power project of $18,700,000 on the Tennessee River which Army engineers have approved and to which reference will be made. On pages 83 and 84 of

the Chief of Engineers' report is a statement as to the Coosa which is startling in its significance, and from which I quote:

Coosa River system: While it can not be said at this time whether the operation of the proposed plants on the Coosa River will or will not increase the amount of power which can be commercially generated at Muscle Shoals, these plants will be considered here in a general way to show the ultimate relation between the Coosa system and the Muscle Shoals-Tallapoosa system. * * *

What has the Government to do with a Coosa-Muscle Shoals-Tallapoosa power system? What are our Army engineers discussing?

A 150-FOOT DAM FOR "NAVIGATION."

I have been quoting from a report of a private water-power company, set forth with the approval of the Chief of Engineers in a public document. It shows the proposed use of public funds to create water powers and aid private power companies, as will be found on page 84, wherein a private company's plans are quoted with approval in an official document, which says of our own Treasury guardians:

The Army engineers propose to build a dam and reservoir on the Etowah River at Cartersville, Ga., which will add an immense amount to the primary power of the plants on the Coosa. The project will consist of a dam 150 feet high, impounding 30,000,000,000 cubic feet of water. The object of this reservoir is primarily to increase the flow of water in Alabama River below Montgomery, for the aid of navigation, the available draft to be used to amplify the low flow being variously estimated from 4,000 to 5,000 second-feet. The dam site is 3 miles above Cartersville and the entire reservoir is in Georgia. Surveys of reservoir have been made by the Army engineers, and their findings are in a report on the Coosa River prepared by Maj. Ferguson, which has not been published. The dam site is now owned by the Georgia Railway, Light & Power Co., who own a considerable amount of land within the reservoir.

The dam proposed by these people for power purposes is lower and the amount of storage less than that proposed by Army engineers. The height of dam and amount of storage which will ultimately be obtained at this site is of vital interest to this company, and to satisfy the ultimate needs storage should be as great as possible.

It should be remembered this is another water-power company over in Georgia that our Army engineers have taken under their sheltering wings.

Think of this startling proposal found in an Army engineer's report. It quotes with approval a statement issued by a private water-power company that they, our own Army engineers, propose to finance the Georgia Light & Power Co.'s dam by increasing that company's dam to a dizzy height of 150 feet for "navigation purposes"—higher than the Goddess of Liberty statue, that considerately turns its back toward us.

A PRIVATE COMPANY "VITALLY INTERESTED."

The height of dam and amount of storage which will ultimately be obtained at this site is of vital interest to this company, and, to satisfy the ultimate needs, storage should be as great as possible.

In other words, our Army engineers propose to build a 150-foot dam for the Georgia Light & Power Co. at Government expense—not even a dollar recommended by way of contribution. Just a plain Treasury raid recommended by Treasury guardians.

After having already spent $2,000,000 on Coosa water-power projects, I quote Senator BANKHEAD's remarks before the Fifth National Conservation Congress (p. 79) to show Government rights in money it expends. This champion of the Muscle Shoals, Tennessee River, water-power project is quoted by the official reporter of the conservation congress as follows:

The company undertaking to build the lock and dam on the Coosa River said: "We are willing to put up this construction at our own cost and give you the navigation (joke), and we will take the water power. Beyond that we are not willing to go. * * * The Government of the United States has no more interest in it (the surplus water) and no more control of it than I have. It belongs to the State of Alabama and to the riparian owners of that State, and you can not take it away from them without a big row."

Now we are invited to have another row after a half century of peace. The Georgia Power Co. and the Alabama Water Power Co., for which we are to build great dams and which are reputed to own everything not nailed down in Alabama, serve notice on the United States of their demands, including $18,700,000 for the Muscle Shoals private water-power project, to which I shall briefly refer, and ten million, more or less, for the Coosa private water-power project, for which Army engineers obligingly recommend appropriations and shell out public money.

FINANCING PRIVATE WATER-POWER PROJECTS.

In this connection it is well to inquire why the States of Georgia and Alabama are not asked to give $30,000,000 to Georgia and Alabama water-power companies for dams in aid of a mythical "navigation" hypocritically set forth in the Army engineer's report. The United States could avoid part of its war levy by turning all the navigation on the Tennessee or the Coosa over to the State or to the private water-power companies that have secured unlimited privileges from those States. When submarines or dreadnaughts go down or up that 150-foot Coosa Lock or Muscle Shoals 150-foot dam a thousand years hence, future generations may observe scores of locks and dams with which these modern engineer Pharaohs have immortalized themselves. One hundred and fifty foot dams are as valuable for "navigation" purposes as Egypts' Sphinx, and higher in altitude. The Sphinx proposed riddles to travelers and strangled those who could not solve them. The Coosa "navigation" riddle is analogous and water-power companies now seem to have a strangle hold on Uncle Sam's purse.

The Coosa River project has all the earmarks of a private water-power aid. It is indelibly stamped with the branding iron of the Alabama power company, "Private; keep off." Enough has been disclosed to call for a rigid and thorough investigation by Congress because of many other worthless and indefensible projects which have been saddled on the Federal Treasury by our engineers. A patient public will prefer to believe in their honesty of purpose, but many projects referred to and others that can not be here reviewed carry compelling evidences of private interests that are now served direct or by subterfuge from the Treasury.

WHAT POWER COMPANIES OWN IN ALABAMA.

Before leaving this illuminating project, which with the Black Warrior and Muscle Shoals aggregate some $40,000,000 of Government money for Alabama water powers, I desire to call attention to sections 3627 to 3637 of the Alabama Code, which permit private water-power companies to condemn public highways, lands of all description, from cemeteries to almshouses, and also smaller water-power companies' plants, under a right of eminent domain ordinarily reserved to the State. Sections 6148 and 6149 give power companies authority to flood the State and to condemn lands generally for flooding purposes. All land within 50 feet of the water's edge, together with the blue sky above and the earth beneath, is included. Section 2069 provides that such power plants "shall be exempt from State, county, and municipal property and privilege taxation until 10 years after beginning of construction of any plant." Exempt forever until construction begins and for 10 years thereafter. This law was passed by the Alabama Light, Power & Traction Co. through the Alabama Legislature for its own use. Official power-trust admission of the fact is on record. Apart from the fact that such sections appear to violate provisions of the State constitution and prove the unlimited power of these "power" companies, is it not infamous that we are financing such companies through the connivance of our own autocratic officials, who justify on the pretense that navigation is to be served?

GEORGIA AND ALABAMA COMPANIES.

From a table placed in the RECORD, July 23, 1914, it appears the Georgia Power Co. owns 55 per cent of all commercial power controlled in Georgia; the Alabama Light, Power & Traction Co. owns 96 per cent of all commercial power in Alabama; and the Tennessee Railway, Light & Power Co. and the Chattanooga-Tennessee Power Co. own 90 per cent of all commercial power in Tennessee.

It may be interesting further to remember that while in 1908 13 groups of interests controlled only 1,827,000 horsepower, in 1913, five years later, 10 groups controlled 6,267,000 horsepower, of which 2,711,000 was developed and 3,556,000 was undeveloped.

Will the Government be permitted to finance these companies and be a party to the unconscionable water-power grabs in Alabama and other States because such course is recommended by our Army engineers?

THE MUSCLE SHOALS WATER-POWER PROJECT—ANOTHER COUNT IN THE INDICTMENT AGAINST ARMY ENGINEERS.

I have high regard for Chairman SPARKMAN, of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, but differ radically in my estimate of many waterway ventures which he approves.

Let me again refer to his words in the Star, previously quoted:

The Muscle Shoals project, already recommended by Army engineers and urged by Senator-elect UNDERWOOD, the retiring Democratic leader of the House, and other Members of the southern delegations, contemplates a Federal appropriation of $18,000,000, reimbursable to the Government, with a view to comprehensive development of the water power.

The Muscle Shoals, Tennessee River, private water-power scandal in Alabama was exposed on the floor by several Members at the last session, and after a stubborn fight the project was squarely met and killed by the House in Committee of the Whole. It must be especially notorious, because it is the first worthless scheme ever stricken from any pork barrel in a couple of decades. What are the facts?

Originally the Government gave Alabama 400,000 acres of public land to improve Muscle Shoals and Colbert Shoals.

This Government has already spent over $3,200,000 in cash in developing a mythical commerce of about 5,800 tons annually at the Muscle Shoals on the Tennessee River in Alabama, or $4,555,000, counting maintenance, in addition to 400,000 acres of public land. A new project recommended by Army engineers in Committee Document No. 20 proposes further Government appropriations of $18,700,000 for this same Muscle Shoals, and the estimate may be increased. The engineers propose to spend $8,575,000 more for building locks and dams, ostensibly for "navigation" (less than 6,000 tons). Next, $1,750,000 more is recommended by Army engineers for "flowage easements." In other words, $10,325,000 is to be donated outright to the Alabama Light, Power & Traction Co., that owns all kinds of property, from men and money to exclusive State and Federal legislative grants, in Alabama. After we spend $10,325,000 more of Government funds for dams and easements to aid this company, a further sum of $8,375,000 is recommended by Army engineers to be loaned by the Government to this water-power trust at 3 per cent per annum, to be repaid during 100 years.

A PRESENT GOVERNMENT SUBSIDY OF $41.76 PER TON.

A few words further as to this project. Muscle Shoals are rapids along the headwaters, and about 250 miles or more distant from the mouth, of the Tennessee River, which flows through Alabama and empties into the Ohio River. Railroads appear to run in the vicinity of the river, accommodating legitimate commerce as completely as in other localities, but after an investment of over $4,555,000 of public money at this point, on the recommendation of our Army engineers, and 400,000 acres of land worth many times the money investment, we find the following insignificant "commerce" reported (p. 2587):

	Tons.
1904	10,560
1905	17,796
1906	26,878
1907	21,100
1908	12,537
1909	17,353
1910	8,782
1911	8,962
1912	5,520
1913	5,887

About half the tonnage usually carried in a single trip by a small ocean liner is the result of 10 years' work and many million dollars in Government investment on the recommendation of our Army engineers.

Of the 5,887 tons in 1913, 2,150 tons were fertilizer, and the balance of 2,700 tons included logs, coal, and other traffic—less than 4 tons daily each way. It cost the Government for maintenance and interest charges, according to estimates of Senator Burton, last session (RECORD, p. 16988), about $41.76 per ton for all freight floated over the shoals in 1913, including fertilizer, which reached 37 per cent of the total.

What a startling chapter disclosed by past investments made for us through the Engineer Corps.

WHERE IS THE LIMIT?

Far more startling and vicious than anything heretofore put through Congress, however, is the new proposal of our waterway guardians who now ask us to put $10,325,000 more into the same locks and dams, ostensibly for "navigation," and they further recommend a Government loan of $8,375,000 additional to a power company for 100 years at 3 per cent. This would probably result in a cost to the Government for "navigation" of $150 per ton or more, to accommodate a private power company. That is the proposal of Army engineers contained in Committee Document No. 20, Sixty-third Congress, second session. Copies are scarce and every Member of the House should make application early for this remarkable document before the supply is exhausted. When our $8,375,000 loan is delivered over to this private water-power company, doubtless our Army engineers will recommend that all obligations to the Government be canceled. An equally generous Congress under the persuasive influence of the Alabama water-power lobby should then arise to the same generous level. If the Secretary of War of a Democratic administration desires to endear himself to a long-suffering people, he will cause an official investigation of the Muscle Shoals proposal, and providing the facts are as set forth in the Chief Engineer's report, he should summarily deal with those who are responsible for the Treasury raid proposed by Document No. 20.

Chairman SPARKMAN stated to the press on March 12 last that his committee would visit Muscle Shoals water-power project some time last May. It has been widely published that the Alabama water-power lobby footed bills, including all transportation charges, on that occasion. What a strange proposition that a Rivers and Harbors Committee should feel called upon to visit a private water-power project off in the sand hills of northern Alabama and also land-reclamation projects in far-away California. It has been predicted that the Government will be out $50,000,000 by the time the contract is ended, if this pernicious scheme can be put through Congress, and that the Alabama Power Co. lobby is spending a hundred thousand dollars to get their project through Congress. An independent investigation ought to be had to determine the facts.

FIFTY MILLION DOLLARS FOR MUSCLE SHOALS "NAVIGATION"—THE HIGH COST OF GIVING.

Engineering mathematics for "navigation" repayments are marvelous. The engineer's report says the Government must spend in five years $8,575,000 for navigation, $1,750,000 for flowage, and a loan of $8,325,000 for 100 years for power, to be refunded. The Government pays $10,325,000 for "navigation and flowage."

Chairman SPARKMAN says we will be "reimbursed" by a 35-cent rent per horsepower. The engineers, however, say, in substance, page 35 of Document No. 20, that, providing the Alabama Power Co. is a business success and in 20 years finds customers for 200,000 horsepower annually and then keeps doing a profitable business for 80 years more at its plant up in the wilds of Alabama, during the 80 years the company will pay the Government $73,500 annual rent toward "navigation." The engineers hope for more, but that is a promoters' "hope," because the company may never sell 200,000 horsepower annually, has no immediate demands for power, according to the hearings, and it may go bump in five years.

Accepting the engineer's contract proposition as stated, the Government first invests $10,325,000 for navigation (probably more, see p. 20). Interest, maintenance, and depreciation for 20 years at 5 per cent, without compounding, reaches just 100 per cent more, or a total of $20,650,000 for "navigation," at which time a reimbursement of $73,500 annually begins, to continue for 80 years. Instead of properly figuring 5 per cent on the new cost of $20,650,000, we continue on the old basis, with an annual outgo of only $516,000 and an income of $73,500 to meet it, or a net loss to the Government of $440,000 annually for 80 years, during which time the Government loses $35,400,000 and receives $5,880,000 rent for power, or a net deficit of about $30,000,000, which added to the $20,650,000 previous expense for navigation gives a handsome net loss on our "navigation" investment of $50,000,000—just to aid the Alabama company to secure a loan of $8,325,000 for power, not navigation. Any business man would make the loss double $50,000,000 based on a $20,650,000 investment for 80 years, but enough has been disclosed by page 35 of our "contract" to show that while it takes high mathematics to qualify cadets for the Engineering Corps, we will find no higher unbusinesslike mathematics than Chief Kingman and his aids offer on the Muscle Shoals contract.

Be it remembered that this brief analysis of Government rights in a contract made with a water-power company by our duly accredited attorneys, business counselors, Treasury guardians, and engineer managers in no way considers $4,550,000 heretofore spent at this same point on the advice of these same attorneys, counselors, guardians, and managers or of 400,000 acres of valuable public land given to Alabama for Muscle Shoals.

Appended to these remarks will be found extracts from the Huntsville (Ala.) Educator and Birmingham papers indicating the Alabama Water Power Co. has a lobby that knows what it wants and pays liberally for what it gets.

"DEMOCRATIC LEADERS" AND "SOUTHERN DELEGATIONS."

Certain Members have decried sectionalism when many wasteful southern projects were exposed. Is it sectionalism when the chairman (from Florida) of the powerful Rivers and Harbors Committee says:

> The Muscle Shoals project, already recommended by Army engineers and urged by Senator-elect UNDERWOOD, of Alabama, the retiring Democratic leader of the House, and other Members of southern delegations, contemplates a Federal appropriation of $18,000,000, reimbursable to the Government, with a view to comprehensive development of the water power.

Why did not the statement say the Board of Engineers has recommended a straight hand-out of $10,325,000 from the Federal Treasury for this water-power trust? No reimbursement, no haggling, but an outright illegal gift of public funds for rainbow-chasing private schemes. Why not place the full outrageous proposal squarely before the country? Why not have the activities of the powerful lobby, with its gaudy, expensive literature, given wide publicity?

Leader UNDERWOOD, of Alabama, "urged it." I am sorry. Southern delegations favor the gift, too. Two senatorial rivals in the House passed through the tellers last session, both voting for it. Probably $20,000,000 or more will be given to the Muscle Shoals project before it is completed, apart from over

$10,000,000 already spent by the Government on the Tennessee, and for a 150-foot dam to accommodate less than 6,000 tons of annual "commerce" at Muscle Shoals. Why should not the Alabama water-power lobby round up southern delegations, including all political rivals in the State? It persuades our Army engineers. How and why? It nearly captured Congress at the last session. A bare defeat by 10 votes, with the "retiring Democratic leader" fighting for it on the floor of the House. And when squarely defeated in the House the same item again appeared in the bill which Senator Burton and his colleagues finally defeated at the other end of the Capitol.

If the committee favors the project, together with good political pull of southern delegations behind it, what is to prevent any other private water-power company from filching $10,325,000, or 10 times the amount, out of the Federal Treasury? Will northern and eastern and western delegations be alarmed over threats to turn down legitimate waterway projects if the Muscle Shoals navigation fraud is again defeated? Why should Congress figuratively crawl on its belly before the Alabama Water Power Co.? Why rob the Treasury of nearly $20,000,000 at the behest of a water-power lobby, even though indorsed by Army engineers? Is that what Northern States are contributing war taxes to finance?

SOUTHERN DELEGATION WITH 27 CHAIRMEN.

The country is confronted with a remarkable spectacle when chairmen from Southern States sit in judgment over the deliberations of 27 of the most important committees of the House, and when a large majority of the Democratic majority controlling national legislation hail from these same Southern States; but when to this astonishing situation the country is further informed by the committee chairman that southern leaders and southern delegations will be lined up behind such scandalous raids on the Treasury, it is a call for sectionalism that will bear fruit in no uncertain manner.

I have been advised that my course in opposing scandals like the $18,700,000 Muscle Shoals, which we defeated in Committee of the Whole last session, is shortsighted; that I am making a grave mistake in opposing influential political powers; that Congress winks at "humbugs and steals," providing they are vouched for by high authority. If it be a mistake to call a spade a spade, then I have no business here. If I am expected to remain mute because political power, however high, demands money from the Federal Government for a private water-power company, then I have not read aright my oath of office as a legislator. The Alabama Water Power Trust, however powerful, is no more sacred than any other private interest that seeks to raid the Treasury.

Congress should not permit this impudent recommendation of Army engineers to become a law without knowledge that the proposed raid is the forerunner of countless similar political grabs, among which Idaho and Montana, or even Wisconsin's 10,000,000 horsepower water powers, may years hence be fighting for a proportionate share of Government swag if this policy is adopted.

With all chairmen of committees located in the southern section of the country, that section is temporarily in control; but Congress can not blindly squander public money on private projects without a day of reckoning; and one of the most scandalous schemes that will arise to haunt the party in power will be a donation of $18,700,000 to the Alabama Water Power Co. Who are the officers and stockholders of the Alabama company? What influences are behind a company that brazenly reaches down onto the floors of Congress to overturn the precept of "special privileges for none," once written into the platforms of a mighty political party now in control of legislation? Why is a $100,000 water-power lobby on the ground trying to put through this conscienceless grab?

Why have Army engineers recommended giving over to the Alabama Water Power Co. $18,700,000 in Government funds? Your Uncle Samuel has been blindfolded and doped by discredited doctors whom he has educated and supported since they first grew long pants. Every disinterested investigating Member will become further convinced of the seriousness of the present conservation situation upon reading House bill 16053, of the Sixty-third session, a general water-power measure, which was reported favorably from the Senate committee.

ANOTHER ETHIOPIAN FROM THE WOODPILE.

The Muscle Shoals project is bad; but what shall be said of that part of section 2 of a general water-power bill which provides that, as between contesting applicants for a water-power permit, preference shall be given by the Secretary of War to that applicant who is "best qualified to expedite and realize the maximum useful development of all the water resources of the region?" The Secretary of War is directed to base his finding on "the report and advice of the Chief of Engineers." Navigation, water powers, coast defenses, Secretaries of War and Navy, Senators, and Representatives, together with all other projects and officials, must circle around the autocratic Chief of Engineers, who gives a soothing lotion here and a hypodermic there while he provides for the Alabama Water Power Co. and other favorites. Apportioning $50,000,000 through mysterious influence, granting astonishing allotments to worthless waterways, handing out invaluable water-power privileges at his own sweet will, is it not high time that a hypnotized public and chloroformed Congress waked to the gross abuse of power assumed by the Chief of Engineers?

I introduced resolutions in the Sixty-third Congress urging an investigation of such infamous schemes as the Alabama Water Power Trust is trying to ram through Congress. Investigations of the influences behind Army engineer recommendations were also urged by resolution. Publicity alone will defeat the Muscle Shoals lobby; publicity alone will halt the rolling pork barrel that moves through the Public Treasury like a car of Juggernaut.

MOTIVES FOR GENEROUS GIVING BY ENGINEERS.

Able statesmen at both ends of the Capitol repeatedly ask for motives for generous giving by Army engineers. With the facts before us each must answer the question to his own satisfaction, and it may be useless to suggest what such statesmen already know, that after scattering $50,000,000 with lavish hand, in addition to approving $250,000,000 in new projects and granting 250 new surveys in 1915, Chief Kingman will easily locate a crowd of pikers if he fails to get all that he asks from Congress.

Top-column publicity notices in a local paper constantly give us first aid to Gen. Kingman's wants which otherwise might remain buried in voluminous reports. In an effort to promote that publicity campaign I quote from a recent issue (Dec. 21):

> Gen. Kingman, Chief of Engineers, has submitted to Congress an estimate of construction of stables, a trade-school building, and a fuel shed at the engineer post at Washington Barracks.

For suitable accommodations the article concludes:

> It is estimated that it will cost about $337,000 to provide for new buildings called for in the approved plans.

On page 27 of the 1914 report it appears Congress has not entirely overlooked such recommendations, judging from past expenditures of $1,138,409 for an engineering school, and we are further advised there is urgent need of additional funds.

"LIMITED RESTRICTIONS AS TO EXPENDITURES."

On page 25 Chief Kingman says the Philippine engineering department "requires funds of wide applicability and limited restrictions as to expenditure." In other words, Congress is invited to pursue the free-arm movement that characterized a scattering of $50,000,000 nearer home, with "limited restrictions." He also desires mounted battalions of engineers, additional companies to give more graceful proportions to the corps; $600,000 is urgently needed for an adequate reserve supply of engineering equipment, and other modest requests he makes on Congress. We are further asked to give $75,000, or an increase of 90 per cent in one year, for civilian "assistants," "photographers," and so forth. By such means possibly do we secure our highly calendared works of art which are found scattered throughout thousands of musty pages in annual reports.

Other branches of the service may have need of a friend at court, and I am not opposing recommendations, but mentioning them. The official with the largest credit account to present against Congress to-day is the man representing a department which has expended over $850,000,000 of public funds during recent history, two-thirds of which was wasted, unless there is no waste in fastening down personal obligations for local expenditures. Possibly he is not affected by influences which govern ordinary people here below, and in any event, if the system is wrong, we must accept full responsibility for its existence.

MEN WITHOUT KNOWLEDGE OR EXPERIENCE.

Members may not agree with me in all things, but no wise man would trust the management of any small business enterprise to the hands of Army engineers who arbitrarily handle $50,000,000 of public moneys, on the average, annually.

What can more fitly express the growing sentiment against bureaucratic utterances, activities, and powers than the well-chosen words of the ablest Member on this floor, the minority leader, who said last Wednesday on the Ferris water-power bill:

> The trouble with an administrative officer here in one of the departments, who never before he came here had any knowledge whatever of general procedure or the precedents in Congress, is that he frequently makes a mistake and slops over. * * * Congress will never be willing to let Mr. Garrison as an administrative officer—which means some engineer which no one could locate perhaps—to determine whether a bridge or a dam shall be constructed across the Mississippi River, or many or most of the other navigable streams of the United States.

And yet the Secretary of War, under the advice of the Chief of Engineers, is given sole power to issue water-power permits on all navigable streams wholly within one State, and Army engineers, without any adequate knowledge of commercial or business conditions, recommend projects on which may hinge a score of millions of public money in an individual case.

What special training, commercial or otherwise, fits an Army engineer or the Secretary of War for such tremendous responsibilities or such important decisions as Congress thrusts upon them? We do not choose a lieutenant colonel of six years ago or a brigadier general of to-day to run a railway or relieve the Interstate Commerce Commission of its responsibilities. And yet we take to our hearts and place a business qualification halo over the heads of our Army engineers in order to show the sublime confidence possessed by Congress—which of course expects them to do the right thing when told to do so by the proper authority, or otherwise.

POWERS AND WATER POWERS.

Under our present unsystematic system of water-power control we retain in Congress the authority to act on interstate navigable rivers; we give the Secretary of the Interior authority to act on unnavigable rivers; we give to the Secretary of Agriculture powers as to rivers on forest reserves; we give the Secretary of War and his Chief of Engineers enormous power to distribute favors on navigable rivers wholly within one State; and then when a suspicious ill-smelling project is to be put over an unsuspecting public, the River and Harbor Committee is asked to do it. As an humble member of that committee I resent the imputation that its members, individually or collectively, do not aspire to the same high standards possessed by any other House committee, but no one can escape the suspicion that in the case of the Muscle Shoals $18,700,000 grab the River and Harbor Committee looked more easy to the Alabama power company lobby than the Committee on Interstate or Foreign Relations, which properly had jurisdiction of the same matter.

Will some vigorous organizing member with little reverence for superannuated customs propose a method that will definitely fix water-power responsibility in Congress where it belongs, and remove from bureaucratic jealousies and astounding powers the present multiplied agencies over invaluable public properties—agencies that are to-day largely subject to the whim, caprice, and judgment of irresponsible subordinate department officials?

CONGRESS DODGES WOLVES TO SHOOT CHIPMUNKS—WASHINGTON'S WATER SUPPLY SIDETRACKED BY THE PORK BARREL.

One of the most interesting spectacles to the average congressional neophyte at each session is the tremendous struggle waged by antihalf-and-half champions in their efforts to protect their home constituents from designing Washingtonians. Days given over to speeches, hundreds of pages in the RECORD, and weeks and weeks of investigating committees are regularly staged by the chief actors every session. Whatever may be the merits of the controversy—and it is possible that a more equitable adjustment of the tax burdens will some day be presented for the Capital City—unprejudiced, dispassionate judgment of the hare-and-hounds spectacle must be that Congress is constantly straining at gnats and swallowing camels. With $20,000,000 for Brazos contractors and $10,000,000 for Trinity dredgers, $12,000,000 for Black Warrior water powers, $64,000,000 for visionary Ohio canalization contractors, $18,700,000 for a private water-power company at Muscle Shoals, $27,000,000 for a Missouri land reclamation, and $275,000,000 to $500,000,000 for another Mississippi land-reclamation scheme, all recommended by Army engineers and all financed by the Government, does it not seem somewhat strained for Congress to indulge in annual half-and-half tax hunts?

The people of Washington, whatever sins of omission or commission may exist, have not received pennies from the Government where Mississippi levee landowners expect to collect dollars. Countless other wasteful projects, a few of which have been briefly mentioned, make the local issue insignificant by comparison. I do not intend to further discuss the half-and-half controversy, excepting to ask why we constantly chase rabbits that have no legal protectors while we dodge gray wolves which openly infest waterway, public-building, Navy, and Army bills. This thought is emphasized by the attitude of Chief Kingman in reference to an important local project.

NO TRIBUTE FOR AIR AND WATER—THE GREAT FALLS OF THE POTOMAC PROJECT WAITS; WHY?

One of the privileges accorded man is the right to breathe without paying tribute to some monopoly. Another is the right to free water to drink, and still another is a right to have municipal control of public utilities for public use. That privilege is sought by wicked half-and-half Washingtonians, yet we have them in chancery so that relief must come through Congress and, strange to relate, on the advice of the ubiquitous Chief Engineer Kingman.

No intelligent man questions the early need of an additional water supply for the city of Washington, of which Congress is the board of aldermen, and all experts agree that this water supply should come from the Potomac River. It is proposed to condemn the Great Falls of the Potomac, owned since 1839 by private corporations, its present owner being the Great Falls Power Co., which is an inactive corporation of Virginia, a majority of whose stock is held by the Washington Railway & Electric Co. This company also controls the Potomac Electric Power Co., which in turn does the public lighting of Washington. These corporations are supposed to be affiliated with the General Electric Co., known in turn as the Electric and Water Power Trust, which in turn is understood to own the Alabama Water Power Co., which wants immediately $18,700,000, recommended in 1914 by Chief Kingman, for Muscle Shoals, down in Alabama.

It has been proposed that Congress take over the Great Falls, real estate, water, water rights, and the falls by an act of Congress containing a provision that the Great Falls Power Co. may sue in the Court of Claims for damages. While this course would be opposed by those who have sat on their rights for three-quarters of a century, including the General Electric, it would result in preventing extravagant damages, estimated by Chief Kingman at double or triple actual values at Muscle Shoals, for which, however, he recommends the Government should pay $1,750,000. The Great Falls rights ought to be secured for less than $100,000, according to Senate Document No. 790, Sixty-first Congress, third session.

I will not discuss the economic side of the proposal or present arguments to show why our Government should own and directly, or through the city, operate a municipal plant that will provide water and power for the Capital City for a century to come. Neither will I offer reasons why this proposal would soon pay for itself and should be acted upon at an early date. These reasons are apparent to every believer in municipal ownership of public utilities.

MUSCLE SHOALS VERSUS GREAT FALLS—WHY THE GREAT FALLS PROJECT IS SIDETRACKED.

Bearing in mind that Great Falls is needed primarily for drinking water for a great municipality, while Muscle Shoals demands an $18,700,000 Government gift for water power for the Alabama Power Co., I desire briefly to present some engineering facts that are significant—first in relation to Muscle Shoals and next the Great Falls project.

Let me quote briefly from Chief Kingman's report on Muscle Shoals, contained in House Committee Document No. 20, Sixty-third Congress. Notwithstanding Col. Riché, on page 57, protests vigorously against the United States paying $1,750,000 for flowage easements for a private water-power company's brazen raid on the Federal Treasury, the Board of Engineers, page 6, overrules Riché because our brass-buttoned autocrats profess to believe—

> It would doubtless lead to considerable delay and would be apt to defeat the present opportunity to make this improvement on favorable terms.

Yet Riché says pointedly:

> I recommend all lands and casements be donated to the United States, and do not fear delay will result in loss to the United States or prevent the improvement of Muscle Shoals.

Chief Kingman approves the gift to a private water-power company of $1,750,000 for flowage and $8,575,000 for "navigation," and a loan to the power company of $8,325,000, or a total of $18,700,000 given to the Alabama Power Co. for work to be completed "in five years." Overruling Riché's courageous protest, Kingman finds imperative haste is demanded as a reason for giving away $1,750,000 for flowage rights, as shown by the report, and he asks that the whole $18,700,000 be paid within five years to furnish an "immediate slack-water navigation." (Pp. 1 and 2, Doc. 20.)

Remembering the Government has spent at this same point $4,555,000 for "navigation," in order to develop 5,800 tons of "commerce" annually, I quote from page 6 the reason given by Chief Kingman for advancing $10,325,000 more for "navigation" and flowage.

> 19. The existing 1913 commerce of the section (5,800 tons annually), as well as the increase which might reasonably be expected, apart from what may be created as a result of the power development, is insufficient to justify so great an expenditure for improvements for navigation alone.

That is to say, Chief Kingman frankly admits 5,800 tons of annual commerce does not justify an expenditure by the Government of $10,325,000 more for navigation in addition to

$4,550,000 already spent among the sand hills and 400,000 acres given to Alabama, but he recommends it immediately, because there are forests and agricultural resources that when "fully exploited will add greatly to the general prosperity." More significant, the committee hearings showed that no present demand for power exists at Muscle Shoals—it is prospective.

I wish to make this point clear before commenting on the Great Falls Potomac River project:

First. The Government has spent $3,200,000 at Muscle Shoals, Ala., or $4,555,655, including annual maintenance charges, and has developed a commerce of 5,800 tons annually, nearly one-half of which is fertilizer.

Second. Against the protest of Col. Riché, Mr. Kingman further recommends that the Government give a private power company $1,750,000 at Muscle Shoals for flowage rights immediately.

Third. He further recommends giving $8,575,000 more for 5,800 tons of commerce in aid of "navigation" for the use of the same company, to be paid by the Government within five years. This is in addition to $8,325,000 more to be loaned for power purposes, or $18,700,000 in addition to $3,200,000 already expended.

Fourth. He states specifically no commerce justifies this expenditure until the forests and agricultural resources have been fully "exploited," and the hearing further shows no present demand exists for Muscle Shoals power.

THEN LOOK ON THIS PICTURE.

If the remarkable Muscle Shoals report is clearly understood, attention is invited to a letter written by Chief Kingman to the Secretary of War, about September 19, 1915, in relation to the Potomac Great Falls water supply for the city of Washington and municipal-ownership project. Therein he says:

This project proposes the combination of a power development and an increase of the water supply of the city of Washington at an estimated cost of $15,021,500. It was the view at the time and until recently that work for increasing the water supply should be commenced in the near future. However, in his annual report this year the then District engineer officer reported that on account of the installation of meters and other measures taken to reduce consumption per capita it would appear that the work, so far as the increase of the water supply was concerned, need not commence before 1920, and that experience may then show it safe to postpone commencement for several years more.

WATER-POWER ECONOMIES QUESTIONED.

The economies of the development have been questioned in some quarters, the estimate cited above contemplated the generation of only power to meet the needs of the Federal and District Governments.

A later study made in the District office indicates that this partial development of power will not be economical, and that if work is undertaken it should be on the basis of developing the full power. The cost of such development is placed at $12,799,000, independent of any features for increasing the water supply, estimated to cost about $4,472,600 additional, making the total cost of the power plant and increase of water supply $17,271,600. In addition a steam reserve must be maintained, as the flow of the river is occasionally insufficient to generate the average load which the plant should carry.

From the information at hand I am, nevertheless, of the opinion that the undertaking will certainly eventually be wise public policy, and that the power proposition will become more attractive as coal increases in price.

In view, however, of the circumstances recited of the many urgent matters to be financed by the Government in the near future, and of the additional time rendered available for increasing the water supply, I am not yet prepared to recommend the submission of an estimate.

TWO PICTURES OF AN AUTOCRAT.

Chief Kingman, the autocrat of all waterway propositions, determines that although this great city and the District and Federal Government headquarters depend upon Great Falls, the "economies" of the municipal undertaking are doubtful, but in the far-off backwoods of northern Alabama he urges Congress to give $18,700,000 at once to a private water-power project. This is in addition to $3,200,000, or $4,555,655, including maintenance, already wasted to secure 5,800 tons of commerce annually according to his own official report, page 2587.

Although Washington's water supply is an imperative question, Chief Kingman refuses "to recommend the submission of an estimate," because of "many urgent matters to be financed by the Government in the near future."

Have I made the point clear that Mr. Kingman recommends immediate advancement of $18,700,000 for the Alabama Power Co., or General Electric Trust, although the hearings show no present demand exists for power, and he has officially stated no commerce justifies this great expense? Heretofore it has been demonstrated the improvement may cause an eventual loss to the Government of $50,000,000 in order to aid a private water-power company. Yet Kingman recommends delay of the Great Falls municipal project because "economies" are questioned.

NO MILL BY THE DAM SITE—NOT YET.

The Muscle Shoals item was smuggled into the last bill, although a new project. Few Members knew of its existence, but some way it was slipped in. Then it got out—hurriedly, ingloriously. Let me say here that it was defeated by splendid work on the floor of the House by my distinguished friend and colleague [Mr. LENROOT], with the aid of my able colleague Judge STAFFORD, and also the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER], and last, but not least, my friend over here on the right, who deserves more credit possibly than anyone else for this fight against waterway waste, my friend from Texas [Mr. CALLAWAY]. The Muscle Shoals project was the first item stricken from a bill in many years. We had a roll call on the bill, but it finally was passed and went over to the Senate. Again the Muscle Shoals item mysteriously got back into the bill, but after proper attention from Senators Burton, KENYON, NORRIS, and others it went out again, with every other item—all lost. But it must go back according, to the Board of Army Engineers, immediately, together with reclamation projects, water-power projects, and real-estate projects, and various other projects that to-day masquerade under the head of "waterways."

I do not speak for the Potomac power proposal; it stands on its own merits; but Congress should have and must have proper estimates. Let me again repeat Gen. Kingman's refusal to submit an estimate for the Potomac Falls proposition, intended for Washington and for the Government:

In view, however, of the circumstances recited and the many urgent matters to be financed by the Government in the near future, and of the additional time rendered available for increasing the water supply, I am not yet prepared to recommend the submission of an estimate.

GEN. KINGMAN'S DEFECT IN HEARING.

He refuses to make an estimate because of many urgent demands made by the $18,700,000 Muscle Shoals project, and by the $20,000,000 Missouri River project, and by the $275,000,000 Mississippi River project, and by the Ouichita River, the Red River, and scores of other questionable projects that are shouting for public funds. Yet all of the traffic on the Red River is 240,000 tons, mostly of deadhead and other obstructions removed in 1912 and 1913. That is the commerce on the Red River, and it cost the Government $100 per ton, outside of the driftwood; but that commerce needs be cared for, with the pressing demands of the Ouachita, the Trinity, the Brazos, and other worthless propositions. We have a peculiar situation here. The Chief of Engineers can hear over the telephone all the way from the Missouri River, or from the Muscle Shoals in Alabama; aye, clear down to the Trinity or the Brazos in Texas or to the lower Mississippi. He can hear of necessary appropriations asked for down there, but he can not hear from the city of Washington. The wires are crossed, possibly grounded; and then, too, they do not vote in Washington. Its inhabitants are classed with the criminals and incompetents, and with Jane Addams and several hundred thousand people of like privileges. They are suffrageless here. Poor Washingtonians have no delegate on this floor and the commissioners have no telephone calls that can be reached as easily as calls from the wild—from the South and West. That explains the whole theory of these appropriations. The man with the pull has the inside; strong political power has the advantage, and we all know it. What do you think of that power? If we could utilize it there would be no need of using the Potomac Falls.

WITCHCRAFT IN ARKANSAS—HUNDREDS OF JOBS CONTINUED, NONE EVER FINISHED.

All bills for revenue originate in the House pursuant to the Constitution. Appropriation bills follow the same general practice, but both House and Senate have now been superseded by Chief Kingman. House bill 20189, finally defeated, appropriated $34,000,000 for rivers and harbors last session, of which $43,000 was set apart for Arkansas streams under an economy policy finally reached by Congress.

When Chief Kingman's $30,000,000 horn-of-plenty allotment was tapped some influence caused him to raise the House item of $43,000 and give $320,000 to two rivers alone in Arkansas. He also gave Arkansas about 800 per cent increase over the House bill, although the total bill proposed by the House had been materially reduced before Chief Kingman became congressional umpire. Let us discover from his reports what caused him to be so generous.

THE OUACHITA RAISE—HARBORS OF REFUGE FOR OUR DEADHEAD FLEETS.

According to the 1914 report, page 870, the Government has expended $3,145,385 on the Ouachita or Black River as it is called in places. An estimated expenditure of $4,876,654 is now progressing. Chief Kingman reports that the average tonnage on the river during the past 24 years, including duplications and quadruplications mentioned by Chairman SPARKMAN, was 156,319 tons. Curiously no mention is made of present commerce in volume 1 of his reports, so volume 2, page 2362, was examined to ascertain present conditions. There it is learned that the industrious snag boat *Jos. E. Ransdell*, flagship of the fleet, hauled 6,436 different pieces of commerce during the year, in the shape of snags, stumps, and leaning trees taken from the river,

U. S. derrick boat *No. 2* was a close second, with 5,071 more snags, stumps, deadheads, and leaning trees, while over on page 2372 we learn that a "party of laborers," in circus tents, collected in 3,333 more snags, stumps, deadheads, and so forth, from the river. To be exact, 14,840 snags, deadheads, leaning trees, and so forth, were rescued from the Ouachita in 1913, and of these, Chief Kingman's deforesting of Arkansas reached 6,948 trees. The tale of the lonesome pine will soon reach Arkansas, although its once popular Arkansas traveler has nothing on the flagship *Jos. E. Ransdell* or other members of the perambulating Ouachita snag fleet, including the circus tent laborers.

AN ENGINEER'S BOOST OF 500 PER CENT.

House bill 20189 gave the Ouichita $25,000, but Chief Kingman generously raised it to $136,000, or over 500 per cent increase, to cover many deadheads of the vegetable and political kingdom. But the tale of waste and fraud is only half told, for the 156,319 mythical ton average, including duplications and quadruplications, had decreased to 64,874 tons when reported in 1913. We also discover that several items of "commerce" are for floatable logs and timber, reaching over 44,000 tons, while a goodly portion of the duplicated balance was of stone, cement, and soft coal. In other words, counting interest on the investment, maintenance charges, and over $20,000 for soft jobs on idle canal locks (p. 2371) the actual commerce, including duplications, costs the Government annually $8 subsidy per ton on the Ouichita River. After giving the startling facts to Congress in his 1914 report, Chief Kingman raised the House bill Ouichita grab from $25,000 to $116,000. Congressional lawmaking, bad as it is, never compared with Kingman legislation. Political pressure may be responsible in part for this distressing waste and fraud upon the Government, but what can be offered in explanation of the Upper Ouichita, which has been under improvement since 1871, on which Kingman's army and navy removed 3,333 deadheads and other obstructions in 1913, and of which he pathetically says in 1914:

> There is no commerce reported on this portion of Ouichita River during the fiscal year.

What a travesty on waterway improvement is the history of the Ouichita, and yet the Ouichita River is no exception to the rule. Let me make a stronger statement: Chief Kingman's gift to Ouichita contractors appears to be economy itself, compared to his allotment to some other streams in the good old State of Arkansas and in other States.

A RICH GIFT FOR THE TRAFFICKLESS ARKANSAS RIVER.

The tale of the Red, Arkansas, White, and other streams that flow through Arkansas is a tale of waste and extravagant gifts from engineers who have mulcted the Treasury out of nearly a score of millions for that State with practically nothing to show for the money. Forty-four thousand one hundred and twenty-seven snags and other obstructions were removed in 1913 and 1914, principally around "Poverty Point" (p. 2386). Uncle Sam is a godsend for Poverty Point in Arkansas and other States as well.

The Arkansas River (p. 2390) shows that after expending considerably over $3,000,000 (p. 899), a total commerce, including quadruplicating, but excluding floatable timber, reached less than 10,000 tons annually. Counting interest on past appropriations, the Government is paying all the way from $12 to $20 per ton annual subsidy to float this insignificant commerce, but again Chief Kingman rushes to the rescue with $193,350 taken from the economy 1915 allotment given by Congress. More than four times the entire appropriation provided for all Arkansas rivers by the House bill was given by Chief Kingman in 1915 to a stream that after nearly 50 years' improvement is sans boats, sans commerce, and sans water. Where can you beat it in all the record of waste in Government affairs?

RED RIVER WARNING SIGNALS—A VERITABLE WOOD YARD AFLOAT.

Nobody knows just what Mr. Kingman threw into the raging Red River, but one or two sidelights are offered in the 1914 report on the commercial tragedy of the Red. These should make even the most confirmed political pork-barrel paralytic sit up and take notice. Page 2361 shows $2,805,398 has been appropriated by happy-go-lucky Uncle Samuel on this "project." Chief Kingman says (pp. 2359 and 2360) exactly 79,083 obstructions, including snags, deadheads, snags, and more deadheads, were taken from the Red River last year, which goes to prove that even the speedy *Jos. E. Ransdell* fleet over on the Ouachita is snail-like by comparison. Deducting floatable logs, timber, and construction material, we learn on page 2362 the total actual lower-river commerce, excluding logs and sand, was 1,442 tons in 1913. That is the return reported for nearly $3,000,000 appropriated during the past quarter of a century. One hundred dollars a ton and over, counting interest, is a fair estimate of the cost to the Government for every ton of actual commerce floated on the Red River. Read the pitiful tale of this river told on page 868 of Kingman's serial publication and it may explain why good men who pay war taxes are driven to drink. Then read the opposite page wherein with $68,603.48 on hand he asks for $100,000 more.

Do not take my word. Read Mr. Kingman's own reports of recommended waste.

SOME WONDERFUL RED RIVER STATISTICS—LITERALLY A MIGHTY LOG-ROLLING PROPOSITION.

In justice to Chief Kingman, we must admit his official reports on the Red River for 1913 show slight improvement over 1912. For instance, the total commerce of 1912 on the Red, above Fulton, exclusive of logs and floatable timber, only reached 236 tons (p. 2308), whereas the same commerce in 1913 (p. 2356) reached 252 tons, or an increase of 16 tons during the year, on part of this $3,000,000 project, for which $100,000 is annually asked by Chief Kingman.

A grateful public will thank our Board of Engineers for discovering 252 tons of real traffic and also to learn that while they removed only 51,492 snags, deadheads, and other obstructions from the upper river in 1912 (p. 2307), the force of men and fleet of boats rivaling the *Jos. E. Ransdell* fleet's great work removed 51,529 deadheads, snags, and other obstructions the following year, or a net gain of 37 snags, deadheads, and so forth, removed in 1913 over 1912. This substantial increase in deadheads in 1913 over 1912 is also reflected on the lower Red River commerce, where we learn (p. 2362) that although the commerce, excluding floatable timber, only reached 1,227 tons in 1912, a vigorous injection of $100,000 annual Government serum raised the commerce in 1913 to 1,442 tons, as before stated, or a net gain on the lower river of 215 tons during the year, which, added to 37 tons gain on the upper river, makes a grand total gain in tonnage of 252 tons for 1913 commerce on upper and lower Red River, in all reaching 1,694 tons floated, exclusive of floatable timber. After an expenditure of $3,000,000, this remarkable showing of Chief Kingman, who demands $100,000 annually for the Red River, is noteworthy. It should be remembered that the 1,694 tons reported includes duplications and quadruplications in commerce mentioned by Chairman SPARKMAN, but, subject to that qualification, the report may be accepted as correct.

Again Chief Kingman's statistics revel among official and navigation deadheads when he states (pp. 2311, 2312) that in 1912 his fleet and army on the lower Red River removed 58,039 snags, deadheads, and other obstructions, whereas the growing Red River army and Red River navy under his orders removed 78,982 snags, deadheads, and other obstructions in 1913. Adding the snags, deadheads, and other obstructions removed on the Red River in 1912 and 1913 we discover from Chief Kingman's official report that after spending $3,000,000 on this ravenous river our engineering fleet and army removed a grand total of 240,042 obstructions, big and little, within the last two years.

We have paid $3,000,000 for this.

	Obstructions removed.	Commerce.
		Tons.
Upper Red (1912)	51,492	
Upper Red (1913)	51,529	252
Lower Red (1912)	58,039	
Lower Red (1913)	78,982	1,442
Total	240,042	1,694

EUROPEAN WAR-TRENCH ENTANGLEMENT.

Before commenting on this European war-trench entanglement, that interfered with a commerce of 1,694 tons before its removal, a phenomenal increase in passenger business should be mentioned, reaching exactly 400 per cent; no more, no less. More specifically speaking, the 1913 report chronicles 2 lonesome passengers during the year 1912, and their courage in facing the 240,042 marine and submarine obstructions was emulated by a total of 10 passengers in 1913. (See p. 2314 of report of 1913 and p. 2361 of the 1914 report.) All this valuable data relating to deadheads on the Red River has been collected by his official army of the Potomac at Washington and given to Congress in support of Chief Kingman's annual appeals for more office help and $100,000 on a $3,000,000 Red River project that reeks with waste and extravagance. Many other waterway armies besides those on the Potomac and Red Rivers are financed by Congress under the direction of Chief Kingman

during these exciting days of "preparedness," and many other rivers like the Red throw out Treasury danger signals.

A STUDY OF DEADHEADS.

What caused Kingman to give $320,000 to the Wichita and Arkansas Rivers? He raised the appropriation 1,000 per cent over the House bill's allowance. What power caused Chief Kingman to urge $100,000 for the Red River when the only tangible commerce consisted in 240,000 deadheads and other obstructions?

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

Mr. FREAR. Yes. Certainly.

Mr. MADDEN. What does that mean—"deadheads and other obstructions"?

Mr. FREAR. It means deadheads taken out of the river. Of course, political deadheads may also be referred to. I do not know about that. [Laughter.] What influence caused Kingman to recommend $18,700,000 for the Alabama Power Co. to build a 150-foot dam for that power company? And what influenced Army engineers to recommend a 150-foot dam on the Etowah River for the benefit of the Georgia Power Co.?

While the work of exposing the stupidity and waste on this and other rivers has been somewhat laborious and the task of making these miserable disclosures from official records exceedingly distasteful, I feel the country is entitled to know what trashy statistics and wasteful projects are being financed in this enlightened age by a war-taxed, patient public.

ARMY AND NAVY STANDARDS COMPARED.

Personally, I do not know either Chief Kingman or his predecessor, and needless to say have no private grievance against them or the bureau they represent. Presumably they have followed in the footsteps of others, gradually usurping power after the manner of Washington bureaucracy. My purpose in performing what I conceive to be a public duty is to acquaint this body with official documentary admissions of deplorable waste and incompetency, abundantly confirmed by other testimony. If it be improper for a citizen to call attention to diseased conditions which menace public health, then I am at fault in this humble effort to awaken public knowledge as to legislative waterway waste and the instrumentalities behind it.

No unprejudiced man can carefully read the engineer's official reports without realizing that Congress and the country have moved along in an aimless, haphazard, extravagant course with no more definite objective than is possessed by a befuddled drunken man. While in this helpless condition we have been annually plunged deeper in the muck by Government officials on whom we felt compelled to leap.

Secretary Daniels recently called a court-martial to try a rear admiral for improperly inspecting Government vessels. Notwithstanding a jury of his peers found their colleague not guilty, the Secretary publicly condemned the trial and disagreed with the findings.

NAVY AND ARMY INSPECTION METHODS.

What was imperfectly inspected? Did the naval officer give a million dollars of Government funds in 1915, following ten millions previously wasted, to private interests that owned the old, deserted hulk Revetment, of Missouri? Did the rear admiral give $470,000, in 1914 and 1915, to a rotting schooner, called the Brazos, of Texas, which at the present rate of repairs will not be patched up for over a hundred years? During recent years has our indicted seamen generously donated a couple of millions to the Trinity, a consort of the Brazos and equally worthless? Has he been guilty of handing out to an ancient line of Mississippi reclamation barges countless millions of Government funds, given by virtue of his official recommendations? Did this rear admiral inspect the old leaky Muscle Shoals craft, on which he had previously wasted $3,200,000 or $4,500,000 continuing maintenance, for calking never-ending holes; and did he recommend, in 1915, that we put enough more money into these same leaky holes to build a great battleship? If so, did he follow the earnest appeal of a "retiring Democratic leader" and advice of "southern delegations"?

Court-martials are not very serious affairs, according to Secretary Daniels, just a scrap of paper between friends; but even so, is there a different code of official responsibility pervading the War Department than is exercised by the naval branch of our preparedness advisors?

ONLY $26,258,472 ACCOUNTED FOR—WHERE IS $3,241,528 OF RESERVE FUNDS?

In view of the gigantic waste officially confessed by these reports, Congress should now be fully advised of the disposition made by Chief Kingman of $3,241,528 airily reported in April, 1915, as reserved for contingencies. What contingencies were taken care of by this dark-lanterned method? After spending $500,000 on more muddy-creek surveys and millions of dollars on scores of scandalous "projects," what became of the rest of the allotment? Congress ought to know the worst—the limit of extravagance.

THE FEATHER RIVER RECLAMATION—ANOTHER COUNT IN THAT SAME INDICTMENT.

After the congressional committee was entertained, wined, and dined, as indicated at the outset of these remarks, it may have been in a proper frame of mind to pass judicially upon the Muscle Shoals water power and also the Feather River reclamation projects, which latter project is under the shadow of the Panama-Pacific Exposition. Started at $33,000,000, the California project has been reduced materially, according to the engineer's report. The Government was to pay all of the new project—then one-third and now one-half—but before completion the Government will be expected to contribute anywhere from $5,000,000 to $10,000,000 or more, depending upon the unreliability of engineers' usually inaccurate estimates. And our Army engineers who recommended a gift of over $10,000,000 on the Muscle Shoals water-power project for "navigation" are equally certain the Government should give liberally from its public funds to help this land-reclamation project, which is unrelated to navigation. House Document No. 81, Sixty-second Congress, page 3, says:

> The board reports that the execution of this project is not necessary in the interests of navigation.

Senator Burton repeatedly condemned the Feather River project and stood guard at the last session against the Muscle Shoals water-power project, inserted in the Senate after its defeat in the House. Mr. Burton is now gone, and possibly the present opponents of the Feather River and Upper Sacramento reclamation project will only be able to protest, while the twin projects, one for water power, the other for 1,000,000 acres of land reclamation, valued at $200,000,000, will make off with $25,000,000 or more from the public crib. These are projects that Chairman SPARKMAN says may get into the next river and harbor bill. If so, we may be sure the Richmond (Cal.) inner-harbor real-estate project, also approved by Army engineers for many wasted millions yet to come, will get into the Treasury trough with both feet. A distinguished Senator said on July 1 last (RECORD, p. 1246) regarding the Feather River project:

> I challenge any Member of the Senate to get that document (Com. Doc. No. 5, 63d Cong.). At no time has it been available in the document room. It is not a general public document available to Members of the Senate or House.

And yet Congress is asked to appropriate $5,860,000 for the Feather River reclamation project without any official means of ascertaining reasons for so doing—to approve the project when notified officially it is not in the interests of navigation.

RICHMOND INNER HARBOR—TO BE DUG OUT OF A MARSH AT A "PROHIBITIVE" COST.

It seems appropriate at this point to briefly refer to another stupendous real-estate bubble that may be financed by Uncle Sam at anywhere from five to ten million dollars or more before completion. The engineers' reports do not give these figures—they never do until the bills are paid—but people living there so estimate. Jamaica Bay Harbor, Long Island, is a notorious seven to ten million dollar real-estate project now financed by a convenient Uncle. Mattawan Creek and Shoal Harbor are also familiar private jobs; fertilizing factory waterway projects are found from New Jersey to North Carolina; railway terminal harbors from Portland, Me., to the Southern Pacific Co.'s harbors at Oakland and elsewhere, all are recipients of generous Uncle Sam's bounty. Some of these were discussed more in detail last session and no more than a brief reminder is now offered.

From the December, 1915, number of the Army and Navy News, published at San Francisco, I quote, page 7, a pointed editorial, as follows:

> For years the United States Army and Navy have suffered from the niggardliness of pork-barrel Congressmen, who have vigorously opposed proper military expenditures, but have cheerfully poured out millions for a public building in a cross-roads village or for dredging useless streams (or harbors) in their districts. That made them strong with their constituents; it meant pork.

Can we deny this, my brother Congressman? Is the criticism unfounded?

But, turning over to pages 18, 19, and 20, among the patent-medicine ads. of the same preparedness publication, is a description of "ringing resolutions" to Congress read by the postmaster of Berkeley, demanding an inner harbor for Richmond. A handsomely designed map, prepared by Col. Rees, United States Army, is close up to reading matter, while half-page real-estate ads. and smaller ones, at so much per square inch, frame the reading matter, advising gullible nibblers that "anything in, around, or near Richmond will yield a handsome

return if bought right." As at Muscle Shoals, members of a former Rivers and Harbors Committee are conveniently grouped for effective coloring.

After Uncle Sam begins dredging his several million dollar project on Richmond flats, bogs, and marshes overlooking the Standard Oil works that surround the flats and bogs, we learn, page 19, "every indication tells the observant visitor that Richmond is the site of one of the largest western cities of the near future." Like a half century ago, the country will unanimously sing, "On to Richmond." Incidentally, Richmond had 6,802 inhabitants last census. But Richmond is being boosted, primarily by Uncle Sam, secondarily by those behind the real-estate project.

"COL. SELLERS" LIKEWISE SAW MILLIONS IN EYE WATER.

On page 20 of the Army and Navy News is a photographic signature of "Thos. A. Rees, Lt. Col.," following paid reading matter, to prove what no one would otherwise believe, that Army engineers have recommended this project. Rear Admiral Pond, United States Navy, is also persuaded to subscribe to a statement, same page, "'At first sight it has appeared to some that the cost of a station thus formed would be prohibitive," but real-estate advocates of a greater Richmond, surrounded by Standard Oil works, think differently, and so forth. Digging a 30-foot harbor on Anacostia Flats is equally feasible and of far greater public value.

Prospective gumps who are looking for Uncle Sam to open up a gold mine in Richmond's bogs, adjoining the Standard Oil works, should take warning from an ex-Congressman's 25,000-acre real-estate project, still watchfully waiting, down on the Kissimmee. Engineers propose, but eventually an overburdened Uncle revolts, following the advice given editorially on page 7 of the Army and Navy News.

Richmond's harbor project is not unknown to fame, and its introduction into any river and harbor bill is sure to invite a flood of interrogations which may strike close to those who have tried to unload the project onto the Government. To use the significant words of Mr. Cutting, "It is a mighty good speculation for Richmond"—and some others.

OTHER HARBORS OF REFUGE FOR HIS PORKSHIP.

If harbor scandals are to be probed, any investigator will find in the Sandy Bay (Mass.) Harbor a situation that demands investigation. During 30 years, $1,950,000 of public funds was dumped into this $5,000,000 project on the recommendation of Army engineers. Then it was abandoned as a useless and worthless venture. Who is to blame? Again, Lookout Harbor was first reported against by Gen. Kingman, but a benevolent Congress overcame his objections and directed a report to be made in favor of either Lookout or Hatteras. Then we began a $3,526,600 refuge harbor, which well-known waterway, experts say, is more valuable to dredgers, contractors, and interested railways than to vessel captains who wisely avoid the coast. A thorough investigation would disclose interesting facts regarding some harbor projects and a first warning signal should be "Lookout."

TRUTH STRANGER THAN FICTION.

A keen writer in the New York Evening Post, speaking of the new slogan "preparedness," pointedly observes:

> Pork barrel men have already adopted the motto: "Waterways for defense." Obviously there is no surer way of keeping the Germans from landing at Long Island than by widening Oskaloosa Creek at a cost of $500,000, and damming Musconetcong River at a cost of $2,000,000, it being estimated that the water power generated by damming Musconetcong River will provide sufficient electric current to operate 200 siege guns for a period of two months against an army of 250,000 men.

Substituting a $20,000,000 bankrupt 13-mile canal and a $19,000,000 Muscle Shoals, "cyanamid" power scheme, both of which are being pushed during this session by powerful lobbies, the picture is perfect.

Several modern patriots now point with pride to their thirsty, crooked creeks, and building bounties while exclaiming "Millions for political tribute, but not one cent for defense—without war taxes."

THE CHESAPEAKE & DELAWARE CANAL—A $20,000,000 COUNT IN THE INDICTMENT.

According to Chairman SPARKMAN's prediction, we may also take over the 13-mile bankrupt Chesapeake & Delaware Canal in order to aid navigation between Philadelphia and Baltimore and, incidentally, help out stockholders now owning the worthless project. Uncle Samuel and several of the surrounding States contributed to this canal stock out of public treasuries when the canal was first started, for real commercial purposes, long before the Civil War and the days of railroads. Army engineers now ask us to again buy a canal we helped to build, and to appropriate $20,000,000 for a 35-foot depth, sufficient for torpedo boats and submarines. On the Delaware, depths have grown and grown until the present river project reaching this canal calls for 35 feet and a total cost of over $25,000,000 on the lower Delaware.

With stock absolutely valueless and bonds quoted at 49 cents on the dollar before this purchase proposal became serious, we are to buy the canal; but, on January 2, 1915, its president wrote the Army engineers:

> The board of directors of the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal Co. do not control the stockholders or bondholders of that company, and the question as to what price would be accepted by them for their interest must be one which they alone can answer. The board do not see how they could do anything more than state that they could recommend a price that would pay the par value of the bonds and give a sufficient amount for the stockholders to induce them to consent to a sale.

Study the proposition on which we are asked legislatively to buy this canal—for sale, if at all, when its bond value is doubled from the 49-cent quotation, and when stockholders holding worthless stock ask to realize all they can; in a horse trade which we are to make without knowing the terms demanded by the fellow who owns the blind horse he is trying to sell.

I do not underrate the high standing of gentlemen who defend this proposed purchase, but high-class men are defending every project that I have questioned. They usually view the project from the highly colored surroundings of the community represented, and at the same time demand that those who question the particular project shall view it with unbiased mind; in other words, with the mind of the promoters. I confess to a disposition to oblige every Member of Congress at either end of the Capitol, but I can not perform my own duty as I see it without registering an humble protest against needless extravagance.

MOVING TROOPS BY CANAL BOATS.

One argument advanced for this purchase is that the canal will aid moving troops in time of war. No proposal is too absurd for those who approve the scheme to take over all worthless stock and depreciated bonds on a canal we helped to build originally. A present canal rule prohibits over 4 miles an hour, or a minimum limit of 3 hours and a quarter in which to run troops 13 miles, the length of the canal. Why take a canal for moving troops when two great railway systems will carry the whole United States Army from Baltimore to Philadelphia—94 miles—in a couple of hours and land 500,000 or more troops in either city within 24 hours, whereas the old bankrupt canal route of nearly the same distance would take 10 hours or more for every canal boat and run the risk of dangerous quicksand banks, Chesapeake crabs, and prowling submarines. Surely Noah's ark remains anchored opposite the Philadelphia Navy Yard for just such emergencies. Four miles an hour for the quick movement of troops is an inspiration worthy of Philadelphia. Twenty million dollars would build and equip three or four Government railways from Baltimore to Philadelphia that would be a 1,500 per cent better investment in every way. The railway terminals now monopolizing the city water front of Philadelphia and Baltimore will never permit any lively waterway competition, although Baltimore dredgers, Philadelphia canal stockholders, bondholders, and a few sincere dreamers may believe $20,000,000 should be spent by the Government.

NO SERIOUS COMMERCIAL COMPETITION.

Let me make a stronger statement. No waterway competition exists to-day in the coastwise trade, because practically all boats are owned by railways. On the testimony of a man who carries the relatively small Chesapeake & Delaware Canal commerce, it is a fact that practically every steamship line operating from Gulf ports, south Atlantic ports south of Hatteras, and north Atlantic ports is controlled by the railroads. Based on that remarkable state of affairs, the Government is constantly importuned by powerful lobbies to expend anywhere from one hundred million to three hundred million dollars for an inland waterway—"God-given channel of trade"—that would in like manner be monopolized by railways if the traffic reached any respectable proportions.

To say railroad interests would not control because of legislative acts is to say that unscrambled eggs solve the trust question. The ramifications of waterway craft ownership and control would have the same possibilities. The Government should have power to control rates and that control should be exercised for the protection of the public.

Is it not significant that if the Government offered to put up $15,000,000, providing the two great cities of Philadelphia and Baltimore contributed $5,000,000, or any part of the expense, not one foot of the canal would be bought? Not one taxpayer in a thousand in either city will be benefited, nor will the Government reap a sou from the investment. Yet we are asked to assume an expenditure of $20,000,000 and a maintenance and interest charge of possibly $1,000,000 annually, and a vigorous

lobby is on hand to put the vicious, wasteful project through. Neither should it be forgotten that Baltimore is the headquarters of the Dredging Trust, exposed last session, an organization which once managed secret agreements for dividing up Government dredging contracts.

If such projects are to be seriously considered we should insist upon equal contribution from localities that expect to be benefited before a solitary nickel is advanced from the Treasury. It would effectually dispose of the canal project, as Philadelphia and Baltimore are not contributing toward any canal-purchase scheme. However, that is not part of the "pork barrel" system, which, like David Harum, contemplates getting all you can before the other fellow gets his, and always to get it first.

PREPAREDNESS TACTICIANS.

Three months ago it was generally whispered that river, canal, and harbor projects are to be hung on the national-defense program during the coming session. Charleston needs a deeper harbor, possibly to admit friendly naval vessels, but will require submarines and existing sand bars to keep out the enemy. Savannah, Philadelphia, and Narraganset Bay and other inland harbors have similar ambitions. Memphis, St. Louis, and Kansas City pine for a sight of real dreadnaughts to protect the Mississippi and Missouri levees, while Newport and other social centers have aspirations of their own.

Not to be outdone by hungry creeks and rivulets and deserted waterways, our inland-canal enthusiasts demand a share of the preparedness plunder. The Beaufort and Norfolk $5,400,000 canal project of 12 feet is to be finished immediately, in order that 35-foot-draft gunboats may push through the remaining 23 feet of mud to rescue the New York Gun Club's preserves on Currituck Sound from invasion by poachers. Boston to Narragansett Bay's $40,000,000 canal, and on to the Virginia Capes, and again on down to Texas, waterways projected by the canal lobby board of strategy, will be dug in order to make 12-foot and 25-foot ditches for 35-foot dreadnaughts and to eventually provide an annual New-York-to-Narragansett naval-canal fox trot.

THE OPINION OF A GREAT WATERWAY EXPERT.

Last but not least, the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal, worthless stocks and bonds and sliding quicksand and all, has suddenly become a national-defense asset. Statesmen who desire home canals, rain or shine, have given out press interviews on the strategic importance of our old bankrupt canal. Members of waterway lobbies eloquently picture Philadelphia, Baltimore, and even the graft-built capitol at Harrisburg overrun by foreign foes, unless we have that canal. Never has war with all its horrors proven such a godsend to canal promoters. Gunboats are to be sent through the canal instead of by open sea to avoid capture, and yet the Delaware, 5 miles wide at the canal's entrance, permits an enemy to bottle up the canal or Philadelphia with equal certainty.

The same kind of expert engineers who approved Trinity River, Muscle Shoals, Hennepin Canal, and political navy yards now agree that canals must be dug, dug, dug, immediately, while above all the cheering for "preparedness" our old familiar friend, the Chesapeake & Delaware bankrupt canal can be heard shouting for $20,000,000 of Government aid for a 13-mile project.

Worthless stocks, bonds recently selling at 49 cents on the dollar, and Uncle Sam is called upon—not for a loan from Uncle, but to buy another worthless canal. After 20 years' legislative study of waterways the country's ablest expert said less than a year ago of this project:

As this goes forth to the country you would think that $2,250,000 was necessary to acquire the canal; that all the House regarded as necessary was $1,300,000; but right in the body of the report appears the fact that $8,000,000 is necessary—$5,750,000 in addition to the purchase price.

Or $17,500,000 more to secure a 35-foot depth.

This is not a time for bargains in canals; it is a time when the individual citizen of the United States is beginning to recognize that he must economize, and he has a right to demand that the Government of this country should show something of the same disposition to avoid needless and extravagant expenses.

One hundred million dollars for proposed inland-waterway canals has been saddled onto the Government by Army engineers at the instigation of the powerful lobby. Buying up old, worthless canals has been as profitable to the United States as an investment in a hoop skirt of the vintage of 1860. Just why Army engineers have bowed to such discarded relics of pioneer days may be fully discovered when a thorough investigation is held by Congress.

Confirming this opinion are these significant words of Senator Burton:

I wish to say that we never have acquired one of those abandoned or run-down canals or public works but that the expense has been far and away beyond our computations.

ABANDONED CANAL MENDICANTS.

Before the Government rushes headlong into reckless canal buying or canal building on the advice of Army engineers let us judge the future by the past.

Quoting from official statistics, out of 4,468 miles of canals built in the United States, 2,444 miles, or over 50 per cent, were abandoned since 1906; or, like the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal or Chesapeake & Ohio Canal, are worthless business ventures waiting to unload on our gullible Government.

Is it not significant that of 2,444 miles of abandoned canals in the United States in 1906 over one-third of those abandoned canals, reaching 908.74 miles, were in Pennsylvania, abandoned at a loss of $34,750,265? Uncle Sam is, indeed, a promising friend to owners of worthless canals in North Carolina and Pennsylvania.

The Chesapeake & Delaware 13-mile canal was built in part with $450,000 furnished by our Government three-quarters of a century ago. The real investment is $731,250, including $259,875 in dividends that were never paid, but excluding $51,187 Government funds embezzled by an officer. Although the canal company is bankrupt, no dividends declared since 1876 and bonds worth 50 cents on the dollar, we are asked to buy it again. Bondholders living in Pennsylvania and neighboring localities have even refused to fix a price until they can unload at a good figure, but we are assured it is now needed for defense purposes.

WHICH CITY WILL BE CAPTURED FIRST?

Many vulnerable points exist all along our coast, from Portland, Me., to Portland, Oreg. All desire fortifications. If this canal is primarily for submarines to be used for the safety of the country at large, then let us first build submarines to navigate it. We need submarines more than canals. If for the movement of troops, then let us provide a respectable Army instead of a skirmish line. If the canal is primarily for the protection of the City of Brotherly Love, far up a river on which we are expending $25,000,000, then a familiar answer once given by the greatest American to Boston capitalists during the Civil War is well to remember. While contributing $25,000,000 for deepening the Delaware to Philadelphia, is it not time that Philadelphia joins in the good work by a slight contribution toward the purchase of a canal owned in part by Pennsylvanians who refuse to set the price?

When our Government Treasury is overflowing with gold, let us fly to the protection of our weakest lamb; but when heavy war-tax burdens are borne in times of peace, when military and naval plans involving a half billion dollars confront us, can we say it is wise to spend $20,000,000 for this canal? If so, is it not equally necessary to spend $40,000,000 more for another proposed canal from New York to Philadelphia? Two years ago no thought of preparedness was advanced for its purchase, but to-day we sit on the safety valve for fear the exhausted nations of Europe will get us if we don't watch out. Are we not beginning at the wrong end of preparedness in this canal scheme, and is it not wise to provide ships to ride the canal and men to man them before we adopt extravagant canal projects—held without price?

CUMBERLAND RIVER $5,000,000 PROJECT—STILL ANOTHER COUNT IN THE INDICTMENT.

Chairman SPARKMAN's announcement that a project to be urged is the $5,000,000 Cumberland River project has the merit of straightforwardness, if nothing more. This is another project that Senator Burton condemned repeatedly and helped to block, but Burton is now gone. This Cumberland River project will be found in Committee Document No. 10, Sixty-third Congress. It presents an interesting phase of present methods and Army engineers surrendering to "influence." In fact it is a striking chapter that exposes the weakness of our present pork-barrel system and political pull. I addressed the House at some length on this project and also on the Muscle Shoals on December 14, 1914, and present a brief extract from the RECORD of that date (p. 203):

In 1882 an experimental canalization scheme to cost $8,500,000 was authorized. It provides for 28 locks and dams, but after building a few locks and dams and spending about $3,000,000 without aid to traffic the rest of the project was abandoned on recommendation of the Army Board of Engineers in 1906. Persistent hammering by interested parties brought a second adverse report from Maj. Harts in 1910. Again a third refusal was filed by Maj. Burgess on October 29, 1912, in response to persistent local demands. All of these reports disapproved of further expenditures in a bad investment.

THE BOOSTER CLUB OF NASHVILLE.

Then came the "Booster Club" of Nashville, which proceeded to furnish rainbow statistics as glittering in character as the inconsiderable and rapidly decreasing river traffic would permit the booster conscience to present. Whereupon Maj. Burgess cogitated, modified his report, but while defeated in this one-sided battle, he declared $4,500,000 must not be expended by the Government unless local committees contributed one-half of the amount. * * *

TWO SENATORS AND NINE CONGRESSMEN AID.

After following this interesting reversal of action it becomes doubly instructive to watch the siege prosecuted against the Army engineers. Two United States Senators and nine Congressmen, with some lesser lights, joined in an assault to learn why this project so frequently disapproved should not be given an official O. K. and $4,500,000 surrendered unconditionally.

At that hearing Col. Black said, "On the basis of the return by the distribution of fair costs to the whole people of the United States there does not seem to be a return commensurate with an investment of $4,500,000."

That is what Col. Black said on January 28, 1914, according to the official report before the 11 able lawyers, incidentally all United States Senators and Congressmen, who argued to prevent any contribution. On February 4, just one week later, the board and Chief of Engineers saw a new light, pulled down the flag in token of surrender, and the right of the Government to contributions was waived.

Quoting further from the same record is this illuminating suggestion from my friend from Texas:

Mr. CALLAWAY. Do you understand how 9 Congressmen and 2 Senators could furnish an engineer with the technical information that would give him light on a great proposition like that? The information that 9 Congressmen or 90 Congressmen could give would not be worth anything.

Mr. FREAR. That is a question which the gentleman can probably answer as well as I can.

A MEMBER. Might they not give some political information?

That, in brief, is the direct political pressure revealed by Document No. 10, River and Harbor Committee, on a project which was three times rejected and as late at 1914 declared by Col. Black unjust to the Government. The engineers finally surrendered, and Chairman Sparkman says this project is on the program for the next bill.

Many similar instances will be found in the hearings. In fact, the practice is general.

Senator TILLMAN did not know the A, B, C of the game when he gave his comprehensive estimate of river and harbor bills over 10 years ago. Since then questionable projects have doubled in amount and are more worthless than ever in character, while our Treasury guardians, who capitulate before influential statesmen, are saddling on the Treasury in 1915 a hundred or more new projects, through the half million dollars used for new surveys. I refrain from calling attention to the small actual commerce to be served by this extravagant canalization scheme, but the loss in net actual commerce appears to reach nearly 40 per cent during the last two years.

POLITICAL PREPAREDNESS.

Not long ago the country was aroused over a charge made in Congress that the President had attempted to persuade the Interstate Commerce Commission to increase permissive railway tariffs. What would become of judicial bodies if political power used to influence the decision of judges or courts suddenly became a burning question? The charges were controverted, but there can be no dispute that the highest tribunal in the country empowered to determine the technical value of waterway improvements and resulting Treasury burdens is regularly beset by political influence.

Influence is exerted by State delegations and men high in the councils of the nation, all of whom have a voice in determining the size of Army appropriations, the status of the Engineer Corps, and other legislative and political actions that vitally concern the Board of Engineers.

In order to extend gratuities from the Public Treasury to insistent localities this influence shapes waterway legislation and cajoles or browbeats engineers whose duty it is to pass upon waterway projects, freely and untrammeled. If it is improper for the President to express his personal opinion on questions pending before the Interstate Commerce Commission or before the courts, is it not shocking for those who demand local expenditures and who may also influence Army appropriations to bring political pressure upon the board?

We have appointed Army engineers to prevent fraudulent or wasteful waterway payments from the Federal Treasury, to protect public funds, and it is vain to disguise the real purpose when parading political power before that board. The practice is openly embraced by those who indignantly deny any unjust advantage is secured thereby. Membership on committees at either end of the Capitol is likewise sought in order to secure liberal appropriations for the same projects when once they are approved.

"Pork" always goes to the other fellow, and while denouncing those who seek to prevent waste the champions of force and influence defend a practice that puts over wasteful projects without number and is demoralizing and indefensible.

However, it is pursuant to the injunction of Capt. Ellison, secretary of the river lobby, whose celebrated utterance should not be forgotten:

We send Congressmen here to legislate for the Nation, theoretically, but actually to get all they can for us, and if they do not get our share, and then some, we do our best to replace them.

BEAUFORT CANAL AND OTHER PROJECTS—A FEW MORE COUNTS IN THE INDICTMENT.

In any review of wasteful projects it is hard to select any particular waterway without doing injustice through neglect to many other projects that crowd their way into the front rank for dishonorable mention. For that reason I refer briefly to the $5,400,000 Beaufort Canal from Norfolk to Beaufort, bought by the Government to aid the needy. No words of mine can describe the indefensible waste of money now occurring on this project. I have set forth the facts repeatedly in the RECORD, and so have abler and better critics in Congress, but I will again say briefly that the millions now being wasted on this canal forever condemns the judgment of Army engineers who recommend the purchase of bankrupt canals and the extension of projects.

Connecting waterways between Norfolk and Beaufort—all the actual commerce that will ever be handled for 50 years will be inconsiderable and it will remain insignificant for half a century. It is apparently a political proposition, as scandalous as the majority of those briefly described. Two small launches—one owned by the Standard Oil Co. for its own use—are the only through craft running the canal, I am informed.

Army engineers speak of military necessity for the project, but it will never be used for military purposes or commerce because the cost of dredging to any usable depth for large vessels is prohibitive. For years the canal did a nominal business, but it is a relic of days before the war, and any man recommending its use for legitimate commercial or military purposes is a fit subject for delusion experts. If the community supposed to be benefited was compelled to contribute toward the expense, presumably not 2 per cent of the cost could be raised. Although vigorously condemned in the Senate, it received $400,000 in 1915 from our generous Chief of Engineers.

The greatest waterway expert in the country, Senator Burton, denounced this "waste" of public money last year in the following language:

Twenty years ago when channels were shallow, when tolls were imposed, the traffic on these two routes [Beaufort and Dismal Swamp Canals] was more than four times as much as it was in 1912. * * * If the traffic was shifted to the railroads, it was because that was the more convenient and economical way of carrying the freight; and no removal of tolls on canals, no enlargement from 9 or 10 feet to 12 feet in depth, no expenditure of $5,400,000, is ever going to bring back what has been lost to those channels. It is a chimera; it is a waste of public money to attempt it.

ANOTHER STATE'S CLAIM TO WATERWAY FAME.

Among recent river and harbor bills North Carolina appears to be a regular beneficiary, a humble testimonial to the influence of influence.

Starting with the familiar Scuppernong Creek, as juicy as its celebrated namesake, thence on down Deep Creek, that boasts of 2 or 3 feet depth and 2,000 tons (?) of annual commerce, rejected by division engineers, but rescued by Chief Bixby, sailing up past the notable fertilizing project on Northeast Creek until we reach a depth of 1 inch at the head of navigation, according to the Chief of Engineer's 1914 report, page 505, and thence hiking over to Lumber Creek, crooked and tortuous, rejected by division engineers, but again saved by Chief Bixby's hold on Government funds. Bennett Creek, losing 2 feet in depth, or 50 per cent of its volume, when the wind gets to it, according to official reports, and Newbegun Creek, named in honor of its first successful encounter with the Treasury, together with Smith Creek, which is owned by Old Man Smith, according to Representative GOODWIN of Arkansas, and scores of other insignificant creeks, including the Contentnia and the perambulating Peedee.

Onthejob and Getsumore Creeks reappear in every river bill with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers, United States Army. Rivers of Doubt and doubtful rivers, all discovered by our military strategists and installed in the bill with convenient pin money. Col. Roosevelt's discoveries were without price, but insignificant creeks have soaked up many millions of Uncle Sam's silver. No noticeable traffic appears on these Rivers of Doubt, but heavy naval guns and artillery from both ends of the Capitol know the exact range of the Nation's strong box. Is it not a striking lesson in preparedness for conquest of the Treasury? Equally true is the fact that strong men of the same delegation oppose the whole scandalous system that now brings discredit to waterway legislation.

KISSIMMEE AND OKLAWAHA—MORE COUNTS IN THE INDICTMENT.

If time permitted, I would willingly mention a score of additional wasteful projects, from Mattawan Creek to the James, including the abandoned Big Sandy and a dozen other inconsequential creeks of North Carolina and South Carolina and Florida, not forgetting St. Lucia Inlet, that has been condemned by members of the Rivers and Harbors Committee and yet patiently knocks at the Treasury door while holding a hundred thousand dollars in its hands. Louisiana, Arkansas, and Texas are not alone possessed of worthless projects, but before concluding I feel sure that the Kissimmee and Oklawaha, of Florida, will again rise up to plague us. Stricken from the bill by the Senate committee in 1914 because of their exposure in the House, they have been defended by champions at both ends of the Capitol. The country has been informed that the official engineer's report is untrue when it says the Kissimmee is dry eight months of the year. What is the difference, provided the engineers approve Kissimmee Creek, wet or dry? The issue of wet or dry on the Kissimmee has become as famous as wet or dry Kansas, and has become a prolific source of argument; but so is the condition of the Trinity, which is dry eight or nine months of the year, according to the same authority. Yet Army engineers recommend an expenditure on the Trinity of twenty millions or thereabouts, although it is reported dry two-thirds of the time.

WHY NOT INSURE AGAINST FIRE?

Meanwhile real-estate ventures along Kissimmee Creek languish and business remains at a standstill waiting for Congress to give employment to idle dredgers and contractors whom our engineers provided for in their recommendations. Florida should take over the Kissimmee Creek bed and turn it into a highway for the use of northern tourists desiring good speedways for their heavy touring cars. Our old friend ex-Congressman Kribbs, whose pathetic letter to the Army engineers concerning Florida land speculations will not soon be forgotten, is presumably still sitting on the banks of the river bed waiting for us to act on his real-estate venture. Settlers "from the North and West" who were waiting to buy "25,339 acres" split up "into 40-acre lots," according to the engineer's report, are still up North on the waiting list, all waiting for the moistening influence of $47,000 of Government currency to aid navigation. No signs of life can be discovered along that famous creek save one lonesome "lame duck" of a speculative turn of mind that sits gazing hopefully into the invisible river filled with imperceptible water.

In harmony with the proposal of Army engineers to encourage water on the Trinity by having Government artesian wells is the advice of the bubbling Tom Moore, written on the town pump in anticipation of a dry Kissimmee:

What is the use for you and me, or both of us, to try
With a pump to pump up water, if the wells run dry?

THE OKLAWAHA $733,000 GIFT—ANOTHER COUNT IN THE INDICTMENT.

It is said of a distinguished statesman interested in this project that he is an enthusiastic sailor, and when he goes forth on the $733,000 creek to row, armed cap-a-pie with paddle and tree clippers for parting waves and foliage he reminds the natives of Father Time, because of a rusty scythe he uses for mowing down the luxuriant water hyacinth that we annually help cut at Government expense.

For all purposes, other than navigation and commerce, the Oklawaha is beautiful to behold, and all it now needs is three-quarters of a million or more to make it an eternal delight for natives and tourists. Nearly two years ago an investigating mind couched the following lines to the Oklawaha:

We have a crooked creek, that has a crooked name,
And grabs a crooked million while in a crooked game;
To make a crooked water power run up a crooked hill,
It crooks your Uncle Samuel through a crooked river bill.

This same project was also inspiration for a letter addressed to the Army engineers, found in House Document No. 514, page 25, which reads in part as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE, *March 26, 1913.*

GENTLEMEN: In connection with your notice of March 11, regarding Maj. Slattery's report on the Oklawaha to Lake Dora, I would like to ask you that you set a date for hearing and arguments in this matter after April 7. I regard this as one of the most important improvements to be considered in Florida. I believe it would be a great mistake and a little short of a calamity to hear Maj. Slattery's report disapproved and this improvement denied. I wish to be heard on it and submit the views of others, etc. * * *

Engineers do not alone build. No such word as "please" appears in this mandatory official notification to set a day for hearing and arguments after April 7. Representatives plead for favor, but influential statesmen may order. "A great mistake" was nearly made and a "great calamity" just avoided because of the alertness of a distinguished statesman who stopped an adverse report in the nick of time. A hearing was held, and after argument the engineers were visibly impressed with the political possibilities of the project, an angle not before considered, and so a statesman's views and Maj. Slattery's views were made the board's views. Funny how a little scientific help from statesmen helps matters.

This creek is without a boat line, according to the official report, but Army engineers recommended $733,000, providing a boat-line service of "twice a week" is "guaranteed." A remarkable service and onerous condition to demand in exchange for a paltry three-quarters of a million from the Federal Treasury, but it was only made after hearing the argument of a gentleman from Florida who knew what he wanted. According to the engineer's reports, it also appears that Kyle and Young are to get benefits through a water-power and land-reclamation project. Yet for some reason not hard to find, the Senate struck the entire item out of the 1914 House bill. It will come up again. Of course, the Oklawaha's commerce is nominal, but $733,000 can make commerce, because it keeps supplies going to dredgers, contractors, and other beneficiaries while it lasts, and is then reported by Army engineers as actual commerce, as I have shown. On this creek there is no need for the admonition, "Vessels large may venture more, but little boats should keep near shore," because there are no boats on the creek. All the boating is done on two railway lines that parallel the creek. Tourists and speculators demand Government money, but commerce will never need it. Is any protection afforded the Government by vacillating engineers who first repudiate such frauds, then swallow them without a grimace?

Incidentally, Florida is hotfoot after North Carolina, for the land of fruit and flowers is well represented, and St. Lucias Inlet, Biscayne Bay, Crystal, Indian Creek, Kissimmee, Choctawatchee, Apalachicola, Oklawaha, and so forth, will get proper recognition in the average annual waterway bill. True, real-estate projects occasionally bob up for recognition, but whenever the engineer's approval has been secured, that ends all worry—the Florida project by some strange necromancy gets into the bill whether big legitimate projects do or not.

A VALUED CONTRIBUTION.

At this point I insert an illuminating contribution alleged to have been thrown overboard by a shipwrecked sailor down on the Trinity River. Most likely it comes from a disgusted Army engineer who is doing experimental work drilling artesian wells for navigation—a man without an army. Possibly it may have been sent by some lonesome young Army officer down on the Coosa or Muscle Shoals who is now engaged in drilling trap rock for 150-foot dam foundations to be built by the Government in aid of the Georgia Power Co. or an $18,700,000 150-foot dam for the Alabama Power Co., as set forth in Document No. 20.

The contribution seems to infringe on the familiar "House that Jack built," and while bearing evidences of hasty, crude attempts at rhyme and meter, it may nevertheless compare favorably in sense and in value with fifty-odd engineering canalization schemes. Goose melodies on goose engineering is necessarily imperfect and impractical, but is frequently valued by childhood memories or scientific pride.

With this brief apology for its appearance, I append, properly acknowledged, a cynical contribution from which I have previously quoted in part as to different waterway projects:

IN THE KEG THE CHIEF BUILT.

Every rank, worthless project that goes in the keg
Engineers have approved, while the money we beg
'Till this waterway barrel gets all our spare chink,
For streams dry and thirsty, with nothing to drink.
The 13-mile bankrupt canal is ambitious
To get twenty millions—in war times propitious,
Which same sum, when given the Waterway Trust,
Will dam Muscle Shoals with war-tax gold dust;
And the dry Brazos—Trinity thirty millions desire
For artesian wells drilled to guard against fire,
While old Mississippi with determination
Grabs three hundred million for land reclamation.
Some small Buckeye ferries join in this cotillion
Thro' war-tax allotments for sixty-four million.
Even Ford limousines, while crossing the river,
Help make freight statistics, more cash to deliver,
While stray pools of water and Missouri sand
Bag twenty more millions for reclaiming land.
Hand in hand with contractors whose junk-laden scow
Makes half of the freight for the pork we allow,
Along with a water power for navigation
To give old St. Anthony a gold coronation.
If political pull distributes this malt,
When will Congress decide to call a sharp halt
In filling up kegs like the chief built?

WASTE IS NOT SECTIONAL.

Existing projects on which millions are annually wasted were criticized in the RECORD of April 10, 1914, and also of January 29, 1915, when the last bill passed the House before

its defeat in the Senate. While the great majority of these objectionable projects are in the South, others, past, present, and future are to be found in the North.

A $2,500,000 water power constructed between St. Paul and Minneapolis has been referred to. Others could be pointed out but I will conclude by calling attention to the Hennepin Canal bubble in Illinois, built by our Government on a promise it would save to Iowa farmers $20,000,000 in freight charges annually. The mockery of engineers' promises and pork-barrel methods is completely demonstrated on this 60-mile canal on which $7,576,496 have been spent and on which 11,856 tons of salt, sand, and miscellaneous freight was floated in 1913. Duplications in commerce statistics produced pitiful results, according to the Engineer's Report, after seven years of high finance canal traffic by Army engineers.

HENNEPIN CANAL—A SEVEN AND A HALF MILLION ILLINOIS CANAL—SALT FREIGHT COSTS $36.75 PER TON.

It costs the Government about $36.75 per ton to furnish a canal for 5,360 tons of Illinois salt, soft coal, gravel, rock, shells, sand, and 6,135 tons of grain and 78 tons of merchandise, all hauled various distances, not exceeding 60 miles in any case. If any fourth-grade pupil offered a table of statistics as useless as that found on page 2478 of the Chief Engineer's Report for 1914, he should be reduced to the primary class. Illinois passengers, launches, sand, and salt are hopelessly jumbled together; but, from out of the confusion, engineers assert that, counting all duplications of canal freight, the following tonnage passed through one or more of the 33 locks along this notorious canal.

Commercial tonnage (1913)—Hennepin Canal.

	Tons.
Merchandise	72
Grain	6,135
Rock	90
Salt	4,215
Lumber	283
Coal	639
Gravel	270
Shells	86
Sand	60
Total tonnage	11,850

Total Government expenditures on work (p. 2475)	$7,597,781.09
Total maintenance charge (1913)	132,033.00
Interest and depreciation figured at 4 per cent	303,910.00
Annual expense, about	436,000.00
1913 cost per ton for waterway	36.75

A loss of 35 per cent occurred in tonnage during the year, and is explained by the Engineer's Report, 1914, page 932, as follows:

The tonnage was about 35 per cent less than that of the previous year, the shrinkage being due to the smaller quantities of rock and earth and gravel carried by Government boats.

After spending seven and a half millions, the "commerce" falls off 35 per cent because a Government dredge is idle forsooth. Who will defend such amazing statistics or a canal that cost the Government $36.75 per ton to furnish a 60-mile waterway for an insignificant Illinois cheap heavy tonnage? Who recommended paying $7,500,000 for this baby's rattle that is found in the pork barrel? The engineers should explain.

Congress has provided a 33-lock, 7-foot canal connecting Chicago with the Mississippi River. The Government paid for this extravagant toy $7,597,781, and it is officially reported to have carried 11,850 tons of cheap freight, including 4,215 tons of salt, at an expense to the Government of about $36.75 per ton for 1913. Does it seem credible that Gov. Dunne and a body of Illinois solons would have the nerve to ask the Government to contribute for another canal?

TABLES CHIEF KINGMAN FORGOT TO GIVE.

No man opposes an intelligent policy of waterway improvement, but wild-eyed lobbyists are constantly urging Congress to dig deeper holes in the Treasury deficit in order to exploit fantastic new projects and in support of many worthless continuing projects.

Statistical hard facts disclose that, while practically all of our river commerce has rapidly vanished from the Mississippi, the Ohio, and the Missouri, we have expended, in round numbers, on these three rivers alone—

	Per mile.
Lower Mississippi, 1,000 miles, at	$100,000
Ohio to Missouri, 200 miles, at	86,000
Upper Mississippi, 600 miles, at	30,000
Ohio River (the Muscle Shoals lobby charges the Ohio River per mile expense at $84,000), 1,000 miles, at	40,000
Lower Missouri (the present project contemplates $75,000 a mile), 400 miles, at	25,000

Without adding one ton of actual commerce to these rivers, by the time the present delirious schemes are finished, as now proposed, we will have more than doubled the above enormous waste of $200,000,000. Some authorities say many times that amount. We have spent enough on these three rivers, without result, to maintain the Government agricultural department for a decade, or enough to construct a dozen Lincoln highways across the country by a Congress that refuses to spend one dollar for local highway aid. Enough money to buy a dozen modern battleships—and we have only begun the job on these three rivers, with a hundred others on the waiting list. Hundreds of millions for dredgers—not one dollar for highways.

Is it not time to take an account of stock to find out just where we have been dragged in our idiotic waterway investments?

APPROPRIATIONS AND COMMERCE.

The field of wasteful projects recommended by Army engineers is large, and as these projects increase, annual maintenance charges grow to huge proportions.

Although criticism may properly be lodged against some harbor projects which are surrounded by privately owned terminals, the commercial value of hundreds of ocean and lake harbors is significant when compared to a deserted river traffic.

The Mississippi, Missouri, and Ohio Rivers were given approximately $17,500,000 under the 1915 sundry civil bill and the 1915 $38,000,000 "economy" waterway bill reported from the Senate committee. Economy is not evidenced by the size of a bill, but by its character.

After deducting ferriage, floatable logs, timber, sand, gravel, levee-construction material, and soft coal that has floated down the Ohio and Mississippi for a half century in rapidly decreasing amounts, the following remarkable statistics appear, based on the 1914 Engineer's report:

HARDENED ARTERIES OF COMMERCE—THREE RIVERS GIVEN $17,500,000 IN 1915 BILLS.

	Tons.
Upper Mississippi (including duplications)	170,000
Lower Mississippi, no definite data, but probably under	200,000
Missouri River (as shown by Engineer's table)	24,000
Ohio River (Kingman's letter), average continuous traffic under	100,000
Total, less than 500,000 tons	494,000

ACTUAL TONNAGE OF FOUR LAKE PORTS GIVEN $499,000 IN 1915 BILLS.

	Tons.
Ashland, excluding 35,000 tons of logs	5,623,309
Milwaukee, average haul over 600 miles	8,647,230
Chicago, both harbors	13,275,000
Superior and Duluth, increase since 1890 is 1,545 per cent	46,875,000
Total	74,420,539

These four lake ports handled 74,420,539 tons. Excluding faked statistics and soft coal that has always floated in barges on a 3 or 4 foot channel, the rapidly diminishing river traffic on our three greatest rivers costs the Government from $10 to $25 per ton or more, annually, depending on basis of estimate; the lake traffic less than 1 cent per ton. The latter is for navigation, the former is for land reclamation and kindred schemes. Can any comparison give a more graphic picture of real waterways—and three deserted rivers on which approximately $200,000,000 have already been expended?

We may shift the blame onto shoulders of incompetent, foolhardy engineers, who have blindly led the blind, or we may denounce all the notorious waterway lobbies that hover around the Nation's Capitol like birds of ill omen, but it is all to little purpose unless we set our faces squarely against a system that is legislatively dishonest and shamefully wasteful.

Several aggressive members of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, it has been pointed out on the floor, are living close to one or the other of the three rivers named. Two members hail from the Great Lake region. Is there any inference to be drawn from this remarkable fact, or from the complexion of committees now found in other legislative bodies?

AN INDEPENDENT PRESS.

The press accomplished the defeat of the 1914 and 1915 pork-barrel bills. Members in both houses furnished the ammunition day after day and did what they could to expose the whole rotten system, but the press, magazines and newspapers combined, came to the rescue patriotically and stopped a $92,000,000 Treasury raid. Without that help it could not have been stopped.

Similar bills are promised at this session. All the army of disappointed dredgers, contractors, and lobbyists of every description who only shared in a measly $50,000,000 allotment, are on hand trying to get after their Senators and Representatives, so that the bill may be hurriedly pushed through just as it has always been hurriedly pushed through in the past.

The spot light of publicity placed upon that bill and the agencies behind it will help to secure its material shrinkage in size, or if unregenerated its absolute defeat, and with the help of the press a change in the whole iniquitous system may soon be brought about.

Preparedness and other great questions confront the people to-day, some of which are of vital importance and others of importance primarily to interested lobbies, but one of the greatest issues will be honest legislative action in behalf of our people.

A BRIEF RECAPITULATION.

In order to state a prima facie case I have tried briefly to present a few of many wasteful and questionable waterway projects contained in the last two river and harbor bills. Also a few vicious projects that received generous allotments from the Chief of Engineers in 1914 and 1915. Those allotments are seemingly no worse and no better than the committee bills which were defeated, but a saving of $42,000,000 could easily have been extended to $60,000,000, or more than double the appropriation made for agriculture, without seriously interfering with any legitimate commerce-carrying waterway that received aid from the allotments.

Counting the sundry civil waterway appropriations carried by a separate bill, over $60,000,000 was given by Congress last session for waterway purposes, and half of that amount, in addition to the $42,000,000 saved, I believe it has been demonstrated ought to have been saved, but was wasted. Not one dollar in ten would be contributed locally along the Ohio or Mississippi or Missouri Rivers to aid in projects recklessly undertaken by our Government. That fact I have endeavored to show as a compelling reason why the present prodigious waste should be stopped. Air-castle projects recommended by Army engineers have been financed by the Government until we have lost all sense of economy or proportion. Getting something for nothing from the Government would be unpopular if local contributions were required in a majority of cases by a discriminating, high-class waterway board.

Projects condemned by Congress in express terms have been presented, and it has been disclosed from the record that the Chief of Engineers within 30 days thereafter rode roughshod over legislative protests by allotting millions of dollars for condemned projects which any disinterested investigator must know are wasteful. Only conjecture can say what autocratic power determined the scandalous allotments.

Over a dozen other questionable projects that were given liberal allotments have been also briefly described—projects that have strong political pull but little else to recommend them. A score of other additional projects have been discussed more in detail to show the flimsy justification offered by Chiefs of Engineers for wasting hundreds of millions of dollars before these projects will be finished, and with countless others to follow. This exposition has been intended to supplement other facts regarding many projects presented last session and to put other Members on their own inquiry. With a little patience and labor any Member could have performed the service better than I have done, but heretofore I have encountered much difficulty in securing important information because not a member of the committee.

A COMMITTEE'S THANKLESS TASK.

By the action of those who may approve my humble efforts to reduce waterway waste, I have been placed on the Rivers and Harbors Committee. It is well understood that no committee has a harder or more thankless task to perform or is more beset by Members and constituencies demanding special favors. However much I may have occasion to differ from my colleagues in the committee, they are accorded the same sincerity of purpose which moves me to seek better legislative methods.

Representing in part a State ranking second in waterway commerce, I am thoroughly interested in general waterway development for the public use, but in no especial project there or elsewhere.

Present waterway legislation is inexcusably wasteful, as I have endeavored to show. The hopelessness of an utter lack of system must be recognized before we look for a change, and with that objective I have given facts upon facts, officially vouched for, to prove the country is covered with useless projects and wasteful river canalization schemes, no two of which can be shown to be of any permanent value to commerce or to the country or locality supposed to be benefited.

THE SCOPE OF WATERWAY EXPENDITURES.

Equally certain is the demonstration that Army engineers have been rainbow chasing and squandering hundreds of millions of public funds without any comprehension of the ultimate value of projects or responsibility for such expenditures.

From the standpoint of proper governmental functions and public economy, the problem becomes far more important when we discover that waterway appropriations have doubled within the past dozen years, and will be quadrupled before the conclusion of another decade unless we call a halt in the mad waste that has been disclosed.

Two-thirds of present expenditures are annually made on rivers and creeks which have lost practically all of the commerce possessed long before Uncle Sam began experimenting through engineers with his gold cure. Private reclamation, private water powers, purchases of bankrupt canals, and no end of private promotion schemes having the engineers' approval now pound on Treasury doors demanding their share of funds raised from war taxes and income taxes. Demands are increasing by leaps and bounds, according to the official records, until waste and extravagance in waterway appropriations run wild and have communicated the same atmosphere of irresponsibility to several other appropriation bills.

WASTE AND INCOMPETENCE.

Direct responsibility for much of our extravagant waterway policy has been charged to Army engineers, and particularly to Chief Kingman and his predecessors, who determine the policy of the corps.

Everyone must realize the engineer is a creature of circumstances and can no more withstand political pressure than can subordinate officials in other positions. Those who chant the praises of the engineer and engage in fulsome eulogy are usually among the favored, or hope to be favored elect in the matter of approved projects.

Responsibility for the system is primarily ours, and while it may be presumptuous to point out our own faults and to suggest a remedy, it is unwarrantable for anyone to captiously criticize. I have tried hastily, if imperfectly, to present sufficient facts that will induce investigation on the part of every Member. In the RECORD for September 3, 1914, will be found abundant confirmation of my views as to the blind slough into which we have run our waterway craft. A careful analysis of the unhealthy character of our present waterway intoxication is there presented by Senator Burton, the ablest waterway champion and best waterway expert in the country. For days he placed the facts before us, and by no subterfuge can his condemnation of conditions be avoided.

Of the $850,000,000 spent on waterways, presumably over a half billion dollars has been wasted without adding one ton of commerce or benefiting navigation. The report of the Public Buildings Commission, Document 936, Sixty-third Congress, should convince any Member that of the $163,000,000 spent for public buildings within the past 12 years, over $50,000,000 have been spent largely for local pride rather than necessity or utility. I do not assume to estimate approximately the amount of waste found in these bills or in the military and naval bills during the past two decades. Based on voluntary statements made to me by men who occupy or have filled high positions which command the confidence of the country, I do say that inexcusable waste through locality demands, political pull, and undesirable legislative methods in these four classes of appropriations now reaches over $50,000,000 annually, and possibly the demonstrated waste would be found to reach nearer double that amount.

THE CURE.

In view of the poisonous and rapid growth of waste, it is incredible that present conditions should long continue. Will the reformation come from within? It is doubtful, because the champions of local expenditures for waterways, public buildings, naval and military stations, and munition plants have grown more avaricious and threatening than ever before. The cure may not come from within, but will come from the country, which recognizes that an existing wrong is more important to deal with than anticipated local benefits, for which taxpayers must roundly pay in any event.

To the present administration comes an opportunity rarely afforded. With our people burdened by war taxes and an enormous defense program, the President has it in his hands to enforce retrenchment and economy, to be reached through high-class administrative boards removed from political influence. This is a first step toward a national budget. If he fails to grasp the opportunity, then the candidate in the next campaign who comes nearest to inviting the confidence of the country will be the man who declares war against waste and extravagance. All candidates will find a promising field for such efforts.

I do not underestimate great problems which confront the country and have an influence in determining individual selections, but the public is in a mood to demand a reduction of waste. If we can not cope with the evil ourselves, it must come through leadership by the chosen official for the highest honor within the people's gift. Of the many able men whose names

are linked with the honor surely one or more will be found ready to assume the formidable task.

A REAL CAMPAIGN ISSUE.

What an issue with which to go before the American people—paying war taxes in times of peace to keep afloat wasteful pork barrels. With a depleted Treasury and knowledge of specific charges against extravagance, not one Democratic leader, from the President down to the humblest committee chairman, has yet raised his voice in opposition. Public-spirited Representatives, irrespective of party, have opposed legislative waste, but what leader has pointed the way to an honest bill? Democratic legislative tinkering has been charged with business uncertainty and unrest. Political exigency has been alleged to be a controlling motive, but while these experiments have been followed by failure and war taxes, thus far not one word against wasteful appropriations. Will the public demand that a halt be called in this annual waste until a scheme of national defense is provided for? Waste is criminal at this particular time, and preventable waste is destructive at all times.

It is the most logical, forceful, and important issue with which to fasten public attention. Other issues may have their day, but reckless waste in public funds will be suitably punished by those who contribute the funds when they discover official mismanagement. Great expenditures may be justified by governmental conditions, but waste is demoralizing to legislative methods and Treasury balances.

A FIGHT THAT WILL ULTIMATELY WIN.

As an economic issue the fight against the "pork barrel" must ultimately be successful, and I believe river waste ought to be settled outside of political parties or partisanship. Men here are as honest as in any other legislative body in the world, and no man will seriously seek to draw distinctions between the honesty of Republican and Democratic Members; but a vicious system has been fastened upon us by the Army Engineer Corps and partially by congressional yielding to the influence of powerful lobbies and mistaken constituencies.

If we face the issue squarely, we will remove the waterway question from political pull as we have removed the railway question from congressional influence. No plan can be devised that will be perfect, but while the American people demand of Congress genuine comprehensive improvement of legitimate waterways, they also demand the abolishment of a miserable makeship that has its lowest and worst form of development in our annual "pork barrels."

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

I have presented these matters in a hurried way, and now, as promised, I am ready to answer the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SWITZER] and, after him, other gentlemen who may desire to ask questions.

Mr. SWITZER. The gentleman from Wisconsin has criticized the Board of Army Engineers for allotting money to projects which he claims were criticized by some Members in the last session of Congress. I will ask him this question: The Board of Army Engineers have expert knowledge on these matters, and when they recommend certain appropriations to be made, and such confidence is reposed in them by the Members of this House that a majority of the membership vote them full authority to make the allotment, and those propositions are also indorsed by the Senate, does the gentleman believe that the Board of Army Engineers should then disregard their honest expert judgment and disregard the indorsements of a majority of the Members of both Houses, and that they should not expend this money according to their judgment and according to the way a majority of the Members of both Houses have voted, but that they should expend it according to the way a minority desire in their criticisms?

Mr. FREAR. Is that the end of the question?

Mr. SWITZER. Does the gentleman believe they should follow their honest judgment, or does he believe that they should refuse to allot money to projects which have been criticized by a mere handful of the membership of this House?

Mr. FREAR. Will the gentleman take his seat now and let me answer that question? Let me say, in response to that, the Army engineers have recommended what purports to be $100,000,000 for the Ohio River project, which is one of the most wasteful projects of all, and so declared by a Senator in the Senate last session.

Mr. SWITZER again rose.

Mr. FREAR. I must object to any more such questions. I told the gentleman I would answer his question. I will give him the statistics. If he will read an analysis of the statistics which I will present he will find that there are not 2,000,000 tons of continuous traffic on the Ohio River. You can not get away from the fact. Of course, the Army engineers desire to follow out the wishes of Congress. I wish I could tell you something that was told me in confidence by an Army engineer, but I have no right; but I know this, that under this present law the board is reported to be desirous of rejecting 25 per cent of the projects that are to-day in existence; and I believe that one of the best and most profitable investments of the Government would be to do away with the Ohio River canalization project on a river that has already had $57,000,000 out of a possible $100,000,000 investment.

Mr. SWITZER. I should like to have the gentleman answer the question I was asking about the Board of Army Engineers, not the Ohio River.

Mr. FREAR. I speak of the Board of Army Engineers and the Chief of Engineers and all of them as being only too willing to carry out what they think to be the wishes of Members of Congress. I assume that that is so. That is a weakness of the system.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. FREAR. I do.

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman from Wisconsin refers to a resolution which he has introduced calling for an investigation of the so-called waterway lobby. I assume that he has included in that the National River and Harbor Congress?

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. And possibly all local bodies. I want to say to him that if he thinks he ought to have an investigation I am not only glad to join him in having it, but that personally I have so much confidence in his fairness after he knows some of the facts that I would be glad to see him on that committee.

Mr. FREAR. That is very generous.

Mr. BORLAND. I would be glad to have him come to Kansas City and find out how much activity there is devoted to navigation and how much is devoted to reclamation. I think perhaps if he would do that he would revise his ideas.

Mr. FREAR. Just a moment to answer that, and then I will answer another question. At this point let me say that I will adopt as a complete answer to the gentleman's statement at this time, of the purpose of the Missouri River work, the fact that the last money recommended by engineers to be used by the Government on the Missouri River for 1915 was $1,400,000 for revetment purposes, which is necessary for reclamation, but only an incident to navigation.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Will the gentleman yield at this point?

Mr. FREAR. Yes; certainly.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Everybody who has any knowledge whatever on the subject knows that it will be impossible ever to make the Missouri River navigable, and insure a 6-foot channel from Kansas City to St. Louis, without revetting the banks. That stream runs through an alluvial country. The channel is shifting from time to time, and its channel never can be made permanent unless it is fixed by revetment. The people will do the leveeing and they will reclaim the land if the channel of that stream is once fixed, which can only be done by revetment. That has been demonstrated by 40 miles of work that was done more than 25 years ago.

Mr. FREAR. In reply to the gentleman, let me say that the best authority on river navigation who has faith, Mr. Barnhart, has built experimental barges on the Mississippi River, and he says he can run on that river to-day with 8 feet, which is an abundant depth for all purposes, but he says he can not get the commerce. It will not be given to him by shippers, because the railroads take all the business in spite of his offer. You have the railroads on both sides of the Missouri River, and you do not send any commerce down the river to St. Louis. Why? The question of terminals, of convenience, of transfers, and many other causes have entered into the loss of traffic on the Missouri, the Mississippi, and practically every other river in the country.

Mr. BORLAND, Mr. POU, and Mr. TREADWAY rose.

The SPEAKER. To whom does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. FREAR. I yield first to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND].

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman's argument is based on the knowledge he has on the subject?

Mr. FREAR. I may have more knowledge than appears in the record—from those familiar with river traffic, from the official records, and from the judgment of many able men.

Mr. BORLAND. If the gentleman's knowledge appears to be imperfect, then we will have to judge of his argument on that basis.

Mr. FREAR. I will reply to any question. I do not care to have an argument.

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman referred to 19,000 tons on the Missouri River in 1914. Where did the gentleman get those figures?

Mr. FREAR. By deducting from the report of the 1914 commerce on the river the sand and gravel and floatable wood.

Mr. BORLAND. Does the gentleman know that he is at least 50 per cent out of the way?

Mr. FREAR. I know that I am absolutely accurate, because I have made the calculation from tables I have submitted.

Mr. BORLAND. Has the gentleman ever read the engineers' report that he referred to, in which it is stated that it was 37,000 tons in 1913, and not 19,000 tons?

Mr. FREAR. I took the figures of the items that I have referred to from the last 1915 report. The only engineers' report submitted to Congress.

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman is willing to stake his argument on the accuracy of that statement, is he?

Mr. FREAR. Unquestionably so.

Mr. BORLAND. All right. I want to get that in the RECORD.

Mr. FREAR. The gentleman has had it three or four times.

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman divides the cost per ton into the construction charges of that river, does he?

Mr. FREAR. When you get $35,800,000 into the river, and then figure on 19,000 tons floated, you will have over $80 per ton annual charge.

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman divides the construction charges per year by the amount of tonnage handled on a river in the course of construction.

Mr. FREAR. Oh, no.

Mr. BORLAND. Is that the method the gentleman would follow in building a railroad? If he had a railroad that was 9 per cent completed, according to the engineers' report, would he estimate the tonnage carried on the basis of the 9 per cent completed and divide it into the total cost of the railroad?

Mr. FREAR. When commerce was on the river before a dollar was ever spent on the Missouri, you had 295 boats, while to-day you have two boats of the steamboat line of Kansas City that have been referred to here, and that is practically all, as I understand it. Can anything be more significant? We have spent over $20,000,000 and now have 19,000 tons of freight annually to show for it. In all we will have spent $35,800,000, and for what?

Mr. BORLAND. One more question. Col. Deakyne's report shows——

Mr. FREAR. I have not seen it. It is not published.

Mr. BORLAND. He shows on the present project on the Missouri River there has been expended $3,577,000 between Kansas City and the mouth. Of this amount $300,000 was for maintenance and $600,000 for the construction of the plant, leaving $2,600,000, instead of $15,000,000, that the gentleman has been talking about. Did you not see that in the engineer's report?

Mr. FREAR. I have taken the Missouri River as a whole. That is all we have got to go by. You have practically no commerce on the river except a little at your particular point. I can not divide up the Missouri River commerce in sections, as to what goes over this part and what over that.

Mr. BORLAND. Yes; you can.

Mr. FREAR. I have taken the information known to every member of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, and that is the basis of making a calculation which covers all funds and all commerce. The lower river recives 95 per cent of all funds.

Mr. POU. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. POU. The gentleman stated that $853,000,000 had been appropriated, and that probably one-half of that had been wasted.

Mr. FREAR. I believe so.

Mr. POU. I would like to have the gentleman tell us how much of that enormous sum was appropriated and wasted while his party was in power and while the distinguished gentleman that he speaks of was at the head of the Rivers and Harbors Committee.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Speaker, I have endeavored to avoid partisanship or politics in my remarks; but I will say this, that if your party—the Democratic Party—has the courage of its convictions, considering that the people of the North contribute 95 per cent of Federal taxes and are paying war taxes to-day, your party will pass in its caucus a resolution that there shall be no wasteful river and harbor bill in this Congress. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. PLATT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Yes; certainly.

Mr. PLATT. Did not the gentleman think it possible that the railroad rates could be so raised as to make these expensive river improvements——

Mr. FREAR. The gentleman asked that once before, last session, but that is merely speculative, as I understand the question.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Certainly.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The gentleman says that approximately $853,000,000 has been expended on river and harbor improvements in this country. Can the gentleman tell how much France has expended?

Mr. FREAR. No; but I trust France can make a better showing than we have.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. It has expended several hundred millions. How much has Germany expended?

Mr. FREAR. I do not know exactly, but in the gentleman's own town, with less than a million dollars appropriation, there were 247,000 tons handled last year and only 19,000 on the Missouri River, after an expenditure of $21,000,000. I do not care what Russia or Africa or any other country expends, because this is an enormous accumulation of wasted money, which we condemn.

Mr. TREADWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Certainly.

Mr. TREADWAY. I would like to ask if I understood the gentleman correctly that he would favor harbor improvements rather than river improvements?

Mr. FREAR. No; I favor harbor improvements where they are legitimate and river improvements where they are legitimate.

Mr. TREADWAY. Did I not understand the gentleman to say that only $135,000 had been given to Boston Harbor out of this late appropriation?

Mr. FREAR. You did.

Mr. TREADWAY. Is not the gentleman aware that the 35-foot project in Boston Harbor is practically completed and that this allotment of $135,000 is principally for maintenance?

Mr. FREAR. I understand so.

Mr. TREADWAY. Further than that, I would like to ask the gentleman if he considers Boston Harbor one which it is justifiable to spend money upon?

Mr. FREAR. Of course I do.

Mr. TREADWAY. Will the gentleman join me in a well-directed effort to dredge a 40-foot project in Boston Harbor?

Mr. FREAR. I will consider the matter carefully, but I understand a Boston paper had a communication last year that the improvement was not necessary at this time.

Mr. TREADWAY. I would like to ask the gentleman if he thinks this matter is to be tried before the press of this country or by Congress here upon its merits?

Mr. FREAR. Oh, no; we will examine it and pass upon it after we hear the proposition.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Yes; certainly.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. I am a new man, and I would like to have my mind clarified a little——

Mr. FREAR. I do not know that I could help to do that. [Laughter.] I know the fault would be mine if I failed.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Does not the gentleman feel that if the streams of this country are not kept as navigable streams, the great transportation monopoly of this country would absolutely absorb the country and throw it into distress?

Mr. FREAR. I say no; not for a moment. The intelligence of the American people has been such that they have passed an interstate-commerce law for the absolute control of interstate-railway rates. In the State of Texas you have one of the best State railway commissions in the country. It regulates freight rates, and if you attempt to lower the tariff below reasonable rates at waterway points, some one in the interior has to make up the difference, because railroads are entitled, under the Constitution, as every man knows, to reasonable rates.

Mr. CULLOP. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Certainly.

Mr. CULLOP. I would like to ask the gentleman if there is not a 9-foot channel in the Mississippi River from the mouth of the Ohio?

Mr. FREAR. Yes; there is.

Mr. CULLOP. And has been for years, which large boats could use at all times of the year. Now, has the commerce on that river been increased or decreased since that stage has been maintained?

Mr. FREAR. It has decreased about 95 per cent, and we have less than 200,000 tons of actual commerce annually, deducting the coal which floats down the Ohio, which has been

previously counted on the Monongahela and on the Ohio at different locks.

Mr. CULLOP. Can the gentleman give the percentage of decrease?

Mr. FREAR. I will say that the general decrease is estimated at about 95 per cent on the upper Mississippi and the lower Mississippi is almost as much.

Mr. CULLOP. Has the number of craft using the river decreased yearly?

Mr. FREAR. In proportion to the commerce; yes. In other words, there is not a through boat from St. Louis to New Orleans to-day, or was not last year, whereas there were hundreds of them in the past.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Certainly.

Mr. SANFORD. Will the gentleman make clear to me what the nature of the remedy is that he proposes?

Mr. FREAR. I think a high-class commission of the character of the Interstate Commerce Commission, calling before it the best experts they could get, would take it away largely from the political influence now exerted. We are all human. I understand that. I do not discount for a moment the influences brought to bear here, or the integrity of every Member on the floor, but such a commission, like the Interstate Commerce Commission, would take away the actual pulling and hauling in the committee or on this floor, as we see it session after session.

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask another question in regard to the charge that the railroads are opposing the improvement of the rivers because they will have a monopoly of the freight-carrying business in the event of failure to improve the rivers. Are not their transportation charges regulated now by the Interstate Commerce Commission in order that they may not charge anything they please, so far as interstate traffic is concerned?

Mr. BORLAND rose.

Mr. FREAR. Entirely so. I anticipated that that would bring up my friend from Missouri on the same argument that he made before, which was a very good argument, in which I was interested, but the law is unquestioned and the commission's authority is being constantly exercised.

Mr. BORLAND. Does not the gentleman know that the waterways are greater regulators than the Interstate Commerce Commission?

Mr. CULLOP. And do not the States in their individual capacity pass laws regulating the traffic intrastate so as to avoid any monopoly there?

Mr. FREAR. They have done so in practically every State in the country, as I have suggested, and as I stated to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DAVIS], his State has one of the best commissions in the country.

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman is familiar with the fact that the 951-mile rail haul from Chicago or Milwaukee to New York is made for about the same price, having water competition, as three to four hundred miles in the Southwest.

Mr. FREAR. Oh, I wish I could enter into that, for I should be glad to furnish an answer to the gentleman.

Mr. BORLAND. Has not the gentleman enough information to state that?

Mr. FREAR. The gentleman from Missouri knows, of course, that ocean freight rates are lower from our country to Europe than proportionately on railroads for the same distance. But it is an entirely different proposition. Every man who has made a study of the transportation question knows the condition that exists on the rivers is entirely different from that which exists on the Great Lakes or the ocean, where you can use large boats and where the conditions are entirely different. The best authority in the country is agreed on the subject.

Mr. BORLAND. So that the gentleman's country has water competition and gets low freight rates?

Mr. FREAR. In cases like that, which are very exceptional, certain communities may have advantages through deep-water traffic, but it can not be stimulated on rivers under present conditions, either in the judgment of experts or in the light of past experience.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

A FEW ATTACHED EXHIBITS.

Defeat of a single project like the private water power Muscle Shoals $18,700,000 expenditure will pay for printing the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD indefinitely, taking into consideration maintenance charges and interest. A defeat of several equally worthless projects now hammering at the Treasury doors will save many additional printing bills for a century to come. For this reason I am induced to present several significant exhibits and to attach a short proposed bill. I also desire to call attention to a discussion of financial problems confronting Congress which appeared in the December North American Review from the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. FITZGERALD. Therein he significantly says, "Probably the simplest work of public officials is devising popular ways to deplete the Treasury." He further suggests that the example of public officials is followed by private organizations and special interests now undertaking to finance countless projects, involving enormous appropriations at Government expense. His words invite the serious consideration of every legislator, for certainly a speaking acquaintance will never be established between Government expenditures and Government revenues until a control of the former is placed in the hands of some responsible body. With a budget system in mind, controlled by one committee, I have suggested a rough draft for a national waterway commission. The bill briefly refers to the commission all waterway projects in order to secure an overhauling of present unscientific and wasteful plans and to further work intelligently toward genuine waterway development. It also provides that at the beginning of each session all proposed expenditures shall be submitted to the Appropriations Committee for examination and approval.

EXHIBIT No. 2.

A bill (H. R. 6821) creating a national waterway commission.

Be it enacted, etc., That a commission is hereby created and established, to be known as the national waterway commission, hereafter referred to as the commission, which shall be composed of five commissioners, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Not more than three of the commissioners shall be members of the same political party. The first commissioners appointed shall continue in office for terms of three, four, five, six, and seven years, respectively, from the date of the taking effect of this act, the term of each to be designated by the President, but their successors shall be appointed for terms of seven years, except that any person chosen to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of the commissioner whom he shall succeed. The commission shall choose a chairman from its own membership. No commissioner shall engage in any other business, vocation, or employment. Any commissioner may be removed by the President for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office. A vacancy in the commission shall not impair the right of the remaining commissioners to exercise all the powers of the commission.

SEC. 2. That each commissioner shall receive an annual salary of $10,000, payable in the same manner as the judges of the courts of the United States. The commission shall appoint a secretary, who shall receive an annual salary of $5,000, payable in like manner. The commission shall have the authority to employ and fix the compensation of civil engineers, clerks, and other employees as it may from time to time find necessary for the proper performance of its duties and as may be from time to time appropriated by Congress, and in making appointments for continuous service the commission, so far as practicable, shall select its employees from the classified service.

All property of the United States in the hands or under the control of Army engineers or other officials or of private individuals or public contractors, including dredges, steamboats, barges, yards, and other property used in the improvement of public waterways, shall be placed under the jurisdiction and authority of the commission.

SEC. 3. That the Secretary of War may, if practicable, detail such Army engineers as are requested by the commission to assist in organizing and establishing a comprehensive system of waterway improvement, providing that such details of engineers shall not be made to the detriment of their military duties.

SEC. 4. That the commission shall have the authority and it shall be its duty to make an investigation of all waterway projects now constructed in whole or in part by Federal aid. The commission shall prepare a complete and succinct statement, by years, of the amount heretofore appropriated for each project, the estimated amount required to complete such project, a report of the commerce now served and to be served, the character of such commerce given by separate items so far as can be furnished, the source of information, the interests to be served, the kind of water craft used, and such other information as may be useful in determining the public use and value of the project. The commission shall also furnish Congress, at the earliest practicable date, information concerning all harbors and waterways now improved or being improved in whole or in part by Government aid, showing the amount of commerce, character of terminals or landings, ownership thereof, and, so far as practicable, ownership of regular lines of craft used thereon; and the commission shall also report its recommendations for the finishing of the projects now being constructed or modification of existing plans or abandonment of work on any project, together with findings upon which such recommendations are based.

The commission shall further ascertain and report what projects are now being improved for purposes other than navigation, and if for power development, a full statement of interests concerned, officers and stockholders, public use to be served, if any, private or public contribution toward expense of construction, and the commission's recommendations thereon. Said commission shall further ascertain and report what projects are now being carried on in whole or in part for land-reclamation purposes, the character of such project, amount of lands to be recovered, estimated value of such lands, ownership thereof, and contributions now being made by beneficiaries toward such expenditures, together with the commission's recommendations.

The commission shall make a full investigation into all work now being performed by the Mississippi River Commission, the amount of money heretofore expended on such river, character and permanency of work performed, and reclamation interests now being served, if there be any, a full statement of contributions by public or private interests toward said work, together with a comprehensive and intelligible report of the probable cost of the present plans of levee construction or other river improvement now being undertaken, the percentage of project completed, and this commission's recommendation thereon. Such

Mississippi River report shall be separate and distinct from reports on other projects now under improvement by the Federal Government.

All of such data and all other available information of a pertinent character affecting particular projects or entire waterway improvements now being conducted by the Federal Government shall be collected in convenient form and presented to Congress in installments at the earliest practicable date.

When the commission shall have reason to believe at any time that the proposed project is not for general use of the public or will not warrant further expenditures, or if contributions shall be required to be furnished before further appropriations are made or further expenditures authorized, such commission shall immediately report to Congress, with a preliminary recommendation thereon, and shall furnish a copy thereof to the United States Treasurer. That thereupon, when so recommended, the Treasurer shall withhold all funds theretofore appropriated not specifically obligated under existing contracts and shall refuse further payments until subsequent and specific action shall be had thereon by Congress.

SEC. 5. That prior to the presentation of any new waterway project appropriations the commission shall cause a careful survey of the proposed improvement, and if it shall appear such project is to serve a public use and is feasible, the commission shall thereupon collate data showing the estimated cost thereof, commerce to be served, water craft to be used, public terminals furnished, and contributions recommended to be made by public or private interests, together with such additional data as has heretofore been specifically required to be furnished on existing projects. The commission shall thereupon transmit to the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives a full report concerning such new project or projects, its recommendations thereon, and, if requested so to do, all other and further information that may be required by the Committee on Appropriations.

Whenever the commission shall determine that any waterway project is primarily for power or land-reclamation purposes or to serve special interests, the commission may recommend Government aid for such project, notwithstanding the special interests to be served, and shall prepare data showing the proportionate amount of Federal aid recommended, together with suitable restrictions as to audit and payment of funds from the Public Treasury. Such recommendation shall be presented as a proposed separate bill to the Committee on Appropriations of the House and shall not be embodied in any general waterway appropriation bill by such committee.

Whenever any new survey shall be proposed for any waterway project the commission, prior to such survey, may require data to be furnished showing the public use and prospective commerce to be served and such other information as may be desired, and a brief synopsis of such information shall be furnished to Congress by the commission to accompany any recommendations made for new surveys.

All existing waterways, new projects, and new surveys shall be classified, so far as practicable, prior to each regular session of Congress, together with estimates of appropriations required for maintenance and improvement for the ensuing two-year period, and a brief report as to each project considered shall be separately prepared and, with the commission's recommendation thereon, shall be placed in the hands of the Committee on Appropriations of the House at the beginning of each session.

Whenever the Appropriations Committee so requires, the commission shall furnish additional data concerning any project, and shall further aid the Committee on Appropriations when requested so to do in the preparation of the regular river and harbor bill, which shall be prepared and presented by the Committee on Appropriations of the House.

The commission shall further compile and cause to be published at the earliest practicable date for the use of Congress an intelligent, concise statement of past waterway expenditures by the Government and of amounts needed to complete all continuing projects, and shall further give estimates of future obligations to be incurred by new projects recommended for construction. The commission shall give preference in its recommendations to Congress of appropriations needed to complete the more important projects, and, so far as practicable, shall enter upon a program looking toward the early completion of such projects.

The commission shall make a thorough investigation of reasons for loss of river traffic and shall make recommendations for the reestablishment of such traffic. It shall ascertain and determine the most available craft for river use, and, as soon as practicable, shall prepare plans and build experimental craft for such purpose.

Whenever reason therefor shall appear the commission may fix reasonable freight rates on all interstate water-borne traffic by common carrier and upon all such traffic on navigable waters wholly within the State, subject, however, to the jurisdiction now conferred by law on the Interstate Commerce Commission to fix maximum joint rates between and over rail and water lines.

The commission shall determine the reasonableness of wharfage or water-terminal charges, whether such terminals are owned by private persons or municipalities, and all river and harbor improvements, including terminal facilities, shall be under the supervision and control of the commission.

Whenever the commission shall determine that unprofitable railway freight tariffs are maintained in any given case in order to prevent waterway competition, it shall be the duty of the commission to make a report thereon in duplicate to the Interstate Commerce Commission and to Congress, with recommendations that Congress give power, if need be, to the Interstate Commerce Commission for fixing minimum railway rates.

The commission shall at the earliest practicable date adopt an intelligent system of natural waterway improvement and shall perform such other and further duties as may present themselves from time to time.

Whenever it shall be desirable to secure sworn testimony from any witness or witnesses relating to any project or to navigation generally, or whenever the commission shall have reason to believe that private interests are secretly or improperly seeking to influence the commission or to force the passage of any private or public waterway measure through Congress, the commission may cause a hearing or summary investigation to be held, and for that purpose may issue summons, subpœnas, or other writs in the same manner and under the same procedure as is more specifically set forth in the act to regulate commerce approved February 4, 1887, and the amendments thereto, which portions of such act relating to procedure, so far as applicable, are made a part of this act, and may bring before such commission all parties believed to be informed concerning the facts or interested in the passage of such measure. A complete record shall be preserved of the testimony taken at such hearing and a certified transcript thereof shall be transmitted immediately to the Committee on Appropriations.

SEC. 6. That all unexpended balances to the credit of any project not specifically obligated under existing contracts shall, from the date of the passage of this act, be transferred by the Treasurer to the general fund, and all vouchers thereafter paid by the Treasurer shall be upon order of the national waterway commission.

SEC. 7. That the sum of $500,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, be, and the same hereby is, appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury, to carry out the provisions of this act.

EXHIBIT No. 3.

A GREAT ECONOMIC PROBLEM.

Practically $150,000,000 has been spent on the entire Mississippi River by the Government. During that same period the loss to actual river commerce has reached approximately 95 per cent. Every waterway bill gives from five to ten million dollars or more for the Mississippi, and about 80 per cent of this amount goes to the lower portion of the river, due to the potent influence of the levee lobby.

The great State of Illinois with its 600-mile Mississippi River border extends along one-third of the river's navigable length, and I quote from one of the world's greatest newspapers, the Chicago Tribune, November 26, 1915, an editorial which gives wholesome advice and warning as to this waterway:

A FORCE THAT GREETS A HALF MILLION DAILY READERS—PORK AND THE LOWER MISSISSIPPI.

It is reported that Representatives of the States along the lower Mississippi, headed, of course, by Senator RANSDELL, of Louisiana, hitherto one of the mainstays of the rivers and harbors pork barrel system, will attempt to segregate appropriations for the Mississippi from other rivers and harbors appropriations.

The proponents of the plan feel that the claims of the Mississippi for Federal aid are discredited by association with such projects as digging out the Kissimmee or Coosa for mythical fleets to navigate.

Senator RANSDELL and his associates are tardily arrived at this conclusion, which in a broader form has been pressed upon them by enemies of the log-rolling system. Legitimate river and harbor improvement can not be injured by the attack upon the monstrous outrage which the rivers and harbors lobby and shortsighted or wrong-headed Congressmen have defended and are defending so stubbornly. That is perfectly clear, but it has been one of the sinister aspects of the fight that responsible Members of Congress as well as the organized lobby have tried to make the assault upon a vicious system and its wholesale waste appear to be an attack upon great beneficient public works. The inevitable inference from this is that the innocent were inextricably allied with the guilty, the builders with the wasters.

The sooner this folly is ended the better for those who have legitimate demands to press, and we hope the report referred to above is a sign of approaching candor and public spirit.

So far Senator RANSDELL and his associates have moved forward. But they have not gone far enough. Let us have a little more plain talking.

What the States of the lower Mississippi littoral are after is not navigation, but flood protection. So far as navigation is concerned there will be no more if the channel is dug a mile deep. There is channel enough now. What is needed for its utilization is a development of terminals and an enforced coordination of rail and water facilities, including rate arrangements. Appropriating millions for dredging and levee making will not accomplish this, though it may be profitable as congressional pork and a relief of the local pocketbook.

The reluctance of representatives of the littoral States to admit this is easily enough understood, because the case for Government aid for levee work is not as strong as it might be. The denizens of the river country have no more right to ask the Nation to preserve them from the normal incidents or processes of nature in their region than denizens of mountain country have to call upon the Nation to protect them from avalanches and landslides, or of prairie regions to save them from high winds or droughts.

That is, they would have no better claim if conditions were left as normal. But the conditions confronting the lower Mississippi States are not altogether normal. Undoubtedly there always have been floods and overflown bottom lands in that region, and to that extent, if it could be measured, the floods would be a condition for local agencies to deal with. But the Mississippi floods in our day are in some measure the result of the artificial drainage developed in the upper valley States, where lands are drained and swamps and lakes reclaimed and forests cut down, with the result that the tributary waters of the Mississippi system are not released as gradually as they were under primitive conditions, but are poured into the main channel in overwhelming quantity in the spring.

There is, therefore, an unescapable justice in the claim that the States affected by these abnormal floods should be assisted from the general funds in a fair proportion as between local and national responsibilities.

But if this reasoning supports reasonable claims for Government aid to the lower Mississippi, it also presents the controlling fact that the Mississippi problem is one which can not be solved in detail and should not be dealt with in sections as at present. Under the present wasteful system the Southern States are given money to spend on local expedients which mitigate the flood evil but do not affect it permanently. This system, or want of system, should be done away with, and if Senator RANSDELL and his associates are farseeing they will work against log rolling and the pork-barrel evil which discredit all rivers and harbors appropriation in the minds of a rapidly growing number of Americans, and they will work openly, sincerely, and vigorously for a commission of the highest character to study the total problem of the Mississippi drainage.

Until such a commission has been created, has made an exhaustive study of the many-sided problem, and reported, no more money should be spent upon the Mississippi or its confluents than is necessary for urgent needs.

The problem of the Mississippi is one of the greatest constructive physical problems of the Nation, past, present, and future. Have we not intelligence enough to free its solution from petty local selfishness and greed and approach it now in a broad and fundamental way?

EXHIBIT No. 4.

[From Collier's National Weekly, Jan. 8, 1916.]

A VOICE HEARD AROUND THE WORLD—SMASH THE RIVER BARREL.

To Senator RANSDELL, of Louisiana, and his fellow backers of the new $46,000,000 waterway bill, "pork barrel" is one of the ugliest terms ever spoken or printed. Nearly all of the 20 or more speeches delivered at Washington at this winter's meeting of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, of which Senator RANSDELL is president, were vehement denials that the annual bill is a wasteful, log-rolled measure. The Louisiana Senator, in an interview, characterized the charge that the old system is a pork barrel as "a slanderous accusation as false as Satan himself." Yet the Senator, being somewhat of a specialist in river legislation, can hardly fail to remember the Hennepin Canal project. After being told that this canal, which gives Chicago, on the Great Lakes, connection with the Mississippi, would surely save shippers from fifteen to twenty million dollars a year, the Government dug it at a cost of $7,401,100. The work was completed in 1909, and in 1914, the last year of which we have an official record, the traffic, hauled an average of 50 miles, was 26,856 tons, only 12,222 tons of which was commercial freight. Interest on the investment and maintenance amounted to $512,520, so for every ton of commerce shipped on the canal the people were out $41.93—40 times the corresponding rate charged by Middle Western railroads. Here are the facts about one waterway failure. We could tell of scores of equally wasteful projects—jobs that never could have been shoved through Congress as separate measures. There are about 250 items in the new river pork barrel, and probably less than 30 of them would have a ghost of a chance if submitted singly. The pork system is pretty near the most insidious force in our National Government. Its wastage on waterways has been nearly $500,000,000—and that is a modest beginning. Congress must abolish the barrel and place the problem of river and harbor improvements in the hands of an appointive commission, as far removed as possible from log-rolling influences.

EXHIBIT No. 5.

FIVE BILLION DOLLARS WANTED BY THOMPSON.

Inspired articles are furnished the press throughout the year by the "mutual-bribery" river lobby, but discriminating newsgatherers are rarely misled. I quote from a recent clipping that advocates a bulwark of public defense built out of pork barrels:

[By John Edwin Nevin, staff correspondent of the I. N. S.]

WASHINGTON, *November 20.*

Advocates of continued expenditures for river and harbor work do not intend to permit their projects to be sidetracked by the administration's preparedness program in Congress. They made it very plain to-day that they will fight hard to continue all projects now in progress. To do this they will endeavor to couple this improvement work with the preparedness plans. The "pork barrel," according to its friends who now are gathering here, instead of being a medium of waste of public funds in reality is a "bulwark of defense."

S. A. Thompson, secretary of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, who is here arranging for the meetings of the organization next month, issued a statement to-day designed to show that Germany's extraordinary efficiency in present world war is due as much to her ability to move troops quickly by her elaborate system of waterways as to her railways.

So important is the waterways improvement work considered, Thompson said, that the German Emperor has not permitted this work to slacken, despite the stress of the war.

The National Rivers and Harbors Congress will approve for presentation to Congress when it meets figures which it is claimed will show that should this Government provide a "pork barrel" of $5,000,000,000 to be expended on waterways improvements and the deepening of important harbors it would then hardly be abreast of Prussia in comparison to the relative size of the countries.

According to Thompson the congress plans a spirited fight to prevent the Nation-wide movement for military and naval preparedness forestalling liberal river and harbor appropriations. The slogan is to be that the improvements suggested are a part and parcel of any national preparedness program. Meanwhile, it already is certain that the diversified interests which will demand appropriations will be the chief danger to the administration defense plans.

"DAM MUSCLE SHOALS."

A large and vigorous lobby is expected to remain in Washington to put through this particular project, which was stricken from the last House bill, but reinserted before the bill was reported to the Senate for its deserved slaughter.

With $18,700,000 of public money at stake to aid the Alabama Power Co.'s private water-power scheme, it is not surprising that the lobby is here and expects to remain here. A congressional investigation of its methods and widespread influence would put to blush the insignificant record of a certain distinguished Col. Mulhall, whose efforts were amateurish in comparison. Practically four pages of news items in the Huntsville Times of May 12 last are devoted to the Rivers and Harbors Committee's visit to this water-power project. Over every page in striking black leaded headlines appears the sentiment, "Dam Muscle Shoals."

Patient taxpayers who have been contributing $4,550,000 in Government money during the past few years to stimulate "navigation" for 6,000 tons annually at Muscle Shoals, will be inclined to join in the sentiment, so imperfectly spelled, particularly upon learning that nearly $19,000,000 more, recommended by engineers, is now demanded by the lobby.

A HUMAN DICTOGRAPH WITH MOVIE ATTACHMENT.

During last summer the Alabama Water Power Co., with its associated membership, was host to thousands of visitors, including a few congressional guests.

After the latter had become reasonably inspired by their surroundings, and roast ox, all legislators, together with prominent railway officials, while yet in a grateful and joyous mood, were urged to express themselves before the multitude.

Glancing over an elegant publication recently put out by the power-company lobby, an observing wag said:

Isn't it a system? All caught in the act. First urged to speak and then photographed in the act with nine different stars all speaking on the same page and platform. Then the human dictograph, the Huntsville Times, overhears admissions of its guests and duly records the same for future use. Photographed and dictographed in one act; what a system.

The Tennessee River Improvement Association is the name under which the lobby sent out invitations and financed traveling expenses and entertainment on the occasion of the visit. I quote literally a few headlines and utterances which were considerately sent me:

EXHIBIT No. 6.

COL. PATTEN'S GREAT ADDRESS.

Preferring to confine himself to statistical facts, Col. John A. Patten, of Chattanooga, and president of the Tennessee River Improvement Association, read his address, which dealt mainly with the great transportation system to be brought about by the development of Muscle Shoals. Mr. Patten's address was a masterpiece and will prove of great value in convincing Congress of the worthiness of the Muscle Shoals proposition.

With the crowd in good swing and Warrior's water powers literally "damned," a distinguished speaker promises to put through the Muscle Shoals $18,700,000 water-power grab. It is easy after one knows how. Again quoting:

SENATOR ——— SPEAKS.

Capt. Ashcraft already had the big crowd in good swing and happy mood for the speaking hours, and presented Senator ——— for the next speech. Senator ——— spoke of his long and untiring friendship for the waterways of Alabama, and now that he had damned the Warrior he is ready to take hold of the Tennessee and put it through. Much applause followed this declaration. Concluding his speech, Senator ——— was requested to present the other speakers of the evening, which he did in the following order:

SPARKMAN SPEAKS.

The first of the visitors to be presented was Representative SPARKMAN, of Florida, chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. Mr. SPARKMAN declared that he was openly in favor of the project, which, he said, is worthy of the consideration of the best thought of America. He stated further that the companion project, that of the manufacture of water power, should also appeal to Congress with considerable force. He concluded by paying compliments to Senator BANKHEAD, and said that the fuller improvement and development of the Tennessee was the only task which confronted the Senator 20 years ago which is now completed.

A vigorous champion of the Kissimmee River, eight months dry during the year, according to Engineer's report, was also eloquently impressed.

FAVORS PROJECT.

Senator ———, of Florida, acting chairman of the Committee on Commerce, expressed himself as an advocate of the project. "I am in favor," he said, "of unchaining the power which lies latent in the shoals and which is capable of making additions to your wealth and power undreamed of and transforming this section into the greatest manufacturing area in America. The only obstacle is more ways and means, and we hope that this will ultimately be removed."

FAVORED UNDERWOOD.

Representative GALLAGHER, of Illinois, declared that the enthusiasm of the people of the Tennessee Valley was equal to that of his own exerted two years ago in the presidential aspirations of OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD. He spoke in favor of the project and expressed the hope that the people would convince all the members of the committees of Congress.

Railroads are not scared. A score of officials join in the barbecue and laugh at competition. Again quoting:

SOUTHERN'S PRESIDENT WITH US.

Fairfax Harrison, president of the Southern Railway Co., related the fact that the Southern was started by Alabamians in a determined effort to obviate the impossibility of getting a boat beyond Muscle Shoals. He declared that it was not his policy to beat down possible competition before it got on its feet; that he welcomed the prospective competition of the Tennessee River; and that he was sportsman enough to cooperate in the completion of the plans.

The "competition" reached 5,800 tons in 1913, after an expenditure of $4,500,000 at Muscle Shoals.

OHIO CONGRESSMAN O. K.

Representative SWITZER, of Ohio, declared that, inasmuch as the Government had been liberal enough to appropriate $77,000,000 in the interest of the Ohio River, that he would of necessity favor the project of the people of the Tennessee Valley. Representative BOOHER, of Missouri, declared that his position regarding the improvement of the Tennessee was recorded in his vote.

SENATOR ——— ENTHUSIASTIC.

Senator ———, of Louisiana, declared that, while his investigation had given him new instruction, it had not converted him. "For," he naively added, "I was already converted. As a matter of fact, I have followed Senator BANKHEAD'S lead so long that I have come to consider my action in that respect as a matter of course."

President Wilson is quoted by able authority:

ADAMSON, OF GEORGIA, SPEAKS.

Representative ADAMSON, of Georgia, chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, urged that the people of all the State rise up and destroy the obstructionist. He declared that there were Members of Congress who protested against the Government doing its own work, against the Government permitting a State to do the work, and against the Government joining hands with an individual or a corporation and doing the work. He declared, however, that President Wilson, whom he declared to be the biggest man who ever sat in the President's chair, would lend his influence, and that as a result a bill would be passed permitting the conservative cooperation of the Government and an individual company.

TEXAS CONGRESSMAN TALKS.

Representative BURGESS, of Texas, declared that he was an advocate of the elimination of Muscle Shoals prior to his coming to Alabama.

"What I have seen," he said, "has only served to strengthen my convictions. Our engineers compose the ablest body of engineers in the world, and in their enthusiastic recommendation of this project and in the enthusiastic campaign of the people of Alabama I join most heartily."

Representative BURGESS, continuing his speech, declared that the one great problem before the American people was not war or tariff or finance, but transportation. He added that it was his purpose to do everything which would cause the South to blossom like the rose, and that in his dream he beheld this section the most prosperous section of a prosperous Nation, and that the solution of the problem of waterway transportation would be the cause of that dream being realized.

WE "SHOWED" THE MISSOURIAN.

Congressman BOOHER, of Savannah, Mo., said he was one of the fellows that had to be shown, but having been convinced before he got here, he was quick to see the wonderful possibilities of Muscle Shoals and would support and work for it henceforth.

SENATOR ——— SPEAKS.

The Senator from Alabama made a favorable speech and was greeted by liberal applause. The Senator, of course, reaffirmed his loyalty to Alabama and how it is possible to carry great projects like this through to success. A great friend of the Tennessee is the Senator, who concluded by saying enough cyanamid could be produced at Muscle Shoals within one year to pay for its entire development.

SOUTHERN RAILWAY PARTY.

The Southern Railway Co. operated a special train to the occasion bearing the following executive officers, all of whom have avowed their cordial and hearty cooperation and sympathy with this great project. * * *

Then follows a long list of prominent railway officials who fervently desire to increase "navigation" and "competition" on the Tennessee and so join in the celebration of proposed railway competition.

TALKS OF BOND ISSUE.

What! Vote for a bond issue to pay debts of the State brought about in a great degree by extravagance and graft? Not with us, if our heads keep level. What could it do but put us in debt and cause our taxes to increase more and more. Our plans rather should be to do away with those unnecessary offices now leaches in the public crib and stop so much leakage by way of graft and embezzlement. (Enterprise Ledger.)

This last article sounds disjointed, but it is copied from the editorial page of the same issue of the Huntsville paper. It is here inserted because apparently a ray of economic sunshine has penetrated into the sanctum of the Enterprise publication, but possibly getting money from the Government is not entitled to the same reasoning as that so graphically set forth by the Enterprise editor and quoted apparently with approval by the Huntsville paper.

MORE INFORMATION FROM THE SAME PAPER.

A few suggestions from the same issue occur on the duty of the Federal Congress toward the Alabama Power Co. No mention is made of the fact that a defective tariff producer, bearing the name of a distinguished Alabama statesman, makes larger war taxes necessary if we are to continue water-power missionary work in that State.

Again quoting:

TENNESSEE RIVER IMPROVEMENT AND A FEW FACTS.

The Federal Government assumed the work of improving the Tennessee River at Muscle Shoals in 1828, relieving the State of Alabama of the work which had been undertaken in a small way. * * *

Senator Burton estimates the Government's expenditures on Muscle Shoals at $4,555,655.

There has been expended on this project by the Federal Government nearly $3,200,000. Had it been completed in 1835, istead of 1890, some good might have been derived from this large outlay of money, but the plan was proved obsolete before the project was completed. * * *

This criticism can be lodged against scores of engineering projects.

$84,000 PER MILE FOR THE OHIO.

The Government has expended for improvements on the Ohio River and headwater tributaries $81,141,719. For the Tennessee, $110,603,337. An average per mile, for the Ohio, of $84,000, and for the Tennessee less than $15,000. * * *

ENGINEERS RECOMMEND PROPOSITION.

The chief engineers of the United States Army, the greatest and most competent in the world, have said the project is practical, feasible, and good. They are the captains, the final judges to make the decision. This has been done and this people call upon Congress to say amen to it.

The enthusiastic invitation for this visitation was accepted and in good faith all are happy. The Committee of Commerce of the United States Senate was there; the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the National House lent their presence; prominent Representatives in Congress from Alabama, Mississippi, and Tennessee, and other States were on hand to lend their cooperation, as were members of the legislatures of these States; various other public officials and the public came and made the occasion memorable for future posterity.

The Muscle Shoals project having been recommended for congressional adoption by the United States engineers, it was very appropriate, of course, for the keynote of the occasion to be "dam Muscle Shoals and dam it now."

NINE STATES ACTIVELY INTERESTED.

The Tennessee River Improvement Association made it known to its guests that the citizens of nine States within the vast drainage area of the Tennessee River earnestly desire the early completion and permanent improvement of the river's navigation.

Pledges of support from the visitors, as far as proper, were secured to the adoption of the project recommended by the Rivers and Harbors Committee in document No. 20, Sixty-third Congress, second session, and transmitted by the Chief of Engineers under date of May 18, 1914.

The visitors made a thorough examination of the merits of possibilities to commerce on the Tennessee River when that river's navigation is permanently improved and are now as enthusiastic boosters for the success of this great proposition as are people along the whole stretch of this great river.

Visitors appreciated the fact that the Tennessee River Improvement Association was not seeking to find the cause for discrimination in congressional appropriation in favor of the Ohio as against the Tennessee River and between the Tennessee and the Warrior, but whatever the discrimination they are not due to respective capacities of these rivers. The Tennessee wins in future.

WILL ADOPT REPORT.

With many of the members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors making a personal inspection of the Tennessee River, they feel confident that they will create sufficient interest to secure the adoption of the engineer's report providing for the development of the Tennessee River, which calls for the opening of this river to navigation and the opening and development of the Muscle Shoals project, which has for the past half century been the dream of the people of the Tennessee Valley section of the State.

These people believe that at last their dream is about to come true. In every way they are showing their interest in this great project.

Will their dream come true? Will the public purse give $18,700,000 to this Alabama water-power company? The people of the Tennessee Valley are not dreaming, but a few interested parties are hypnotizing the press, the public, and possibly Congress with a scandalous proposition that will become a nightmare to the party in power if once adopted.

—

EXHIBIT No. 7.

A STRAW AS TO THE NEXT BILL.

From a press clipping widely copied throughout the country I quote with headlines appearing in the conservative Washington Star, of December 23, 1915, omitting many additional projects mentioned in the article that only serve to help make up a "staggering" aggregate:

[From the Washington Star, Dec. 23, 1915.]

DEMAND IN HOUSE FOR "PORK" BILLS—COMMITTEE HEADS PLAN BOTH WATERWAYS AND PUBLIC BUILDING MEASURES—ARMY ENGINEERS FAVOR $120,000,000 PROJECTS—TENDENCY ON PART OF MEMBERS TO INSIST ON LIBERAL APPROPRIATIONS.

Despite prospects of a fight in Congress over revenue legislation and the pleas of party leaders for economies, Chairman SPARKMAN, of the House Rivers and Harbors Committee, is planning to report a general waterways bill, and there was talk to-day of the intention of the House Public Buildings Committee, headed by Representative CLARK of Florida, to report an omnibus building bill.

It developed to-day that when the Rivers and Harbors Committee meets after the holidays to determine its course there will be up for consideration favorable reports of the Army engineers on new projects aggregating about $120,000,000.

REQUESTS FLOOD COMMITTEE.

The committee is being flooded with requests of Members that projects in their States be taken care of, and these, together with other data and favorable reports of the War Department, will be filed away for consideration. The committee may decide to restrict the bill to continuation of projects already authorized; and if so, a contest likely will develop in the House on this issue. There is already evidence of an intention on the part of many Members to insist upon more liberal waterway appropriations.

There are numerous big projects on file, favorably reported on by the War Department. Some of these larger ones are:

CALL FOR MANY MILLIONS.

New York-Delaware Bay waterway, $20,000,000; Tennessee River, at Muscle Shoals, $18,701,000; East River and Hell Gate, N. Y., $13,400,000; waterway, Beaufort-St. Johns River, Fla., $14,400,000; Chesapeake and Delaware Canal, purchase and improvement, $8,000,000; Cumberland River, above Nashville, $4,500,000; Red River, La. and Ark., $6,020,000; Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, Cal., $5,860,000; waterway, St. George Sound to the Rio Grande River, $3,632,910.

Plans as to the most of these projects are for comparatively small initial appropriations, which, however, would commit the Government, in principle, to their ultimate completion.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I object to any unanimous consent being given at this time for that purpose. I desire to proceed with the business of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes and the gentleman from Oklahoma objects.

COAL AND OIL LEASES.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 406) to authorize exploration for and disposition of coal, phosphate, oil, gas, potassium, or sodium, and move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for its consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman calls up the bill (H. R. 406), and moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for its consideration.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. CULLOP in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk proceeded with the reading of the bill.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Washington, Mr. HUMPHREY.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the speech of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] and have no desire to take part in that controversy, except that there are certain statements he made in reference to the Government engineers that were not made clear, at least to me. I tried to understand the situation. I will ask the gentleman a question or two, because I think as a member of the Rivers and Harbors Committee and a Member of this House there ought not to be any misunderstanding about these charges against the engineers. I do not think the gentleman intended there should be.

Mr. FREAR. Certainly not.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The first question I want to ask the gentleman is this: I understood him to say there was a report in regard to the Missouri River that he was unable to secure.

Mr. FREAR. That is right; I went to the Rivers and Harbors Committee and asked for it.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Who did the gentleman ask?

Mr. FREAR. I asked the secretary.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The Chief of Engineers?

Mr. FREAR. No.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Did the gentleman ask a member of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors?

Mr. FREAR. No. I asked the secretary of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, and he said it had been mislaid, and——

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I want to ask the gentleman——

Mr. FREAR. He said it was to be sent in later on.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The gentleman stated something about the Chief of Engineers in relation to the Falls Power Co.

Mr. FREAR. I read his statement to the Secretary of War.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. What was the gentleman's criticism there, that he had refused to pass on the development of the power?

Mr. FREAR. That he had refused to submit an estimate when requested to do so; that it was because of the urgency of improving other projects that ought to be cared for, and I made a comparison between Muscle Shoals and Great Falls.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Submitted an estimate for what?

Mr. FREAR. Of the expense of obtaining power or for developing the project.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Who asked him to make this?

Mr. FREAR. I think the Secretary of War. A letter was sent by him to the Secretary of War—I am not sure for whom the request came, but he refused to do it.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. It was not a matter of navigation?

Mr. FREAR. No; it was a matter of power production.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I want to get who was it that made the request.

Mr. FREAR. I think the District Commissioners. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] now says the commissioners made the request.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. If it be true it was simply a power proposition, while these others were for the purpose of river and harbor improvements, I do not think any criticism would lie against the engineers for failure to go out and investigate for power purposes while these other improvements were under consideration. The question of water power is not the question with which Congress and the Government engineers have to do primarily.

Mr. FREAR. That is a matter of consideration. There is practically no navigation at Muscle Shoals, and never will be; yet $18,700,000 is demanded from the Government at that point.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I understood the gentleman to condemn in very striking terms the improvement upon the Ohio River——

Mr. FREAR. I did not enter fully upon it, as I did not have time.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I understood the gentleman to quote Mr. Burton upon the proposition. I would like to know whether Mr. Burton agrees with the gentleman as to the inadvisability of improving the Ohio River.

Mr. FREAR. I did not quote Senator Burton on the Ohio project. I would not want to say as to that, but I will say other Senators declared, on the floor of the Senate, it was the worst project in the bill, and I could give the gentlemen their names.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The gentleman is not prepared to say that Senator Burton, who has condemned so many of these projects——

Mr. FREAR. I do not condemn them——

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The gentleman does not know whether or not Senator Burton condemned the Ohio River project, although he has condemned many others?

Mr. FREAR. I could not say.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. This is all I want to ask the gentleman.

Mr. FREAR. I did not want to be misunderstood, and I thank the gentleman for the opportunity to reply.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I want to say in regard to another criticism the gentleman made in reference to the engineers, he said that they had expended $2,000,000 upon projects which he claimed had been condemned by certain Members of the Senate.

Mr. FREAR. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I said they had allotted that money, two million five hundred thousand and some odd dollars.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I hardly think the gentleman's statement in that respect is a fair criticism, and I will tell him why. He does not point out or show what the $2,000,000 was for. Very likely a good portion of that $2,000,000 was expended in the preservation of work that was already under way. Probably a great deal of it was expended to prevent loss to the Government upon projects that were already constructed, and the fact that they requested the expenditure of $2,000,000 upon projects that some one might criticize upon the floor of Congress it seems to me is an unjust insinuation against the engineers. Now, the gentleman made another insinuation against the engineers that seems to me is without justification. He pointed out they had expended a great deal of money upon a certain river or project where the traffic was small, and, on the other hand, they had expended very few dollars upon the harbor of New York where the traffic was very great. Now, I do not think the gentleman ought to make that kind of a statement. He said he wanted to be fair, and I hope he did want to be fair; but that insinuation was wholly unfair. Why, you take the two great ports upon the Pacific—the port of San Francisco and the port of Seattle, the two greatest ports upon the Pacific Ocean—and not a single dollar was expended upon either one of them because it was not necessary. They did not ask that any money should be expended. You take some of the greatest harbors of the country, and not a single penny was expended upon them because it was not necessary. Now, because the engineers give money to some project that carries less tonnage than the New York project or the San Francisco project or the Seattle project is not any reason for criticism. I have been surprised——

Mr. FREAR. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes.

Mr. FREAR. Did the gentleman hear Mr. Hurlburt, of New York City, when he said how much money was needed for New York Harbor, and they could not get it because Congress refused, and the gentleman knows New York has been urging——

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I did not, but I am calling the attention of the gentleman directly along this line, that he points out an isolated fact and says there is one condition over

here where there is a harbor that has a great traffic and has only a few dollars, and here is another that has less traffic and has so many dollars, and from these two disconnected facts wishes the House to believe that the engineers have done something wrong. Such argument is unwarranted and hardly conforms to the gentleman's oft-repeated statement that he wanted to be fair. Now there is one other statement which the gentleman constantly referred to. As a member of the committee, I will notice it for a moment.

He seems to be greatly distressed about some lobby. Now, I think there has been more demagogy about this question of lobby before Congress than any other one question, perhaps, that we have had. As a member of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, I want to get all the information I can from everybody about these projects, and I do not know where we are going to get the information about them except from people who know about them. I do not think that any man who wants to do exact justice by these projects and by the country objects to getting all the information he can from any source; and I think any man who is so weak that he is afraid he will be coerced by some lobby to vote money out of the Treasury unjustly is unfit to be a Member of this House. [Applause.]

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

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

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I understand it, the district engineers are appointed to furnish to the committees and to Congress reliable information as to the respective projects. Will the gentleman point out what is the need of any outside source of information, such as these congresses and others which he has referred to, if there are individual engineers to furnish Congress reliable information?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes; I could point out strongly, I think, and satisfactorily to any reasonable mind, why it is necessary. We do not need any additional advice as far as the engineering problems are concerned. We are willing to follow the engineers, and we usually do. But when it comes to the other part of it, to the traffic, to the advantage it will be to the locality commercially and to the general conditions surrounding, I do not think that the Government engineer has any better judgment than some other intelligent citizens who live in that community and who know the conditions better than it is possible for him to know. The Government engineers go from place to place. They do not always stay in the same locality. And we want the people who live in the neighborhood of these improvements to come here and give us all the information they can as to the value from a commercial standpoint of these improvements.

Mr. Chairman, if I have any time left I will yield it back.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for one hour.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, the bill under consideration (H. R. 406) is, with a few minor amendments, identical with the bill that passed this House September 23, 1914. It relates to coal. The first eight sections are devoted to coal, the next five sections to oil and gas, the next four sections to phosphates, and the next three sections to sodium and potassium, in the order mentioned. Fifty-three million acres of coal land have been withdrawn in the West and held under present withdrawals as the coal areas in the public ownership in the United States. Twenty-five million of the fifty-three million have been tested out, examined, and classified by the Geological Survey, and have been found to be definitely valuable for coal. A rough estimate of the amount of coal yet in public ownership in the United States, as made by the Geological Survey, is 10,000,000,000 tons of bituminous coal, 30,000,000,000 tons of semibituminous coal, 50,000,000,000 tons of lignite coal, making a total of about 450,000,000,000 tons of coal in the public-land States still owned by the Federal Government and about 150,000,000,000 tons, or one-fourth, in private ownership.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. FERRIS. I will.

Mr. STAFFORD. Reading the gentleman's report I notice the figures he has just given, but found no reference as to the amount of anthracite coal that is now on the public domain and not appropriated.

Mr. FERRIS. I do not have that. I think there is a very little amount of it.

Mr. STAFFORD. There is, of course, some anthracite to be found in the Matanuska and Bering Sea coal fields.

Mr. FERRIS. This bill does not apply to Alaska on coal.

Mr. STAFFORD. It does not apply to Alaska, yet his report does give the total amount of coal not only in the United States but also in Alaska.

Mr. FERRIS. No. This is exclusive of Alaska. As the gentleman from Wisconsin will recall, we passed an Alaskan coal bill that became a law.

Mr. STAFFORD. I remember that.

Mr. FERRIS. So far as coal figures are concerned, this bill has no application to Alaska at all, and the tonnage I have quoted is exclusive of Alaska.

Prior to 1873 there was no coal law on the subject at all. Coal land went to patent as part of homesteads, different forms of homesteads, and went into private ownership, and have been sold and resold, and peddled about here and there, until 150,000,000,000 tons have gone into private ownership in that way. To show how some of the coal lands went, I will say that some of it went as part of railroad grants. Congress has in the past, under different grants, granted to railroads 159,125,734 acres of the public domain. Some of this has been proven valuable for coal, and some of it is being mined by the railroad companies, and in some cases the railroad owns both the mines and the transportation facilities, and it makes it extremely oppressive for those who burn coal to buy coal when the transportation lines own the production.

From March 3, 1873, to June 20, 1913, only 458 coal entries, aggregating 586,000 acres, have been made. As stated a moment ago, Alaska figures are not included at all, and the bill, so far as coal is concerned, has no application to Alaska.

Some of the objects of the bill, we think, are these: First, we believe it will open coal lands and bring some competition to the coal trusts and for the benefits of the public. Second, we attempt to, and we think we accomplish it, to divorce production from transportation, and I think that is a necessity that is recognized by all parties here in the House. Third, we think we bring about development of the millions of acres of coal land that are lying idle, at least some of them, and thereby reduce the price of coal to consumers, and thereby bring about development of the dormant mineral products of the earth, and thereby practice conservation and other uses.

We think we have a provision here that will bring about the better treatment of labor and that will improve labor conditions. Only last winter gentlemen will recall that out in Colorado and in other coal-mining sections we had a lot of labor troubles, and the militia were called out several times. We think we have placed some helpful provisions in the bill in that regard.

We believe that the bill will give an area large enough in the lease to enable a coal company to put up a plant and properly mine coal in an economical way, and we think it will be beneficial to practical development.

Mr. MADDEN. What area does the bill give for any one plant?

Mr. FERRIS. It allows a maximum of 2,560 acres. One of the great complaints against the present coal law is that under it they can not get an area large enough to justify the putting up of a plant that will produce coal economically.

We have a provision in the bill providing for the minimum royalty of 2 cents a ton. That, to one who had not thought of the subject, would seem an extremely low royalty. Of course, that is a minimum royalty, but even that will bring an enormous revenue into the Treasury, if it were applied to the General Treasury, or to the reclamation fund, to which the proceeds go in this instance. But the bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to go beyond 2 cents a ton when it is feasible and when the conditions warrant it.

The bill is not hatched up, of course, by the committee or by myself, but it was drawn and drafted by Secretary Lane, in the Department of the Interior, aided by the Geological Survey and by the Bureau of Mines, after consulting with coal people and going into the proposition in a far-reaching way; and the bill that we bring to you is the result of their labors and the result of our labors and of such investigations as we could make on it.

The bill is distinctively a leasing bill. It does not authorize the sale of the coal lands, although it does not repeal the existing law. For those who think the existing coal law is adequate, we do not repeal it, but leave it intact. But for those who believe in new and improved methods of development, we have prepared the bill to meet their view.

Members from the far West in good faith, I know, have asserted that this leasing makes Federal provinces out of the far Western States, and they speak of bureaucracy and all that sort of thing. I can not agree with them in their opposition, as to minerals. I do not agree now, and have not in the past agreed, to the leasing of agricultural lands of any sort. I believe the homestead laws ought to be extremely liberal, so that men can

acquire lands for agricultural purposes, so that they can own them in fee as their own. But I do not think that rule ought to prevail as to minerals.

Is this proposition of leasing coal lands a new thing? Not at all. Nearly every civilized country in the world except our country has the leasing system. Let me name some countries that have it. They are Australia, New Zealand, Canada, and all the Provinces of Canada. These countries are very near to us; that is, close by. We have copies of their forms of lease, and statements of the methods followed in leasing. We do not have to go outside of our country to find ample precedent for the leasing of coal lands. For instance, the State of Colorado has a leasing law. That State leases its own coal lands. We have copies of their leases here. The genial gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] is the ranking member of my committee. Although I think he is opposed to a leasing law for the Federal Government, yet his own State administration, in his own State, leases its coal lands. Of course he has a perfect right to hold his view, but this is only a case of the Federal Government doing precisely what his own State is doing within the limits of the State.

As to the genial gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], whose face I do not for the moment see, but whose voice we often hear, this bill only does for the lands owned by the United States precisely what his State does for the lands owned by that State. They have a leasing law in Wyoming. I have copies of the leases which show that this law is more liberal than his State law is in that regard. But his hand is raised in protest here against the Government doing the very thing they do in his own State.

Then again, from the State of Idaho, we have on our committee the genial gentleman [Mr. SMITH] who does not agree with us on the leasing, yet in his own State, with the party, his own party, in power, there is a leasing law, and everybody stands by it and is for it.

Then again, from the State of Montana, we have a member on our committee and I believe he does agree with us, and his State has a leasing law. The State of New Mexico also has a leasing law, and the State of North Dakota has a leasing law; and the State from which the distinguished gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SINNOTT] comes has a leasing law, and that State leases its coal lands.

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

Mr. FERRIS. Yes.

Mr. SINNOTT. But it is not a long-distance leasing law. You do not have to go 4,000 miles to confer with the officials having charge of the matter.

Mr. FERRIS. I know that is true, but nevertheless the State of Oregon is doing with respect to its own coal lands precisely what the Federal Government proposes to do with its coal lands, namely, to lease them and get a royalty from them and pay it into the reclamation fund to develop the West. We hear things said here with earnestness and apparent good faith which nevertheless, when analyzed and brought down to particular facts, do not pan out.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him for a moment?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes, I will, in just a moment. The other day we had the water-power bill up, and the most vigorous and almost the only protest made against that bill was made by the genial gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL]. At the close of the debate, when the bill had passed almost by unanimous consent, the gentleman from Wyoming made his motion to recommit it and substitute his bill for ours. His bill contained a proposition—and I want the House to hear me on this, just to show what this condition is—the bill he offered in his motion fixes a minimum price of $1.25 an acre and a maximum price of $20 an acre, and directs the Secretary of the Interior to dispose of those lands at the best price. Now I do not believe that the gentleman from Wyoming can be sustained in Wyoming on the practice of selling water powers at a maximum of $20 an acre.

Let me quote from his bill; it is section 5 of the Mondell substitution:

> That such right of way, occupation, and use as is in this act authorized is granted upon the condition that the grantee, its successors, or assigns shall pay to the United States Government the market value of all timber or wood cut or removed from any such right of way or reservoir site or adjacent lands at the time of cutting and before the removal thereof and as fixed by the Secretary of the Interior; also for all lands included within such areas or rights of way or reservoir sites, not less than $1.25 per acre nor more than $20 per acre, to be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior and paid at the time the map or maps provided in section 2 hereof are filed: *Provided*, That for rights of way exclusively for purposes of irrigation there shall be no charge imposed for material, earth, stone, or timber, or lands used.

I do not think anyone can defend such a bill. If any committee should ever report such a bill, it would be shot to pieces on this floor so even the author would not know or recognize it. The House will never agree to such a proposition. I do not believe there is a man anywhere who can sustain himself in his own State, where the people understand what he is doing, who is here, who will take a position of that sort. As between an intelligent leasing law and the sale of all the power sites in the United States at a maximum price of $20 an acre, as provided by the bill of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], I think the people of his State will take their choice on the right side if they have a chance to do it. So much is said to blind them and so little said to enlighten them. I do not fear the results of a just leasing law for coal and oil lands if the people can ever be made to understand it. It is to help them and benefit them. Members speak here as if some great wrong was to be ushered in on them. No such thing is either intended or accomplished.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. I yield to the gentleman now.

Mr. MADDEN. How much will this coal land yield an acre at 2 cents an acre royalty?

Mr. FERRIS. Oh, no one knows. I gave the gentleman the figures—about 450,000,000,000 tons, all told, in public ownership. That is a rough estimate. No one knows how fast it will be mined. No one knows just what a single acre will produce.

Mr. MADDEN. You must know how many tons there are to an acre.

Mr. FERRIS. Oh, no; no one knows that. Of course, there are estimates.

Mr. MADDEN. If you know the depth of the vein——

Mr. FERRIS. It varies. A vein might have 50,000 tons under one acre and there might be 2,000 tons of lignite under another acre, and another acre might have none at all. I do not pretend to know. My figures are in the aggregate, and are the best available figures.

Mr. MADDEN. It seems to me that these geologists in the Department of the Interior ought to be able to calculate with some accuracy about what the yield to the Government per acre is going to be under this leasing law.

Mr. FERRIS. They have classified about 25,000,000 acres. There are 53,000,000 acres withdrawn, and of that 53,000,000 acres some will not yield any coal at all. The coal is down under the ground. They have made rough estimates from borings as to the total amount of coal, and their estimate is that there are about 450,000,000,000 tons in Government ownership and about 150,000,000,000 tons in private ownership.

Mr. MADDEN. So the conclusion has been reached that 2 cents a ton would be a fair royalty?

Mr. FERRIS. No; that is the minimum. It may be more, but can not be less.

Mr. MADDEN. What would be the maximum?

Mr. FERRIS. There is no maximum. They can go above that as far as the conditions in each case warrant.

Mr. MADDEN. Some time ago, when these conservation bills were before the House, it was argued by some gentlemen that a dollar a ton royalty for this coal up in Alaska would be a very small royalty, and that it would yield a very large income to the Government. I am glad to see that gentlemen have come down from the clouds to the earth and to a place where they now believe that a reasonable royalty is what ought to be received.

Mr. CULLOP. Will the gentleman permit me to answer his question, or rather make a suggestion at this point?

Mr. FERRIS. Let me answer it first. No member of the committee who has given any attention to the subject, and no other gentleman who has given attention to it at all, has advocated a royalty of $1 a ton on coal. That would be preposterous. That is as much as the coal is worth all told at the mine.

Mr. MADDEN. And more, too.

Mr. CULLOP. The rule for ascertaining the amount of coal is 1,000 tons to the acre for each foot of thickness of the vein, so that a vein 5 feet thick would produce 5,000 tons of coal as you work the mine out from the shaft.

Mr. MADDEN. That would be $100 an acre, at 2 cents a ton.

Mr. CULLOP. Yes; and as you work it back, 800 tons more, which would make 1,800 tons in all to the acre for each foot of thickness. As you work a mine from the shaft out you leave nearly one-half of the coal, and when it is worked out to the limit of the lease or holding then it is worked back, or all taken out, and in this process of cleaning up it produces, as a rule, 800 tons more to each foot of thickness per acre, so that under that rule of measurement, which is regarded as a good one, there are 1,800 tons per acre to each foot of thickness, and a vein 5 feet thick would produce 9,000 tons, which, at 2 cents a

ton royalty, would make $180 an acre; so that 2 cents a ton is a good royalty. Operators would hesitate to lease at that price per ton in producing fields. Such a royalty would be regarded high, and in developed fields if such a price could be secured it would be a splendid bargain. I should think if the Government can lease its coal lands at 2 cents a ton royalty it will be making a splendid bargain, and if it has the amount which the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] has just stated, it would in such event derive an enormous income from such a deal.

Mr. FERRIS. I am obliged to the gentleman for his statement. He has had more practical experience in coal than I have had, and I appreciate his answer and his helpful statement.

Mr. TILSON. Before the gentleman proceeds, will he allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. I notice that the words "qualified applicant" are frequently used in the bill. While I do not contemplate applying for any of this coal land, I should like to have the gentleman explain who are qualified to become applicants.

Mr. FERRIS. The first section states that plainly. If the gentleman will look at House bill 406, it lays down the qualifications "Any citizen of the United States or association of such persons, or any corporation organized under the laws of the United States."

Mr. TILSON. Is that all that is meant by "qualified applicant"?

Mr. FERRIS. That is all. We do not want to lease to foreigners. We do not want to leave the way open for some foreign concern to come in and lease our fuel supply, because at any time we may need our oil. For instance, our battleships use oil as a fuel, and we thought it well to require the application to be made by a home association, or by a citizen of the United States, rather than by some one outside.

Before I was interrupted I was giving some examples of countries that had a law like this and of States that had a law like this. Now I want to call attention to some leasing that is actually done by our own Government, where it is a success; and when I have shown cases where an absolute test is being made, where it has been proven to be workable by other countries and by States, and in this country by our own Government, it seems to me we have proven at least that the principle of the bill is correct.

All over my State they are leasing Indian oil lands. The Federal Government is doing it. The Federal Government is leasing Indian coal lands in my State—not all over the State, because the coal does not extend all over the State; but the Federal Government is leasing coal lands in my State and leasing oil lands in my State, and doing it successfully, and getting royalties for the Indians, and helping to make the Indian self-supporting. It is a success. It helps our State. It is not bureaucracy. It is not making a Federal province out of us. It is the thing to do. To be sure, the oil operators would like to have it without royalty. To be sure, they would like to be free from regulation. To be sure, they would like to own it free and get it without paying anything for it, but any sane man knows they can not get it, and neither can you Members from the West get all the "water powers," all the coal, all the oil, for nothing, and it is right that it is so.

It is said here that no one will develop under it, but that statement is not true. They do develop it, and the development has been so great under this law in my own State that we have a population as great as Kansas and greater than Arkansas, and we have not been a State but eight years.

Not only that, but the development has been so great that we have produced more oil than any State in the Union, and pretty nearly all of it is on leased land. I know that my good friends living in the sparsely settled States, like the gentleman from Colorado, our honored and trusted Member, Mr. TAYLOR, and others, think that they are right about it. I did feel disappointed the other day when the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], who is the grand exalted bowwow of this whole movement out there, should offer a motion to recommit and put in $1.25 an acre as a minimum and $20 an acre as a maximum. Is that the program they offer? And why is it they think they have any reason to expect that anyone will support them? Tell me, what man in Wyoming wants a maximum price of $20 an acre? Tell me, who?

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. I would like to get the gentleman's notion of the advantage of the proposition of leasing over selling.

Mr. FERRIS. I will give it to the gentleman. If we sell the lands outright, as we did prior to 1873, they get into the hands of monopoly, the hands of the railroads who control the transportation, so that both production and transportation are in the hands of one corporation, and the corporation too often under this condition of affairs practices extortion on the consumer. They pay the Government nothing and they pay nothing toward irrigation or building up the State or the West. They only enrich their own pocketbooks, and so I say that the West is a greater loser under the proposition to sell than they would be to lease, and still a lot are protesting. I know that there has been some unintelligent administration of affairs in the West. Men through one cause and another have been sent out there who could not get along with the western people and the western conditions. They did not know how to handle matters out there, so that the people have decided that the Government employees are a lot of tenderfeet who do not know what they are doing.

I think the best thing that could be done, what the boys from the West ought to do, and I am a westerner myself, is to go to the heads of the departments and have them take or cull out the impracticable men in the service, in the Forestry Service, who are administering the forest and mineral lands illogically and not properly, and transfer them or put them into some work that they know something about. They should do that and then appoint some practical men who know how to handle the conditions in the West. I believe it would remove a lot of this protest by western people against the Government. The gentlemen from the West can never accomplish anything for the West or for their constituencies by teaching the people to hate their own Government. They will succeed in teaching them a lesson that they will have to reteach in later years. It is a mistake, and I hope the heads of the departments will help these Western States to that extent.

The legislation which we have prepared has the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, the head of the Interior Department; it bears the approval of Dr. George Otis Smith, the head of the Geological Survey, who has been in the department a long time; it bears the indorsement of the head of the Bureau of Mines and Mining, all of whom have sat with us and helped to write the different paragraphs, and they stand behind every line of it. We are bringing the project here with the support of the best men who have given a long, faithful, and earnest attention to it. It has been so carefully prepared and carefully considered. It is a well-considered bill and it will fill a long-felt want.

We have a provision in the bill that the railroads can only mine coal enough for their own use and none whatever for commercial purposes. We are undoubtedly right on that. It gives the railroads no control whatever over transportation. It does not give them control over the consuming public, nor allow them to control, first, the production, and second, transportation. As it is now, when they are allowed to control first the production and second transportation, it gives them both ends of the string, and the consuming public must suffer, must bare its own back, and take what comes if that condition prevails.

I have spent a little more time on the coal provisions than I intended to. I did not intend to make a speech this afternoon at all, but I have given a good deal of work to this matter this year and last year. We worked on this through the holidays. I will hurry along and present the committee's views on oil and gas.

There are approximately 5,000,000 acres of oil land in the United States that have been withdrawn by the Government which this bill will affect. No one knows how much there may be. There are 330,000,000 acres of unentered Government land out there. Of course you can not see oil on top of the ground. Nobody can see under the ground, and nobody knows how much more there may be; but the Geological Survey, which has made borings and tests and observations, say they have withdrawn 5,000,000 acres, and there are 5,000,000 acres of oil land out there. Oil and gas are now mined under the placer law where it is being mined at all. The placer law was intended to be applicable, in my opinion, to the mining of precious metals, such as the mining of gold and silver. It really has no application to the mining of oil and gas at all. It is totally out of place, totally nonworkable, and never should have been made applicable to oil. These are not my words; these are not alone my thoughts; but these are the thoughts of every department and of every man who has given earnest attention to it. Let me give you in a word how it works under the placer law. Eight men can associate themselves together and call themselves an oil company and take up 160 acres of land. That looks harmless on its face; and immediately thereafter they can take up another 160 acres, and another 160 acres, and so on indefinitely. Under that procedure we drew a system of dummy entries, we drew stool pigeons, we drew fraud, we drew every sort of procedure other than honorable, straightforward, understandable procedure, and

the oil interests of the country and the people of the country and the Interior Department and all are asking Congress to pass a law that is applicable to the oil situation and remove the placer law, which every one admits is inequitable, inadequate, and no good. We have brought in a bill that we think accomplishes that. We have brought in a bill that authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to lease these lands and retain for the Government a royalty on the part of the thing produced. There is nothing harsh about that, nothing wrong about that, nothing new about that. It is precisely what a sensible man would do if he owned the land himself, precisely what the States are doing that do own the lands, and precisely what every civilized country that has oil land is doing, save our own. Then why all this furore and commotion against a law that has precedent on every hand and is practical to do this identical thing?

The States have it for their land; other countries have it for their land. We are proceeding in my own State of Oklahoma by the Federal Government issuing oil leases and developing oil under such a proposition as this, only the royalty goes to the Indian, it being Indian land. There are people who object to it. Of course oil men want the oil lands for nothing. I do not fall out with them personally, but some one must have the sturdiness, some one must have the earnestness to stand on the side of the Federal Government and see to it that the oil men and the people who are wanting more than they are entitled to do not always get it. Many of the oil operators in my State said when they first began to lease Indian lands, "Oh, this is a joke; it will not produce anything"; but nowhere has there been so much development as in my State under it. We have passed California; we have passed West Virginia; we have passed Pennsylvania, and all this under a leasing law. I merely mention this in anticipation of what the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], genial, earnest, logical speaker that he is, and my genial friend from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] will say to-morrow amidst great splendor. They will begin to talk about Federal provinces, bureaucracy, bureau control, long-range government. This is the best Government I ever lived under, and I am not going to teach my people to hate the Government. I am afraid these gentlemen, genial and lovable as they are, and our friends, are teaching a lesson to their people which they will have to unteach before they get through.

Some things we claim for this bill and which we think it will accomplish are, first, we think it will aid, by the strong arm of the Government, to prevent monopoly—not to abolish it. I wish we could abolish it, but I think we can not; but I think the strong arm of the Federal Government, through the Department of Justice and through the Interior Department and through holding on to leases, will in a measure hold up and work to control the monopoly that prevails in oil. The Supreme Court helped us a little last winter when it decided that pipe lines are common carriers.

This bill provides that no one can have a right of way over any public land until they submit to the proposition of being a common carrier. Because when the Standard Oil Co. owns both the production and the pipe lines, you and I have pretty difficult sledding to produce oil by their side. Second, we think it will insure competition. We have inducements in this bill that will cause prospecting by which we would get some competition in the oil business. We think we have provisions in here that will prevent speculation, from the fact that we issue a prospector's permit; and if they do not do their duty, or "tote fair," to use a slang expression, we can give it to another man who is acting in good faith. We have given ample protection to the prospector. We believe if we give him one-fourth of the area of the land and he discovers oil upon it, that is sufficient remuneration to him for the discovery. We do another thing. We believe that by retaining three-fourths of all the oil land and giving one-fourth to the prospector we will be able to control a sufficient supply for our Navy, which burns oil, and we may be able to take into our hands and into our own control a fuel supply that may or may not be necessary at any moment. I know of no reason why we ought to let our fuel supply get into the hands of a monopoly who can charge the Navy and our own Government an exorbitant price in buying it back from them when we have it in our own hand and can get hold of it at a reduced price or through royalties on our own property. We lease the oil lands for a term of 20 years. At the end of that time the Secretary can fix new conditions and new royalties and give a permanent right for 10 years more if it is so desired. We grant rights of way for pipe lines only in the event they become common carriers.

We think the bill is feasible; we think it is workable. We take the proceeds from these leases and put them in the reclamation fund, which is going to wither and die if something does not come to the rescue of it, because it has dwindled down so that last year we got only $3,000,000 from the sale of public lands to keep irrigation going. It had already dwindled down until the irrigators had to come in and borrow from the Federal Government $20,000,000, which the Government loaned them and which I think was right; and why the western people will come in here and fight a law that is trying to come to their rescue is more than I can understand. I know they say they want this land to go into private ownership. They say, "We want the taxes." I do not blame them for it. I live in a State where a great deal of the land is not paying taxes, because the Indians hold nontaxable trust patents for them. We are in a much worse shape in that way than these gentlemen; but the Indians were there first and they have some rights. The Government land was there first before these western people went there. Those States were admitted and an enabling act passed, and the constitution of every one of them accepted the terms of the enabling act, which reserved control and ownership of these lands, until the Federal Government decided to do something else with them.

I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma reserves the balance of his time, and the gentleman from California is recognized.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve my time so I may discuss a matter that is still before the committee before the matter is closed.

Mr. FERRIS. Debate is not closed.

Mr. RAKER. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman does not have to reserve it.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and Mr. FLOOD having assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. CULLOP, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 406) to authorize exploration for and disposition of coal, phosphate, oil, gas, potassium, or sodium, and had directed him to report that it had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to address the House for one minute. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Speaker, it was not my purpose to trespass on the time and patience of the House in the discussion of the foreign war, but the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] the other day cast a reflection on our German citizens as a class, and I therefore feel impelled to resent his imputations against them. His criticism, I take it, was unjust and unmerited. Some few, because of their zeal, may merit his attack; but as a class it was uncalled for and unjustifiable, and the country will so consider it.

In the district which I have the honor to represent in Congress we have a large citizenship of German extraction, and I know of no more loyal, law-abiding, industrious people anywhere than they. They have done much for the upbuilding and progress of the country; they are law-abiding, industrious, and progressive. In their communities, I am proud to say, the very best conditions of local self-government prevail; their domestic facilities are models and their educational and religious opportunities are unsurpassed. They deserve credit for the high attainments they have secured and the splendid conditions they have brought about. They are loyal to the Government; they are Americans first and above all else and freely respond to every requirement imposed upon them as such. They have materially contributed to the advancement of our civilization, to the uplift of humanity, and to the development of the cause of liberty, and I do not hesitate to say here in their defense, if any is needed, that they are as loyal to the institutions of this country, as obedient to its laws, as liberal to maintain its honor and dignity as any class of people who live under its flag and profess allegiance to it.

Many of these people came from over the sea; came to make their homes here, to cast their fortunes with us, and I assert that when they took upon themselves the renouncement of their allegiance to the country of their nativity they fully understood the gravity of the obligation, and have fully kept the same, both in spirit and letter. I challenge the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER], who has made the serious imputation of disloyalty, to make proof of his charge to the country. It is unfair to these people, who have done so much for the upbuilding of this country, for the promotion of the cause of liberty, of education, of religion, and its material welfare that it should go unchallenged. Doubtless with many of these people, as their minds go back to the fatherland, sweet memories of

their childhood and relatives left behind are recalled, and these reflections arouse in them a warmth of feeling and ardor for their welfare, which is most natural. How could they divest themselves as human beings of such interest and affection? It would be unnatural if they did and reflect on the warmth of their disposition and want of affection.

No class of citizens who have taken up their abode in this country, who have cast their fortunes with it, who have sworn their allegiance to it, have been more faithful, loyal, and obedient than they, for which they deserve praise instead of censure. If some have not proven so, that fact furnishes no ground for attacking them as a class, and any such attack the people of the country will resent, and rebuke all who make it with the punishment it deserves.

The world is passing through a great crisis, the like of which history fails to record. This country is passing through a crisis which strains every undertaking of human endeavor and taxes the patience of the most heroic to maintain peace and sustain our commercial supremacy, to reconcile divergent opinions and conflicting interests. Duty demands that we appease passions and allay fears in order that harmony may prevail and all classes increase their loyal devotion to the institutions of our country and promote the common cause for which they were founded. Improper motives should not be attributed to good, loyal citizens which might tend to alienate their loyalty.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER], if he will recur to the history of the German citizens in this country, will find that they have always responded to every demand made by this country from the time of the first settlement to the present hour, have contributed their means and manhood to its support, have defended it in time of war and assisted in its upbuilding in time of peace. Their contributions furnish a rich legacy to their people and an enduring monument to their patriotism. I commend their loyalty to the State and Nation and acknowledge their fealty for the upholding of our institutions and the upbuilding of the grandeur of the Republic. There was no foundation, in my judgment, for the attack made on this class of our citizens as a class; no proof has been furnished by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] to sustain his charge; and in behalf of those who live in my district and in my State, I resent it as an unfair imputation on their good name and fame and their unquestioned loyalty to the institutions of our Government, of which we are all justly proud.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock) the House adjourned to meet to-morrow, Tuesday, January 11, 1916, at noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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 the Treasury, transmitting estimates of urgent deficiency appropriations for public buildings, construction, and sites, commencement, continuation, and completion of public buildings within the limits of cost authorized by law (H. Doc. No. 517); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Comptroller of the Currency, transmitting the annual report of the Comptroller of the Currency for the 12 months ending October 31, 1915 (H. Doc. No. 24); to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting an estimate of appropriation for purchase of vertical flat filing equipment (H. Doc. No. 518); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Assistant Secretary of Labor submitting estimates of urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916 (H. Doc. No. 519); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission submitting estimates of urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916 (H. Doc. No. 520); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

6. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Navy submitting estimates of urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916 (H. Doc. No. 521); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

7. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting estimates of deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916 (H. Doc. No. 522); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

8. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting report on the cost of production in the knit-underwear industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting schedule of papers and documents which are not needed in the transaction of the public business and which have no permanent value or historical interest (H. Doc. No. 523); to the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers and ordered to be printed.

10. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on reexamination of Cape Charles City Harbor, Va. (H. Doc. No. 524); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

11. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Mud Creek, Butler County, Ky. (H. Doc. No. 525); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

12. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of the mouth of Cape Neddick River, York, Me. (H. Doc. No. 526); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

13. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Port Orford Harbor, Oreg. (H. Doc. No. 527); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

14. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examition of Point Lookout, Mich., with a view to building a suitable breakwater (H. Doc. No. 258); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

15. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Estero River, Fla. (H. Doc. No. 529); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

16. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on preliminary examition of White Chimney River, Ga., to a point called "the Neck" (H. Doc. No. 530); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

17. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Thames River, Conn., with a view of providing a 20-foot channel between New London Harbor and the city of Norwich (H. Doc. No. 531); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

18. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on reexamination of Clinch River, Tenn. (H. Doc. No. 532); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

19. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on preliminary examination of Bayou La Batre, Ala., with a view to securing a channel connecting Bayou and Pass aux Herons of suitable depth and width (H. Doc. No. 533); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

20. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Adams Creek, N. J. (H. Doc. No. 534); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

21. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Forked River, N. J. (H. Doc. No. 535); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

22. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Monhegan Harbor, Me. (H. Doc. No. 536); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

23. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on preliminary examination of channel from the town of Bolinas, Cal., to the sea (H. Doc. No. 537); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

24. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report of the annual inspection of the several branches of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers (H. Doc. No. 538); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. CARLIN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the resolution (H. Res. 74) calling on the Attorney General for information as to whether or not prosecutions have been instituted against dealers in gasoline for violation of the antitrust laws, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 28), which said resolution and report were laid on the table.

Mr. TAGGART, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the resolution (H. Res. 76) requesting the President of the United States to furnish the names and former allegiance of persons involved in alleged criminal or otherwise unneutral plots, together with specific information regarding such plots, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 29), which said resolution and report were laid on the table.

Mr. SHERWOOD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 8493) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War, and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 30), which said bill and report were referred to the Private 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. 6232) granting an increase of pension to C. W. Brown; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 4311) for the relief of heirs of Robert Wix, deceased; Committee on War Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KONOP: A bill (H. R. 8472) to acquire a site and erect a manufacturing plant for the manufacture of arms, ordnance, armor, and other military and naval appliances at or near Green Bay, Wis.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 8473) to amend the act entitled "An act to amend sections 2275 and 2276 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, providing for the selection of lands for educational purposes in lieu of those appropriated," and to authorize an exchange of land between the United States and the several States; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada: A bill (H. R. 8474) legalizing certain conveyances heretofore made by the Central Pacific Railroad Co. and others within the State of Nevada; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. PARK: A bill (H. R. 8475) to require manufacturers of clothing and shoes to stamp on each article the material entering the composition of the article manufactured; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STERLING: A bill (H. R. 8476) to permit the United States to be made party defendant in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAILEY: A bill (H. R. 8477) for the taxation of land values in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LEE: A bill (H. R. 8478) authorizing the erection of a post-office building at Rossville, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 8479) to provide for the erection of a public building at Lumberton, in the State of North Carolina; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8480) to provide for a site and public building at Dunn, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 8481) to appropriate money for the erection of an ordnance and munition plant in the second congressional district of Indiana; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 8482) for the reduction of postage on first-class mail matter; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. TILSON: A bill (H. R. 8483) for the reduction of the rate of postage on first-class mail matter for local delivery; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 8484) authorizing the establishment of a plant at or near Springfield, Ill., for the manufacture of munitions and implements of war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NOLAN: A bill (H. R. 8485) to provide for the establishment of a Division of Civic Training in the Bureau of Education; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. SMALL: A bill (H. R. 8486) to authorize the President to set aside, for the protection of game animals, birds, or fish, lands purchased by the United States in the State of North Carolina under authority of the act of March 1, 1911, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KELLEY: A bill (H. R. 8487) to provide for the erection of a public building at Howell, Mich.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BUTLER: A bill (H. R. 8488) to provide for a site and public building at Lansdowne, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HAMILTON of New York: A bill (H. R. 8489) to establish a fish hatchery and fish-culture station in or near the city of Dunkirk, N. Y.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SNYDER: A bill (H. R. 8490) to provide for a public building at Herkimer, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 8491) to amend the act entitled "An act to amend sections 2275 and 2276 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, providing for the selection of lands for educational purposes in lieu of those appropriated," and to authorize an exchange of lands between the United States and the several States; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8492) to restore homestead rights in certain cases; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SMITH of New York: A bill (H. R. 8494) authorizing the President to appoint a commission to be known as the Peace Commission of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BRITTEN: A bill (H. R. 8495) to amend section 4463 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8496) to amend an act entitled "An act to promote the welfare of American seamen in the merchant marine of the United States; to abolish arrest and imprisonment as a penalty for desertion and to secure the abrogation of treaty provisions in relation thereto; and to promote safety at sea," approved March 4, 1915; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GRIEST: A bill (H. R. 8497) providing for the reduction of the minimum number of pieces of third and fourth class matter mailable under permits and for the extension to first-class mail the privilege of mailing matter without stamps affixed; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. EDMONDS: A bill (H. R. 8498) to set aside $100,000 for use at Guam for improvements of the harbor and fortifications; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8499) directing the Secretary of War to transfer to the Secretary of the Navy a dredge for use at Guam; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 8500) to authorize the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co. to change its line of railroad through the Chilocco Indian Reservation, State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. JONES: A bill (H. R. 8501) to provide a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HELM: A bill (H. R. 8502) amending sections 1, 2, 3, 7, and 8 of an act entitled "An act to authorize the Director of the Census to collect and publish additional statistics of tobacco," approved April 30, 1912; to the Committee on the Census.

By Mr. FOSTER: Resolution (H. Res. 84) making changes in the rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 85) making changes in the rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KEATING: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 91) authorizing and directing the Department of Labor to make an inquiry into the cost of living in the District of Columbia, and to report thereon to Congress as early as practicable; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 92) to provide for holding the San Antonio Bicentennial Exposition in 1918; to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

By Mr. GARLAND: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 93) authorizing the appointment of a commission in relation to educational, vocational, and military-naval training; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. MORRISON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 94) granting permission to erect a monument in the Arlington National Cemetery, Virginia, in honor of certain lady members of Presbyterian Churches; to the Committee on the Library.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SHERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 8493) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War, and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war; to the Committee of the Whole House.

By Mr. ADAIR: A bill (H. R. 8503) granting a pension to Eveline Michael; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8504) granting an increase of pension to William Dellinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8505) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. McKee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8506) granting an increase of pension to Lewis G. Haiston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 8507) granting a pension to Lorens Stoser; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 8508) granting an increase of pension to Hannah Sawyer; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BARNHART: A bill (H. R. 8509) granting an increase of pension to Solomon C. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BENNET: A bill (H. R. 8510) for the relief of William H. Manning; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BRITTEN: A bill (H. R. 8511) granting a pension to John Rommel; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRUMBAUGH: A bill (H. R. 8512) for the relief of the Columbus, Delaware & Marion Railway Co., of Columbus, Ohio; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CANTRILL: A bill (H. R. 8513) to muster in and muster out M. T. Bradley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8514) to muster in and muster out Ebenezer R. Parks; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8515) to muster in and muster out John Frank Goddard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8516) to muster in and muster out Isaac Thomas Risley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8517) granting a pension to James Baker; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 8518) to reinstate Philip Barbour Peyton, jr., in the United States Navy as a midshipman; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 8519) for the relief of the heirs of Asaph Wilson; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CLINE: A bill (H. R. 8520) granting an increase of pension to Enos W. Erick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COX: A bill (H. R. 8521) granting an increase of pension to William H. Audrey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8522) granting an increase of pension to George W. East; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8523) granting a pension to Benjamin F. Richardson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8524) granting a pension to Mary Hobbs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8525) granting an increase of pension to Adam E. Robbins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8526) granting an increase of pension to Calvin D. Lewman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8527) granting a pension to William Cassidy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8528) granting a pension to Garrisson M. Wright; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8529) granting a pension to Jacob Seigler; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8530) granting a pension to James Ellis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRAGO: A bill (H. R. 8531) granting an increase of pension to Katharine D. Treibler; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 8532) granting a pension to Bercie Pinkston; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. EMERSON: A bill (H. R. 8533) granting a pension to Margaret Hagan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8534) granting a pension to Bernice McLaughlin; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8535) granting a pension to Alfred J. Goodman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8536) for the relief of Samuel D. McElroy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8537) for the relief of Nelson M. Maydole; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8538) granting relief to William B. Nesbitt; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8539) to present a medal of honor to John C. Palmer; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FESS: A bill (H. R. 8540) granting a pension to Clara Daughters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8541) granting an increase of pension to Lizzie Q. Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 8542) for the relief of James A. Bell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8543) granting an increase of pension to Abraham Bouder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8544) granting an increase of pension to Henry S. Rider; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8545) granting a pension to Rebecca Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOSS: A bill (H. R. 8546) granting a pension to Moses Reeves, jr.; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8547) for the relief of James O'Brien; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8548) granting a pension to Robert Leigh Morris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GANDY: A bill (H. R. 8549) granting an increase of pension to Willis R. Stowe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARRETT: A bill (H. R. 8550) granting a pension to George W. Leathers; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GOULD: A bill (H. R. 8551) for the relief of Martin Norton; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 8552) granting an increase of pension to Helen M. Strong; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMILTON of New York: A bill (H. R. 8553) for the relief of Frances A. Bliss; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8554) granting an increase of pension to David G. Bliss; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HELM: A bill (H. R. 8555) granting an increase of pension to Stephen B. Woodruff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8556) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Melvin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 8557) for the relief of the heirs of S. C. Masters; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8558) granting an increase of pension to Richard M. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8559) granting a pension to Thomas N. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 8560) granting a pension to Alfred C. Nance; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 8561) granting an increase of pension to Caroline Lincoln; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8562) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Raybell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KONOP: A bill (H. R. 8563) for the relief of Jonas Archiquette; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 8564) granting a pension to W. O. B. Tibbs; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8565) granting a pension to William Winn; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LEE: A bill (H. R. 8566) granting an increase of pension to Nancy Humphreys; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LENROOT: A bill (H. R. 8567) granting an increase of pension to Edward H. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McFADDEN: A bill (H. R. 8568) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Deegan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKENZIE: A bill (H. R. 8569) granting an increase of pension to Mary L. Reading; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8570) granting a pension to Henry E. Rubendall; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8571) granting a pension to Charles Wheelden; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8572) granting a pension to Sarah Withers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 8573) for the relief of the estate of John C. Phillips, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MAPES: A bill (H. R. 8574) granting a pension to Rufus Boer; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MEEKER: A bill (H. R. 8575) granting a pension to Ida H. Byrd; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 8576) granting a pension to Westley J. Brasier, alias William J. Brasier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8577) granting a pension to Joseph Kasiah; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8578) granting an increase of pension to William J. French; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8579) granting an increase of pension to Orange Scott Cummins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8580) granting an increase of pension to Joseph R. Guffy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NOLAN: A bill (H. R. 8581) granting an increase of pension to John McMahon; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OAKEY: A bill (H. R. 8582) granting an increase of pension to Zilpha M. Mason; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8583) granting an increase of pension to Harrison W. Fox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8584) granting an increase of pension to Mary Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8585) granting a pension to John F. McCarthy; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8586) granting an increase of pension to Paul Revere Hunn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 8587) granting an increase of pension to Mary Westall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8588) granting an increase of pension to Mary F. Eddy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8589) granting an increase of pension to Lydia A. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PARKER of New York: A bill (H. R. 8590) granting an increase of pension to Robert B. Tozer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PHELAN: A bill (H. R. 8591) granting a pension to Charles M. Walker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POU: A bill (H. R. 8592) for the relief of the heirs of C. S. Barbee; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REAVIS: A bill (H. R. 8593) granting an increase of pension to James W. Nauslar; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RODENBERG: A bill (H. R. 8594) granting an increase of pension to John Steagall; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RUBEY: A bill (H. R. 8595) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Rowlett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8596) granting a pension to Olive M. Ross; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUCKER: A bill (H. R. 8597) granting a pension to David R. Miles; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 8598) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Shrider; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8599) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Cottrell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8600) granting an increase of pension to John W. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8601) granting a pension to William R. Prichard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 8602) granting a pension to William F. Primmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8603) granting an increase of pension to Elijah Pew; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8604) granting an increase of pension to Fannie Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8605) for the relief of James Oakley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SABATH: A bill (H. R. 8606) for the relief of James Cassidy; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8607) for the relief of Charles E. Malm; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8608) for the relief of the heirs of Thomas Reed; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8609) granting a pension to Gustav J. Tichy; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8610) granting a pension to Barbara Andrlik; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8611) granting a pension to Clara E. Jordan; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8612) granting a pension to Israel Buckowsky; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8613) granting a pension to Joseph Truka; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8614) granting an increase of pension to Frank G. Cook; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8615) granting a pension to John J. Harrington; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8616) granting a pension to Michael Smetina; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8617) granting a pension to Benjamin Shoeman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 8618) granting an increase of pension to Walter Starnes; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SISSON: A bill (H. R. 8619) granting a pension to Sarah Ann Burliston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 8620) for the relief of the estate of J. P. Dieter; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMALL: A bill (H. R. 8621) granting a pension to William R. Hardison; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8622) for the relief of the estate of B. F. Havens; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8623) for the relief of the estate of George D. Pool, sr.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8624) for the relief of Mary Bailey Pratt; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8625) to reimburse the officers and enlisted men of the Revenue-Cutter Service and Public Health Service for losses sustained in the wreck of the revenue cutter *Tahoma;* to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 8626) granting a pension to William Wilson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STEELE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 8627) granting a pension to Clara McPherson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STERLING: A bill (H. R. 8628) to remove the charge of desertion against Peter Hill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8629) to remove the charge of desertion against William Trow; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8630) for the relief of the Farmer's State Bank, of Eureka, Woodford County, Ill.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 8631) granting an increase of pension to Cyrus R. Rand; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWITZER: A bill (H. R. 8632) granting a pension to Bertha J. Stewart; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8633) granting an increase of pension to Albert Platt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TILSON: A bill (H. R. 8634) granting a pension to Catherine Steele; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8635) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Lynn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8636) granting an increase of pension to Ann Quinn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8637) granting a pension to Mary J. Allen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8638) granting an increase of pension to Kate J. Jerolman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8639) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. McKiernan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8640) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Fuller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8641) for the relief of Alonzo Derrick; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8642) to correct the military record of L. F. Norton; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VARE: A bill (H. R. 8643) for the relief of Rose McIlwain; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WALSH: A bill (H. R. 8644) granting an increase of pension to Albert Damon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Evidence to accompany House bill 3120, for the relief of Jennie Raley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolutions of six Protestant churches at Utica, Ohio, favoring an amendment to the Constitution prohibiting polygamy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRITTEN: Petition of Thomas O'Conner and James W. Breen, of Chicago, Ill., favoring amendment of the existing seaman's law, adopted March 4, 1915; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of committee of firemen of Chicago, favoring amendment of the so-called seaman's act of March 4, 1915; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of Stenographers, Typewriters, Bookkeepers, and Assistants' Association, of Washington, D. C., against child labor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of Admiral Schley Naval Squadron, No. 16, in favor of granting pensions to widows and orphans of men who served in the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, memorial of Adams's Music Store in favor of the Stevens bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DYER: Memorial of citizens of Peoria, Ill., favoring a change of foreign policy for the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Captain M. W. Marvin Camp, of Walton, N. Y., favoring the enactment into law of the Key bill (H. R. 54); to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, memorial of commissioner of labor of Kansas, favoring passage of House bill 476; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of Stenographers, Typewriters, Bookkeepers, and Assistants' Association of Washington, against child labor; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of St. Louis, of 560 members, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of C. M. Goethe, favoring House bill 476; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: Petition of 92 residents of Lyon County, Kans., protesting against any tax on gasoline; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition signed by J. H. Blinston and 28 other residents near Cataract, Wis., urging passage of the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Frank B. Morse and 24 other residents of Ableman, Wis., urging support of the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FESS: Resolution of the Boggs Post 518, Grand Army of the Republic, asking Congress to amend pension laws so as to grant every honorably discharged soldier a pension of $30 per month; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of German-American Alliance of the State of Ohio, asking for an embargo on munitions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of German-American Alliance of Springfield, Ohio, asking Congress to provide special neutral vessels to carry mail to all foreign countries; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of conference of independent retailers for the passage of the so-called Stevens bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GARNER: Memorial of Southern Medical Association, in favor of increasing the number of medical officers in the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRIEST: Memorial of knitting manufacturers of the Central West, relative to the free intercourse between the United States and belligerent powers in noncontraband articles, as well as advocating antidumping restrictions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAMILTON of New York: Papers to accompany House bill 3200, granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Wallace; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HILL: Petition of Adams Manufacturing Co., of Shelton, Conn., favoring House bill 702; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON: Petition from Presbyterian Ministers' Association, of Washington City and vicinity, for Smith-Hughes bill to provide a motion-picture commission to license films fit to be seen; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. KELLEY: Petition of Leasia & Hedley, druggists, and 54 other residents of Williamston, Mich., in favor of the passage of the Stevens bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LEE: Papers to accompany H. R. 8302; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: Petition of citizens of Paynesville, Minn., urging legislation which will force mail-order houses to help pay the taxes in those sections where they dispose of their goods; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORIN (by request): Memorial of National Security League, of Philadelphia, favoring preparedness for national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), petition of sundry laborers of the Pittsburgh (Pa.) post office, urging passage of House bill 4771; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also (by request), petition of Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring change in the method of paying the railroads for carrying the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of International Reform Bureau, favoring censorship of films; to the Committee on Education.

Also (by request), petition of brotherhood of 1,500 men in Second Presbyterian Church, of Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring establishment of a Federal motion-picture commission to censor films; to the Committee on Education.

Also (by request), memorial of International Reform Bureau of Washington, D. C., favoring Federal censorship of films; to the Committee on Education.

Also (by request), petition of F. M. Walton, of Los Angeles, favoring an irrigation system for Victor Valley; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also (by request), memorial of National Council of Congregational Churches, favoring prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NOLAN: Protest of the International Union of the United Brewery Workmen of America, against prohibition legislation, and statement showing over 5,000 men employed in breweries were thrown out of employment on January 1, 1916, through confiscatory State legislation on the prohibition question; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of American Neutrality and Peace Convention at San Francisco, Cal., favoring change of foreign policy and investigation of certain officials; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Petition of Chanton worsted mills, in favor of legislation aiding the industries of making dyestuffs and high explosives; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUSSELL: Papers to accompany bill for relief of William R. Prichard; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STEELE of Pennsylvania: Memorial from the Chipman Knitting Mills, of Easton, Pa., urging the passage of H. R. 702, to provide revenue for the Government and to establish and maintain the manufacture of dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: Petition of Henry H. Sweetland, of Morgan County, Colo., against preparedness and favoring Government ownership of munition factories; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TILSON: Petition of New Haven Socialist Party, urging passage of resolution for convention of congress of neutral nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of New Haven Socialist Party, for printing of full report of Commission on Industrial Relations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.