MISSISSIPPI.

William E. Davis, Duncan.

MONTANA.

C. E. Davison, Roundup.

NEW MEXICO.

Clinton E. Byrne, Des Moines.
Olive Jones, Cloudcroft.

NORTH DAKOTA.

William E. Wright, Dunseith.

OHIO.

Robert L. McKim, Mount Victory.

TENNESSEE.

T. C. Howell, Chattanooga.

TEXAS.

Oscar G. Compton, Dayton.
Jessie Conn, Kountze.
Earl L. Cowart, Silverton.
Lawson B. Fulgham, Voth.

UTAH.

Frank M. Shafer, Moab.

WYOMING.

George R. Bringhurst, Lovell.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, *January 23, 1917.*

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

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

O Lord, quicken our minds and hearts that we may respond willingly, cheerfully, and faithfully to all the duties devolving upon us, that we may meet the close of this day with a clear conscience and be prepared for whatever awaits us to-morrow, because we have wrought faithfully. This we ask in the spirit of the Master. Amen.

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

MILITARY PREPAREDNESS.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing an editorial therein from the San Francisco Chronicle.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The editorial referred to is as follows:

[From the San Francisco Chronicle.]

THE "PREPARATION" CRAZE.

Pending the outcome of the peace suggestions in Europe our entire program of military "preparedness" should be suspended.

What will come of the overture made by Germany we shall see in due time. The important fact is the evidence that the people of the belligerent countries are utterly disgusted with the continuous and horrible fighting and are more than ready to quit.

Nor do any of them probably particularly care what the terms are, so only that individuals of all nations are free to go and come in the world and pursue their respective callings precisely as they were before the war.

It is the vanity of the rulers and not the desires of the people which is the obstacle to peace. And the people will have their way.

And at such a time it is a shocking thing that the one great neutral Nation should completely abandon its pacific policies of past years and plunge into preparations for war.

It is said that the President feels that the situation is too delicate to make it desirable for the United States to make any suggestion.

But it would not be in the least indelicate for Congress, by joint resolution, to propose to all the belligerents that if they will disband their armies and scrap their warships we will do the same, and that, as evidence of our sincerity, our entire expansion program shall be suspended pending the result of the European war.

The heads of the Army propose a peace force of 500,000 men, with a million and a half men behind them, trained and ready for war. Some one suggests that we could probably get the 500,000 by fixing the pay of privates at $30 a month. If none in an army of 500,000 was paid in excess of $30 a month, the pay of the Army alone would be $180,000,000 a year; but the pay of officers, subsistence, and maintenance of barracks would easily bring the amount to $400,000,000 annually, and we have not added the cost of a navy "equal to that of any other power."

The world has gone mad. No war was ever waged or ever will be except for the control of trade, and no modern war can be carried on except at a cost for each side vastly exceeding any possible gain to either.

Nor can any great war be carried on except by mortgaging the energies of future generations to the extent that they can not pay and have enough left to support themselves decently.

And future generations will not endure it. Nor is there any reason why they should. We have no control of the activities of our descendants, nor are they under the slightest obligation to pay our debts. And they will not starve themselves to pay the war debts of their ancestors.

The more we spend for preparedness the more we shall be asked to spend.

The right thing to do is to stop now.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bill and joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 7748. An act to authorize the United New Jersey Railroad & Canal Co., and such other corporation or individuals as may be associated with it, to construct a bridge across the portion of the Delaware River between the mainland of the county of Camden and State of New Jersey, and Petty Island, in said county and State; and

S. J. Res. 182. Joint resolution authorizing an exhibition of the various activities of the Government service.

RIVERS AND HARBORS APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 20079, the rivers and harbors appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 20079, with Mr. RAINEY in the chair.

The Clerk read as follows:

Smyrna River, Del.: Continuing improvement, $20,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 9, by striking out lines 15 and 16.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, on page 402 of the Engineer's report it appears that we have had a total of $107,807 thus far appropriated for this river. The balance on hand, according to the report, is $18,547. The bill calls for a new appropriation of $20,000—for a river that is 11 miles long, that has but one steamer of 96 tons upon it which makes two trips a week. In 1915, last year, we expended $747 upon this river or creek, as it may be. The commerce in 1913 reached 117,786 tons. In 1915 it had diminished to 18,580 tons, or over 85 per cent.

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. I want to say in fairness to this matter that the tonnage reported in 1915 and in 1914 is due to the fact that the people using that stream did not report their tonnage, and if the gentleman will bear with me further, I will also say that the reason there is so much unexpended balance is because of a controversy between the United States engineers and the people there relative to a right of way. That has since been adjusted, and the money appropriated last year and this year can well be used in continuing that project. I desire to interject my answer right there, while the gentleman is talking.

Mr. FREAR. Very well. I accept the statement. The commerce report is simply lumped in one total and it is not itemized. Ordinarily Army engineers give us statistics on which we can determine the character of commerce. This additional appropriation is for dredging upon the river. It is not for anything especial, so far as I can understand, for new jetties or anything of that kind. In view of the fact that $18,548 remain on hand and only $107,000 has been expended upon the river in all time, with one little steamer upon it, I move to strike it out.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, in addition to what the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. MILLER] has said, I would like to observe, with regard to the Smyrna River, Del., that the people in the larger cities, particularly Philadelphia, are now seeking communication by water with the city of Smyrna, in Delaware, and that it can be approached economically for freight purposes by way of the Smyrna River. I know of my own knowledge that a steamboat was purchased during the last year or so to establish a new communication with Smyrna from Philadelphia, and that those who undertook the purchase of this boat did so upon the assurance that the people of Smyrna were seeking aid, and that they wanted to get their goods to the market and wanted better communications with the cities with which they dealt. The difficulty was principally that there was not sufficient depth of channel in the Smyrna River to accommodate the new steamboat; and after it was purchased and efforts were made to have the channel deepened there arose a question as to the ownership of a piece of jutting land that made an elbow in the river. The desire was to straighten the river, and the whole project was held up for

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

some considerable time, because that question of right of way or ownership had not been determined. My latest information is that they have reached an adjustment, and that the proposition to deepen and widen and straighten that river is now in a fair way of being carried out. It seems to me, again, as I stated yesterday with regard to Raccoon Creek, that this is one of the projects that ought to be commended, because it proposes to get the people in the rural districts and their products out to the larger centers in order that they may trade with the rest of the world. It is a relief proposition; it is extending the trade of a local community to the broad market beyond. Smyrna is practically bottled up, so far as water transportation is concerned, while the Smyrna River remains in its present condition. If we want to help the people in the back country, if we want to take care of those in what in foreign countries is called the hinterland, I assume the Government can engage in no other or more beneficial function than providing means by which the people may communicate with each other, by which those who are engaged in daily toil on the farm may find transportation to a profitable market for their output. I trust the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Wisconsin will not be adopted.

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. Mr. Chairman, I desire to oppose the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin. I am glad the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] explained this to the committee, because the people who stand ready to invest their money in the Smyrna Steamboat Line that will use this stream are people in Philadelphia. They have been held up the past two years in starting this line because, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] has said, there is a controversy regarding the right of way between the United States engineers' office and the local people who are to give the land for the cut-off. In 1913, in spite of this controversy, there were carried over this stream about 125,000 tons, valued at over $1,000,000. In 1914 it fell, according to these statistics here, to 20,000 tons, but it was valued at $300,000. Right there I want to say to the committee that, upon my own investigation, I have learned that the people who use this stream have not reported their tonnage. Now, that is their fault, but I submit that the value of this port and the value of the goods carried over this stream warrant an appropriation. In 1915 there were carried, it shows here, only 18,000 tons, as compared with 20,000 the year before, but the value is almost double—about $500,000—which further substantiates my point that these statistics are not correct, because they do not show the correct amount of tonnage really using this stream. And, as Mr. MOORE has said, for a community that is really dependent upon water transportation for its commercial livelihood the sum of $20,000 appropriated in this bill and the $18,000 left over from last year, to which the gentleman from Wisconsin refers, is not too much money to expend on this improvement. I may say that the town of Smyrna is one of those towns which was shortsighted a number of years ago when the railroad was being built through that section of the country, and they did not encourage the railroad to come there, and as a result they are on a little spur line of the Pennsylvania Railroad. I have nothing more to say, except that I trust the amendment will not be adopted, and it has merit or I would not have taken up the time of the committee to answer the remarks of my friend from Wisconsin.

I herewith append a copy of a letter received by me last year on the question of the nonreport of tonnage on the Smyrna River, as well as a copy of the statute on this point:

[Portion of letter from Mr. J. E. Hoffecker, of Smyrna, Del., relative to Smyrna River traffic.]

SMYRNA, DEL., *January 24, 1916.*

* * * * * * *

In regard to the tonnage on Smyrna River, which is reported by the Chief of Engineers as being 20,000 tons last year, I conferred with Mr. F. S. Malcom, manager of the Smyrna Transportation Co., and Mr. L. M. Price, principal owner of two boats operating on the Smyrna River, and both of these gentlemen are of the same opinion with me, that the tonnage reported to the Chief of Engineers does not include the tomatoes and grain transported out the Smyrna River, aggregating thousands of tons annually by tramp steamers that come to Smyrna for cargoes. For example, the steamer *Vessels*, owned by Capt. Vessels, of Leipsic; the steamer *Princess* and the steamer *Denney Brothers*, owned by Denney Bros., Salem, N. J.; the steamer *Greensboro*, owned by Capt. W. M. Vineyard, Milford, Del., all hauled tomatoes out of Smyrna River and probably not one of them filed a report with the Chief of Engineers.

Besides this trade there are numerous boats, likewise not reported, who carry out thousands of bushels of grain annually to the mills in Wilmington, Del., and various points across the bay in New Jersey. It would be almost impossible to furnish a complete record of the tonnage, because there are so many of these outside boats not reporting their traffic to anyone, whereas the engineer's office possibly only gets a report from the Smyrna Transportation Co. and Mr. L. M. Price. There are three or four other boat owners who may or may not report their business, viz: Walter Donovan, Bert Keyser, Frederick Lane, Walter W. Stokesbury, all of Smyrna post office, who are constantly trafficking on Smyrna River.

It is also proper to mention 35 or 40 fishing boats employing hundreds of men in their crews, whose traffic in the fishing business is also carried on from Smyrna River. This business is carried on by fishermen from Smyrna, Wilmington, Chester, New Castle, Delaware City, Port Penn, Pennsgrove, Woodland Beach, and so on, all of whom harbor in and use Smyrna River in connection with this business.

One of the chief points to be borne in mind is that these Delaware rivers afford the citizens of our State the only means of competition with the railroad; as you are aware, they only have one railroad system in Delaware, viz, the Pennsylvania. The steamboat lines plying on the various rivers in Delaware afford this opportunity, not only for competition with the railroad but save our people thousands of dollars annually in the cheaper water freight rates.

The Smyrna River is second in importance in the entire State of Delaware to the Christiana at Wilmington. It serves the towns of Smyrna, Clayton, Kenton, Cheswold, Hartley, and the adjacent rural country within a radius of 8 or 10 miles. If this river did not receive Government appropriations whereby it is kept free of shoals, etc., all of this traffic would be forced to go to the railroad, not only to the great inconvenience of distance but also would be compelled to suffer the penalty of higher freight rates.

* * * * * * *

The main point, however, is to have an accurate report of the tonnage, which, as above stated, the Engineer's Office never receives. I do not know how much this unreported tonnage would amount to.

* * * * * * *

To show you how interested our business men are in the maintenance of Smyrna River navigation I need only point to the fact that a committee having the matter in charge has secured title to rights of way for proposed cuts to eliminate crooked bends and shoals in the river, and, as I understand it, the titles deeding these rights of way have been turned over to the proper Government officials.

The law relating to the reporting of tonnage is herewith appended.

An act to facilitate the collection of commercial statistics required by section 2 of the river and harbor appropriation acts of 1866 and 1867. (Feb. 21, 1891; vol. 26, p. 766.)

Be it enacted, etc., That owners, agents, masters, and clerks of vessels arriving at or departing from localities where works of river and harbor improvement are carried on shall furnish, on application of the persons in local charge of the works, a comprehensive statement of vessels, passengers, freight, and tonnage.

SEC. 2. That every person or persons offending against the provisions of this act shall for each and every offense be liable to a fine of $100, or imprisonment not exceeding two months, to be enforced in any district court in the United States within whose territorial jurisdiction such offense may have been committed.

Approved, February 21, 1891.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Broadkill River, Del.: For maintenance, $10,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend on page 9 by striking out line 17.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I will not add anything to what I have said with regard to the other project of Smyrna except it occurs to me that $18,000, which is $1 for every ton shipped last year, was a large enough balance to take care of it, and no justification exists for an additional $20,000 at this particular time. However, I am not discussing that further now, because it has been disposed of.

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. If the gentleman will yield, I think the gentleman is mistaken; there is only $10,000 asked in line 17.

Mr. FREAR. The balance on hand is $18,548.

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. I was referring to the Broadkill River.

Mr. FREAR. I was referring to the Smyrna, the one just passed. I want to commend my good friend from Pennsylvania upon his ingenuity in defending every project, no matter what it may be. If it is a small project, it is for the benefit of the farmer; if it is a large project, it is for the benefit of the people of Philadelphia. I am never able to catch him unawares; he always has a ready answer for any project. Now, in the case of the Broadkill, we have expended $108,862. We have a balance on hand of $9,596, according to the engineers report, and this amendment carries $10,000 more. There were no operations on this stream in 1915. However, office expenses, which always arise in all of these cases, appear to be $228.65. In other words, there is a maintenance expense of the office on all these occasions. The contract has been completed. While this says it is to build a jetty, there is no evidence of any imperative need at this particular time for this 11-mile project which was begun in 1872. The commerce of 1915 on this project on which we have expended $108,862, reached 5,891 tons, with practically two or three small boats——

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. I want to say again, in excusing these people for their negligence in not reporting tonnage, that I know personally that they have not been reporting the tonnage

in this—the Broadkill River—and other Delaware streams. I tried to get them to do it, and their failure to do so is the reason such a ridiculous tonnage shows in the report.

Mr. FREAR. The tonnage is small, although I do not question the statement of the gentleman from Delaware, as I know he would not misrepresent it, even if it is his own project. There are no steamers on this river, only schooners and small power boats, according to the report of the engineers. In view of the commerce statistics furnished, I submit that in view of the money that we have expended, with no steamers on the river, with $9,596 on hand, which is nearly $2 for every ton carried last year, the project ought not in my judgment to be allowed.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak out of order for about three minutes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order. If the gentleman wants to introduce something by unanimous consent, all right.

Mr. EMERSON. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the various rivers entering into the Delaware River from the State of Delaware are frequented by oystermen. These wooden vessels, to which the gentleman from Wisconsin referred, are very largely oyster pungies. It is the business of a large proportion of the people of this coast, and they need these exits and these entrances. The men go out in their pungies and dredge for oysters in the salt water of the bay, and they come back—or at least they did until recently—into these rivers, like the Broadkill, now under discussion, and there they float the oysters in fresh water and they harbor their craft. It is an industry of itself, and a great industry, resulting in the shipment to cities like Philadelphia of tens of thousands of tons of oysters that are distributed to all sections of the country, as far, indeed, as these bivalves may safely go. Why there should be an interference with the improvement of a river that is serving a public purpose in this way, I do not understand. Perhaps the farmers also use this river. I have no doubt they do. Many farmers are also oystermen and also fishermen, and they come and go with their small craft, not necessarily steamboats, but wooden boats propelled by sail or gasoline. It is an opportunity to make a living. It is the business in which American citizens are employed, and it seems to me the Government is doing the smallest thing it can do to make safe these passageways upon which such citizens come and go.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will.

Mr. MANN. I understand the gentleman to say that the proper use of this stream was to take the oysters up and float them in fresh water so as to bloat them.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. No; to feed them.

Mr. MANN. Oysters do not feed on fresh water.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think the gentleman is in error. This time I will have to differ from my distinguished friend.

Mr. MANN. They increase in size by bloating in fresh water, and the food-control board has prohibited the shipment of such oysters.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That may be. Dr. Wiley had some views on that subject which were at variance with the views of the practical men engaged in the business. The gentleman from Illinois may not know it, because sometimes fresh-water oysters do not get as far west as Chicago. They have a sea tag now that passes out that way, and it may be measurably safe until the first course of the dinner is served to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will permit, it is likely those oysters do not reach Chicago, because after they have been floated in fresh water they do not last well and are not very good. We get real salt-water oysters in Chicago.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Well, there is a difference of opinion between practical men and theorists as to the treatment of an oyster, and if the gentleman from Illinois, who is an arboreal expert, will bear with me for a moment as an oyster expert, I will observe to him that I have been on the oyster pungies, and have spent at least a week investigating the business. And I have seen those hard-worked men get up at 3 o'clock in the morning, and I have gone out with them, and I have even assisted in the dragging of the dredge and the culling of the oysters when thrown upon deck. And I have seen them taken out on the banks in rivers like the Maurice River, on the other side of the bay, and put upon floats, not "bloats," I would say to the gentleman from Illinois, where the tide of fresh waters have flowed over them and fed them. Oysters are living things and have to be fed, and instead of carrying them away where they are in danger of dying and leaving an unpleasant taste in the mouths of epicures, they are sometimes fed, so that they may be preserved, not in alcohol but in aqua pura. Dr. Wiley and others have differed as to the propriety of feeding oysters, but the oyster has to be fed, and it has been the practice, whether the gentleman's notion of the regulations of the Department of Agriculture are correct or not.

Mr. MADDEN. As the farmer's friend, will the gentleman say these were farmers that were getting up at 3 o'clock in the morning that he was assisting in taking in the dredge?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The farmer gets up with the rise of the sun and goes to bed with the setting thereof, and the oysterman does likewise, and as I have been the farmer's friend on this floor, so now in this emergency I beg to be considered the friend of the oysterman. [Laughter.]

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to proceed out of order for a few moments.

On yesterday my good friend from Colorado [Mr. TIMBERLAKE] caused to have read into the RECORD a telegram from some Colorado woman's suffrage party stating the reasons for the picketing of the White House were because of the undemocratic blocking of the Federal suffrage amendment by the President and his party. Now, there is where these militants fail in their argument. The President and his party promised the male voters of this country many things that they did not keep. The President and his party promised the male voters to reduce the high cost of living, and did not keep the promise; but the male voters do not picket the White House for that reason. But the male voters of this country would have defeated the President and his party because of their failure to keep that promise had it not been for the female voters in these suffrage States. If the female voters would use the ballot a little more wisely, they could accomplish more than by this picketing process. Why, the women run this country, but some of them evidently have not found it out yet.

The best homes in this country are run by women, but not by militants. Last fall thousands of husbands, fathers, and sons voted for the President and his party because they were asked to by wives, mothers, sisters, and sweethearts, for the reason that the President had kept the country out of war.

I desire to say to my militant friends that one vote in the ballot box on election day is worth 100 pickets outside the White House fence.

Mr. KING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EMERSON. Yes.

Mr. KING. Since the President has made his escape from the White House and is now going to be at the Capitol three days in the week, has the gentleman any notion as to whether the Capitol will be picketed or not?

Mr. EMERSON. I have no such information. It might be a good idea, however.

But they say the President and his party promised to assist them to get a Federal amendment which would provide for woman's suffrage. If this is true, he failed to keep his promise for three and one-half years, yet the women of this country elected him again. Instead of voting for a man for President who promised openly for suffrage these militants in the States where they had the suffrage voted for the man who they claim failed to keep his promise. It is one argument against woman's suffrage, if they are so blind as to permit the President and his party to fool them for three and a half years and then reelect him. Male voters do not do things that way. Mr. Hughes stood openly for suffrage by Federal amendment, and yet I imagine I can see last fall a company of old-maid militants marching under a Wilson and Marshall banner with this inscription: "Vote for Wilson; he saved the lives of our sons by keeping the country out of war." Nevertheless, I am for suffrage by States and by Federal amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Waterway between Rehoboth Bay and Delaware Bay, Del.: Continuing improvement and for maintenance, $50,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the motion of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 9, by striking out lines 18, 19, and 20.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, this is the same amendment that I opposed to the last item; and I repeat my motion in respect to this item, because it seems to me it is a tremendous expense to undertake on this project as compared with the returns that will come to us from it.

We have already appropriated $122,000 for this 6-foot canal. We have a balance on hand, according to the report of the engineers, of $65,181, and yet this bill carries an additional amount of $50,000. Out of the last payment, as near as I can ascertain or find out, there was $69,710 paid by the Government for railroad damages. It is proposed now to continue the work, with a commerce that reaches 13,655 tons. There are no steamers on the stream.

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. I understand, of course, the remark of the gentleman that the project is not completed, and that we therefore can not ascertain what the commerce will be.

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. I appreciate the gentleman answering his own question. Last year he brought this point up here, and the project had not then been completed. Last week the project was completed, and the first cargo to go through the canal was carried.

I would call the gentleman's attention to the fact that 13,000 tons carried in 1915 was while the canal was in process of construction. But it was not complete.

Mr. FREAR. Was this Government material?

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. No; it was not Government material. It was freight going down to Lewes, which is at one end of the canal.

Mr. FREAR. There were no steamers on this stream, according to the report, but 11 power boats. This information was furnished by interested parties. It is a 6-foot canal, to cost $156,000. About one-half is completed, and $65,000 is on hand, and at this time, in the present condition of the Government finances, it seems to me it is unnecessary to appropriate the additional $50,000.

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. Mr. Chairman, I do not like to take the time of the committee, but I sympathize with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] in a good many points he has raised. I was able to agree with him on the public-buildings bill. Although I had a project in it, I voted against it. But as to some of the points he has raised to-day about these projects——

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Delaware yield to the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. No; I can not yield to the gentleman at this time. I would not like to be discourteous. If I have time, I will come back. I feel, as long as the gentleman from Wisconsin is directing his remarks to certain of these matters, that it is my duty to present the other side, especially as I have taken the trouble to go over these streams, every one of them, not only once, but several times.

The last project for which he has moved to strike out the appropriation is one that was adopted about 20 years ago. The total appropriation called for is $250,000. As he says, $182,000 has already been appropriated and this bill carries an appropriation of $50,000, making a total of $232,000.

If his amendment is carried the project will not be completed. The money that has been spent will be absolutely wasted. If I wanted to take the time of the House I could demonstrate to the Members very clearly the condition from the standpoint of one who has been over this ground thoroughly, that it would be not only a waste of the $182,000 already appropriated, but it would be an absolute dropping of a project that has every reason to be included in this bill from the standpoint of merit. The country through which this canal goes is a very sandy country. Many points are too far away from a railroad for economical hauling. The canal connects an inland bay with Delaware Bay, and as I called attention to the fact a few moments ago, the project was not completed last year, but nevertheless over it was carried a total value of agricultural products amounting to $203,000. I submit that when that tonnage, to the value just indicated, is carried over it in a year in which it is not completed, it augurs well for the proper use of that project when it is completed. It was only last week, as I said, that the first cargo went through from one end of the canal to the other. The total amount of expenditure will be only $232,000, and the maintenance will not be expensive.

In answer to the gentleman's remark that no steamers are used on this canal, it is not necessary for large steamers to be used to haul these products out. They are carried from an inland agricultural country to Lewes, which is at one entrance of Delaware Bay, and the produce is there placed on steamers for Philadelphia or on railroads for transportation to other points, or if it is intended for transportation abroad, outside of the country, there are ocean steamers that touch at that point.

I will not take up more time of the House at this point, but I wanted to call attention to the fact that the gentleman from Wisconsin, although he means well by his remarks, is not altogether accurate in them.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR].

The question was taken, and the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Waterway from Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, Del. and Md.: For improvement by the purchase of the existing Chesapeake & Delaware Canal and appurtenant property, in accordance with the project recommended by the Chief of Engineers in paragraph 3 of his report dated August 9, 1913, as published in House Document No. 196, Sixty-third Congress, first session, $1,300,000. And the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to purchase said canal and appurtenant property at a cost not to exceed the amount herein appropriated for such purpose.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin moves to strike out the paragraph. The Clerk will report the gentleman's motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on pages 9 and 10 by striking out the paragraph, beginning with line 24 on page 9 and ending with line 9 on page 10.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, this is what is known as the Chesapeake & Delaware 13-mile canal, which is a part of one of the links of the inland waterway project that is to run along the Atlantic coast. It was in the bill four years ago, and an effort was made to strike it out at that time, but it remained in the bill until the bill was defeated in the Senate.

The engineers have submitted three different propositions in the past on this project. One is for a 12-foot canal. That will reach $8,000,000 in expense. That is the one which ostensibly is placed in the bill. Another is for a canal of 25 feet depth, to cost $12,000,000, and that is what is proposed to be carried on after the first project has been started. The third project, which is the only one that can be of service to the preparedness program just now being urged in favor of the canal, is one of 35 feet depth, which will cost all the way between $22,000,000 and $23,000,000. I have not the figures before me. The bill before us carries $1,300,000 for this canal. It is known generally in the House and in the Senate—that is sure to take place—that the initial appropriation must be doubled if we are to have this canal, because the Army engineers say it will not be bought for less than $2,500,000, in round numbers. It was increased by the Senate committee to approximately that amount four years ago.

Mr. TREADWAY. Is there any way of proving up these figures of $2,500,000?

Mr. FREAR. I do not see how; but I say $1,300,000 can not touch it. And now, to carry out the thought of the gentleman from Massachusetts——

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will put the statistics in the RECORD.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Why does the gentleman say $1,300,000 can not touch it? Is the canal worth more than that as an operating proposition?

Mr. FREAR. I will explain to the gentleman by reading what I was about to take up. On January 2, 1915, the president of this canal company wrote the Army engineers a letter, from which I will read a brief extract:

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 will 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 be the par value of the bonds and give a sufficient amount for the stockholders to induce them to consent to the sale.

Now, four years ago, before this project to purchase the canal was proposed seriously by the Government, some one stated upon the floor of the House—I think it was the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE]—that the stock was worthless and the bonds worth only 50 cents on the dollar.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will have to correct the gentleman on that. I made no such statement as to the bonds.

Mr. FREAR. To my best recollection, the statement was made here by some one.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I may have said that my information was—I have no direct personal information upon this subject at all—that the stock was worthless, but that the bonds were paying 4 per cent, it being a going company and the bonds being distributed amongst a large number of estates which had acquired them by reason of the death of the original holders.

Mr. FREAR. At that time it was stated, and apparently with authority, that the bonds were worth only 50 cents on the dollar, which, of course, is hardly possible if this was a going corporation and paying 4 per cent.

Mr. COX. For how much is that concern capitalized?

Mr. FREAR. I do not remember. The Government, I think, paid over $500,000 as a bonus when it was originally started. Then Pennsylvania and Maryland made some contributions.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman let me read, in his time, some figures with respect to this?

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. COX. How much is it bonded for?

Mr. FREAR. More than $1,000,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The original stock subscription was $1,162,038.50. The original cost of construction was $2,201,864.03, so that the company was obliged to assume a floating debt of $1,039,825.53, which was increased by annual deficits for more than 20 years after the canal was opened. As to the question of values, I think the gentleman will not deny that there is value there. He will not deny, I think, that the Government board appointed for the purpose of ascertaining the value appraised the property at $2,514,000. The canal now carries a million tons of commerce a year, and to take it away without consideration is suggestive of confiscation.

Mr. COX. I do not think there is any desire to take it away without compensation. I wish the gentleman would state to the committee the amount of outstanding bonds against it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will put that all in the RECORD.

Mr. COX. Can not the gentleman state it? I have not time to read it all.

Mr. MANN. What is the operating profit of this canal now?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am not competent to tell the gentleman, because I have studiously kept out of the financial question; but my information is that the company has earned enough money to pay 4 per cent interest on its bonds. That the property is running down, as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] says, may be true in that it costs money to keep the property going; but apparently, from what you can see with the naked eye, the company owns a large estate, has locks and buildings and grounds and a right of way and tugboats. The company is not chartered to do a transportation business. It is simply a toll company, which stands there with inadequate facilities when it might be made serviceable for the carriage of 50,000,000 tons of commerce which originate in the immediate vicinity.

Mr. COX. Is it carrying the commerce satisfactorily?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Such as it can; but as it stands it is a positive menace to the safety of the country in time of war.

Mr. COX. Is it carrying the commerce now?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It is carrying a million tons a year. The amount has fluctuated. This old canal was a dream of the forefathers of the country. It was commenced in 1825 and finished in 1829. It was the only great carrier between the North and the South. We talk to-day of the South being in the saddle. Historically in those days the South was in the saddle, financially and in almost every other way. The centers of wealth and population were largely in Virginia and other Southern States, and canals were their means of transportation, along with the earthen roads. The railroad did not come until years after this canal was constructed and doing business. It was a great patriotic move of the big men of the country to build this canal to facilitate the commerce of the States.

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

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Wisconsin may be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Unanimous consent is asked that the time of the gentleman from Wisconsin be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FREAR. I just want to add one more proposition, Mr. Chairman. I have been through this canal. I have seen it and I know what it is. There is a little commerce, inconsiderable as compared with the commerce that we see on waterways ordinarily; but four years ago it was proposed to purchase it as a commerce-bearing canal, at a depth of 12 feet; but now the proposition is to put it in our great scheme of preparedness. The difficulty of that lies in this: That the engineers recommend on the same page and in the same pamphlet that we proceed to dig a canal across New Jersey, which is equally imperative, at a cost of $45,000,000 for a 25-foot canal, and there is no limitation if we are going to have a 35-foot canal, which is to be another connecting link, and according to Admiral Benson is equally important and necessary for the protection of New York and Philadelphia. Then, of course, there will be the additional canals at the southern end of the system proposed.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Certainly.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. There is no project before the House for a canal from Philadelphia to New York. The gentleman knows there is a canal now existing between the Delaware River and New York. That was another scheme of the forefathers before the days of the railroad.

Mr. FREAR. Yes; it was all right for our forefathers when canals were popular and commerce was carried upon them in the early days to provide canals. To-day it seems foolish to urge upon us that this canal can carry troops advantageously when the railroads can carry fifty times as many in the course of a day, and yet that is one argument advanced.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Speaking of carrying troops, this canal in its limited condition did actually carry troops from the North to the city of Annapolis to protect the city of Washington, at the call of Abraham Lincoln, at a time when the railroads were disabled, and it helped to save the fate of the Nation.

Mr. FREAR. Yes; I have heard that frequently; but that was before great trunk lines were running from Philadelphia to Baltimore.

New York has or is spending $100,000,000 for a great canal. If the people of Pennsylvania who insist that they are going to be benefited, and the people of Maryland who expect to be benefited, feel that this canal is so valuable to them, why do they not offer to contribute toward the canal when New York is putting up $100,000,000 for her canal. We have been dredging the Delaware River at a cost of $23,000,000 so far, up to the city of Philadelphia, and doing all we can to help my friend from Pennsylvania and to satisfy him. Now, they insist upon a 35-foot canal at Government expense. This project is for 12 feet but the other follows. I appeal to the House if it is fair to require the Government to do what is practically for the interests of Pennsylvania and Maryland primarily? Of course, there is some little commerce below, but a large part of it is timber that is being cut off in the Carolinas.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Certainly.

Mr. COX. Is there any provision or any recommendation by the Army engineers requiring cooperation on the part of Maryland or Pennsylvania?

Mr. FREAR. No; we find that in the case of some streams, but it is not here with reference to this project.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman think it is not cooperation for the city of Philadelphia to spend $13,000,000 to improve docks and piers, in order to take care of such new business as may come through this canal and from other sources?

Mr. FREAR. It is not at all in the nature of a contribution. In Germany those people insist on a contribution of a certain per cent, and a certain per cent goes to the locality.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is a Government enterprise.

Mr. FREAR. Yes; a government enterprise, but they have to pay the dredging and improvement of the waterways. Here all they do is to give the land and put up a pier, and that is called a contribution, whereas it is none whatever; it is simply a local project in the matter of building wharves.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I am very much interested naturally in the discussion of this question by the gentleman from Pennsylvania and his answers to the suggestion by the gentleman from Wisconsin that there ought to be some larger contribution. I can not forget his very eloquent speeches made at the last session of Congress when another bill was being considered in which he explained with great frequency, and always with earnestness and eloquence, how it was that there should be a very much larger contribution on the part of those who were particularly benefited by that river and harbor improvement. I am interested in hearing, as I said, this discussion to-day. I see that he has taken points from the debate that proceeded last year, and I congratulate him that he is doing so well. I have no doubt that he will be materially assisted in this by his colleague on this side of the Chamber, who made some remarks along the same line last year. However, I shall vote for this proposition.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is referring to the discussion on the bill relating to the flood control in the Mississippi River?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Yes.

Mr. MANN. There is an item carried in this bill of about the same amount that would be carried for the first year in the flood-control bill. Does the gentleman recall whether the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, that was then having a cat fit because there was no provision for contribution, has included any provision for a contribution in this bill?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. I do not think they have.

Mr. MANN. Their memory seems to be pretty short.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Now, Mr. Chairman, some question has been asked about this proposition presented here four years ago. The bill then provided for an appropriation of $1,300,000 to purchase this canal. That was arrived at in this way: The stock has paid no dividends since 1874. It was charged, with considerable vehemence, that we were called upon to spend $1,300,000 of the people's money for a canal which had not paid any dividend on the stock since 1874, which was a pretty raw proposition. But that is not all the truth; that is part of the truth. In addition to the stock we would get $2,600,000 in bonds of this canal, which had paid interest at the rate of 4 per cent and never defaulted through the long series of years. In addition to that they had saved enough from the tolls to keep the canal in good condition, and at that particular time, as I recall, there was a surplus of $70,000 in the treasury to take care of any emergency that might arise.

So we were getting not a worthless canal, as indicated by the statement that it had paid no dividends on the stock since 1874, but we were getting a canal which had paid 4 per cent on $2,600,000 in bonds, had never defaulted, and in addition had made enough money to keep the canal in good order and put by a surplus of $70,000, which it had on hand.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman recall what the net operating revenue of this company is?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. No; I do not. I have not thought about it for four years.

Mr. MANN. I just looked up the report and find it is something over $100,000 a year. The interest upon the bonds is $104,000, but, of course, that comes out of the net operating revenue, and there has been some surplus in recent years.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. I do not know what the gentleman means by "net operating revenue."

Mr. MANN. The gentleman ought to know what I mean by net operating revenue.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Possibly I ought, but still I do not know what it means.

Mr. MANN. The language itself is sufficient, and the gentleman has business experience enough to know what the net operating revenue means.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. The business that I have been engaged in has never had any net operating revenue. [Laughter.] But this particular proposition has never defaulted upon the interest on its bonds.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Oh, let me finish this statement. Two million six hundred thousand dollars in bonds paying 4 per cent interest we were to get. We were to pay just half of that amount, $1,300,000, just half the face value of the bonds, so that upon the $1,300,000 that we proposed to pay we would receive interest of 8 per cent, judging the future by the past. We were to get these bonds. We inquired among the business men of Philadelphia on the stock exchange there, the bankers who knew the value of these properties, and we were advised by them that these bonds were listed at 50 cents, that that was a fair market value, that that was what it was reasonably supposed they could be purchased for on the market, so that we took the $2,600,000 and just divided it by 2, and that is the way the committee arrived at $1,300,000, which it was proposed to appropriate.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I have in hand the report of the Committee on Coast and Insular Survey, Senator SAULSBURY, chairman, which goes over this whole matter after an investigation and hearing. They had all the witnesses they could find before them with a view of ascertaining the value of this property, and as to the question raised by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], they say this:

> The revenues from tows and towages for the year ending May 31, 1913, was $186,940.68. The revenues from all other sources during that fiscal year were $4,220.07, making a total revenue of $191,190.75.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will excuse me for a moment, I have taken this time in order to answer that particular question so that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] and others upon this side who are particularly interested in this canal might not be bothered further about replying to these particular charges, but might devote their time to explaining why it was that there is no greater amount of local contribution provided by Philadelphia. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman let me explain it now?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. No. [Laughter.] The gentleman, I dare say, will have ample opportunity in which to make that explanation, and I suggest that if he will get the speeches I made last year in answer to his criticism that there was not sufficient local contribution upon the Mississippi River, and read them to the House, it might be worth while, and perhaps accomplish the desired result. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HUMPHREYS] that the fight I made on the flood-control bill, which he brought in and for which he is entitled to most of the credit, was made in the interest of the Rivers and Harbors Committee. I was endeavoring to preserve the authority of the Rivers and Harbors Committee. I am rather glad we had the experience, because it would be useful to-day in the event of certain questions arising upon this floor.

As to local cooperation, and with respect to a project passing through a series of States, as this Chesapeake & Delaware Canal does, I assume the question would be exactly similar to that of the Mississippi, particularly in the upper stretches of that river, because there are contributions from the lower States—where the answer always is that it is a national project, that it courses through a series of States, and that you can not enforce contributions from one State where a number of States are directly interested and involved.

The Chesapeake & Delaware presents the problem of connecting up for useful purposes this great body of water, the Chesapeake Bay, through 13 miles of mainland, now dug for canal purposes, with that other great body of water, the Delaware Bay and the Delaware River. The intracoastal scheme contemplates the union of these waters from, so far as this map before us is concerned, Beaufort, N. C. [indicating], which is underneath Cape Hatteras, up through Pamlico and Albemarle Sounds, to an existing canal which has been taken over by the Government, into Hampton Roads behind Norfolk, through the Chesapeake Bay on up to this point at the head of Chesapeake Bay, where now the progress of the Nation, both from a strategic and commercial point of view, is blocked, at least to the limit of a 10-foot waterway capacity. The proposition is to open that waterway to greater service in order that the commerce that comes up here, or the war vessels that find it necessary to go inside and avoid the dangers of Cape Hatteras and other points along the coast, may be safeguarded and permitted to move on a standardized waterway with as much safety and certainty as they might do upon railroads. All this is possible, but at present can not be done while these several small connecting links like the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal stand in the way. Here is the Delaware River running the other side of the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal to the city of Trenton. From near by an old canal passes on to Raritan Bay, connecting up the East River into Long Island Sound. Gentlemen will observe that the whole course is sheltered. We often discuss these natural conditions, even from the God-given viewpoint.

Why was this great waterway thrown up in sections here, and here, and here [indicating on the map], and this splendid one connecting New England through Long Island Sound, except it was intended by the Creator himself that man should improve what he had thus provided?

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. MANN. If I understood the gentleman, God intended to have an inland canal all the way along, but He got tired and did not finish the job?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Well, I assume the gentleman has a closer association with the Almighty than I have.

Mr. MANN. Well, I think that is likely. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Coming from Chicago, I assume he needed it. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. The closer we get the better.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It is very hard to come back, especially after you have lived in Chicago. We once read a book about what Christ would do in Chicago. This, however, is a practical proposition, although for the moment we are giving it a rather reverential aspect. [Laughter.] With all deference to my distinguished friend from Illinois, these waterways are here, and it is possible to link them up by doing a little digging here and there.

Mr. Chairman, this story has been so often told in the House that I hesitate to take much time on it now, but it is not understood in some sections of the country. What we are endeavor-

ing to do is to make a connection like that, and that [illustrating on map], in order to bring into thorough and complete communication 1,800 miles of shore line within the ocean. Now, one of my best friends, one of the distinguished Members of this House, more distinguished than any other possibly, has sometimes indicated that we ought to go out on the ocean to do our trading. Why, gentlemen, during the last two months the papers have recorded probably a dozen disasters to shipping at sea along our coast. Some one has said it makes no difference as to the cost if a single life is to be saved. Men make this sort of preachment when they deliver lectures, and get intensely sympathetic about "your boy," and "my boy," who is sailing out upon the high seas. I can grow even more practical in my sympathy. It has not been so long since 17 men living in my district, or nearly, here in Philadelphia, sailed down this river on barges that could have gone through an improved waterway safely; were towed out to sea, carried around the treacherous shoals of Barnegat, upon which there have been three disasters during the last two months, one a Government vessel—the transport *Sumner*—a complete loss to the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. These men passed out on barges, under tow, carrying coal to the people of New England, and were wrecked at this point [indicating Cape Cod], where every one of the 17 was lost. I say, with such regrettable instances in mind, I have a right to be practically sympathetic in addressing Congress, and to say, "Why not give the money to cut through here [indicating] and to cut through here [indicating], in order that we may have safe communication for this ordinary, everyday routine business that must be carried on between the North and the South?" Why risk it any further?

Mr. FREAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FREAR. Could that boat on which the 17 people were lost have been cared for by this proposed canal?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It could.

Mr. FREAR. What was the draft of that boat?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Less than 12 feet, as I recall.

Mr. FREAR. The Army engineers' report says that this canal when built will only accommodate a boat of 10 feet, and I was wondering if the gentleman was right in regard to this transport.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman is partially right. The existing canal has a depth of 10 feet, but the new canal would begin with a depth of 12 feet, and there would be required at least 1 foot of leeway; but we are looking to a greater depth, as the engineers have suggested.

The Secretary of the Navy has indicated on several occasions that there are a few vessels of the Navy that can go through this old Chesapeake & Delaware Canal, but only a few. The Navy Department would like to have the canal deepened, because they are constantly sending small vessels, submarines, torpedo-boat destroyers, torpedo boats, small munition ships, and so forth, from the navy yard here [Boston] to the navy yard here [New York] and the navy yard here [Philadelphia] and the navy yard at Norfolk, and they would a thousand times rather in these times of peace have the security of these inside passages than to go to sea and take the risk of a December or January storm and be wrecked at sea. And why should we take that risk in times of peace? One Secretary of the Navy once proposed to send four torpedo boats from the New York Navy Yard to the Charlestown Navy Yard, and I asked him to send them through the inside passage, to test out whether it would be the wisest, the speediest, and safest thing to do. I think it was Secretary Newberry. He wrote me that the department desired to use that passageway but the draft of the vessels was too great, and they must go outside.

Now, gentlemen will pardon me for telling this story again on the floor of the House, but some may not have heard it. When those four vessels reached Cape Hatteras they struck a storm and they were driven out to sea. Some of the men were injured; fortunately, no lives were lost; but the revenue cutters had to go to sea on an alarm call to bring these vessels home, and one of them that was not reached by the revenue cutters had to be beached in order that the lives on board might be saved and the property of the Government salvaged.

That was a bitter proof. We have dozens of them every year in commerce. We have many of them every year in the ordinary affairs of the Army and Navy. Do my distinguished friends, who have given little thought to this question, know that in the War Department alone we have more than 2,500 vessels? They are not all vessels of large draft. Some of them are engineers' boats. Why, the War Department's fleet, I think, in numbers equals that of the Navy fleet. If it does not, it is very close to it. And these vessels are doing what? They are engaged upon the inland waterways most of the time. Some of them are not equipped to go out to sea. As between this point and that point [indicating], a distance of only 13 miles, we could give them a safe inside passage from the Norfolk Navy Yard to the Philadelphia Navy Yard, from stream to stream, saving them an outside sailing distance of 325 miles; and this when the sailing is frequent and on routine business. Gentlemen, why do we drive them out to sea down here along the coasts of Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia, and then up the Chesapeake Bay, a distance of 325 miles, when all that risk and delay could be saved by this simple improvement of 13 miles? [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise merely for the purpose of indorsing the action of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors in including in this bill the item for the purchase of the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal, for I think it one of the most important items in the bill and one that remains in it without change or amendment.

I am not so much concerned about the deep-water coastwise shipping as I am about the barge and light-draft traffic that would use a waterway like that. The section traversed by that canal is one of great commercial activity, greater than any other on the Atlantic except that of New York Harbor and connecting waters.

Now, as to the cost, I fully indorse what was said by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HUMPHREYS]. We had occasion to go very carefully into that feature when we were preparing the 1914 bill, and in view of his criticism of the engineers and his reference to the attention paid their recommendations by the committee, I wish to call the attention of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] to the fact that, notwithstanding the engineers recommended we pay something like $2,600,000 for this canal, or not less, as I recall, than $1,800,000, we fixed the price, after careful consideration, at $1,300,000, which I think is a fair price. That was fixed upon the basis, as stated by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HUMPHREYS], of about 50 per cent on the value of the bonds of the company. Reading from the report, which is somewhat hazy as to value, we found that the bonds had about absorbed the stock and that when the bonds are paid the stock will be practically worthless. Now, somebody had stated, as the report showed, that the bonds were worth about 50 cents on the dollar; and there being about 2,600 of them, we thought $1,300,000 was a sufficient amount to pay for them. We might have eliminated a part of the $2,600,000 had we been desirous of so doing, as about $600,000 of those bonds, as I recall now, were said to be a fraudulent or an over-issue of bonds, but were later on indorsed by the management of the company; and so it appeared to us the property was liable for the entire amount. Hence we fixed the value at half that, or $1,300,000.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Of course this is purely a canal, an artificial waterway. I take it the committee before recommending the purchase or the construction of an artificial inland waterway has taken very careful consideration of the general subject as to how far these artificial waterways are profitable, and in consideration of that question must have given attention to the principal artificial waterway now in existence in America, the Hennepin Canal, which runs through the richest territory in the United States. Is the gentleman able to tell how much money now passes through the Hennepin Canal—what the cost of operation is, and how much it costs the Government for each ton of freight that passes through that canal?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I would say in answer to the last question of the gentleman that, as I understand it, the cost and operation of the Hennepin Canal is perhaps out of proportion to the freight carried over the canal. I do not recall the tonnage exactly, but I think it is perhaps a little less than 30,000 tons per annum.

Mr. MANN. The cost of the canal was, to begin with, $20,000,000——

Mr. SPARKMAN And was not recommended by the River and Harbor Committee.

Mr. MANN (continuing). Connecting two of the principal commercial waterways of America, and running through a very rich country. Now, how far does the committee take into consideration where it has made an experiment before it makes another experiment?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Well, we have considered not so much the general question of canals as we have the specific conditions surrounding a proposition whenever presented to construct or purchase a canal.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman was on the committee when the Hennepin Canal proposition was presented?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No; I beg the gentleman's pardon. I was not in Congress then.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman was on the committee when the Hennepin Canal——

Mr. SPARKMAN. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I was not. And the River and Harbor Committee had nothing to do with the construction of the Hennepin Canal.

Mr. MANN. It was since I came to Congress, and the gentleman came to Congress before I did.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The gentleman is wrong again. The construction of that canal was begun in 1890. I did not come to Congress until 1894. And, besides, its construction was not recommended by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, but by the Committee on Railways and Canals.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is mistaken. It is a river and harbor project and the river and harbor bill carried the appropriation.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Again I beg the gentleman's pardon. I am not mistaken. I know exactly what I am talking about. The proposition first came, as I recall, to the House from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. A point of order was made against it by some one, and the presiding officer held that the River and Harbor Committee did not have jurisdiction of it, and it went to the Committee on Railroads and Canals.

Mr. MANN. Well, that is perfectly patent. Gen. Henderson, of Illinois, a Member of this House for a long time—and I believe he was chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, but, if not, he was very high in rank—got this proposition allowed for in the river and harbor bill, though it was carried through when Mr. Reeves was a member of the committee. The-gentleman was a member of the committee, and I was in the House. I visited the canal when the work was first commenced. But that has nothing to do with the question. It was an experiment. I take it the committee has examined to see whether it was a successful experiment or not. It is a canal running from the Mississippi River to the Illinois River, connecting with the city of Chicago by water, connecting with the city of St. Louis by water, connecting with the upper Mississippi by water, connecting with Iowa by water, connecting along the line of transportation between the East and the West, maintained at very heavy expense, and I suppose it costs about $10 or $15 to the Government for each ton of freight that goes a mile on it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Well, I will say in further answer to the gentleman that while I have considered somewhat the results in a financial way of the construction of the Hennepin Canal I have not done so with reference to the purchase and remodeling of this canal, for the reason that I think that each proposition should stand on its own merits. Besides I think this one is a better proposition. This canal is accommodating ten, twenty, perhaps thirty, times as much commerce as that carried by the Hennepin Canal or transported on the railroads paralleling it.

Mr. MANN. Well, the gentleman is mistaken. There is ten times as much commerce passing along the line of the Hennepin Canal as will pass over that canal.

Mr. SPARKMAN. No; I differ with the gentleman as to that.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman has not studied the railroad situation. He is not familiar with it. If he had studied it he would know that the Burlington Railroad, the Rock Island, the Milwaukee & St. Paul, and in fact all the railroads of the West are in competition with the Hennepin Canal. That is the reason why the Hennepin Canal does not do any business.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I want to ask if the contrast of the Hennepin Canal with the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal is fair in reference to the terminals?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. As to the railroads that are there, is it not a fact that Chicago probably has 25 or 30 or more, perhaps, trunk-line railroads coming and going to offset any canal, whereas as a matter of fact we have but two roads paralleling the territory traversed by the Delaware & Chesapeake Canal?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think that is so.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And has it not been shown before the committee, and is it not in evidence in the report known as the Agnus report, that the commerce on the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal is estimated at 50,000,000 tons annually?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is true.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is one of the reasons why we advocate the construction of this canal, to afford a relief for freight and transportation, because instead of having 25 or 30 trunk lines coming and going, as they have at Chicago, to reach out and radiate to every section of the country, we have only two lines, that are so greatly overdone that the great railroads of the East are compelled to issue embargoes on freight, not having sufficient cars to carry it.

Mr. MANN. That is a matter of local condition all over the United States. The reasons given by the gentleman from Pennsylvania are not sound. The question is, When these artificial canals are constructed can they carry, or will they carry, the freight cheaper than by rail? Our experience is, after having built a canal and given the people the right to carry over it for nothing, the expense being paid by the Government, it still can not compete with the railroads. The business is there. There is more business there than there will ever be in this canal.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I feel that I ought to apologize for taking any more time on this item. But it appears to me that some facts exist regarding it which have not been stated. This project can rest upon the question asked by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]—that is to say, whether, if this canal is constructed, it will carry a large commerce and at a cheaper price than is exacted by the railroads? The answer to that question upon all the evidence must be in the affirmative, and I ask the attention of gentlemen who may have any doubt in their minds regarding that proposition.

This canal connects the great Chesapeake Bay, upon which are situated Baltimore, Norfolk, Newport News, and other large cities, with the Delaware River, upon which are situated Philadelphia and Wilmington. The Delaware River is the busiest interior waterway in the United States, so that the mere fact that this waterway will connect the Chesapeake Bay and the Delaware River, both having large existing commerce, is a fact which will arrest the attention of gentlemen who wish to know the importance of this project.

Again, this waterway connecting Chesapeake Bay with the Delaware River has been investigated by both civilian and engineer commissions at least six or seven times. It has been investigated by commercial organizations. I challenge any critic or opponent of this bill to find anywhere in the official reports or the reports of any commercial organization, no matter where located, any report which did not unreservedly commend this project for its commercial value. If the gentleman knows of any report to the contrary, I ask him to state it.

In addition, I advert to the last report of the engineers upon this project. I am reading from House Document No. 391, Sixty-second Congress, second session, page 97. This relates to the commerce upon this waterway. Now, I read from page 98:

> According to the reports of the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal Co., the average annual shipments through the canal for the last five years have been 716,644 tons, for which the tolls have averaged $163,151.33, or a general average of 22¾ cents per ton.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. SMALL. May I have five minutes more, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMALL. Now, as to the commercial value, if converted into a free canal. First, let me say that this canal at the present time affords very restricted facilities for commerce. It is a lock canal. The locks have a width of only 24 feet, so that barges and steamers which operate through this waterway have to be constructed to fit the locks rather than be built along plans best adapted to carrying capacity. Now, as to the commerce which would be developed upon this as a free waterway and as a tidal canal—and that is what it is proposed to be—I read from the report this extract:

> Letters requesting information as to their own individual shipments were sent to commercial organizations, boards of trade, and all shippers whose names could be secured, and in many cases large shippers were personally interviewed, sometimes several calls being made before the desired information was obtained, and in other cases repeated visits secured no information. No information could be obtained from underwriters of marine insurance.
>
> The data obtained can be only a fraction of the total commerce, but the statement below is compiled from the figures received from shippers as to their own shipments, and may be considered authentic as far as it goes. Some of the heaviest shippers were among those who failed to

furnish figures. According to the responses received, the following existing commerce could and would use a free canal to advantage:

Shipments from southern points: Iron, 120,000 tons; lumber, 496,889 tons; tomatoes, 1,361 tons; coal, 140,000 tons; chemicals, 17,000 tons; paints, etc., 600 tons; miscellaneous, 231,564 tons; or a total of 1,012,814 tons.

In addition to the above there was reported freight amounting in value to $375,000, but the tonnage was not stated.

Shipments from northern points: Bridge iron, 18,000 tons; coal, 872,518 tons; tomatoes, 16,748 tons; oils, 600 tons; granite, etc., 40,111 tons; fruits, 300 tons; miscellaneous, 481,921 tons; or a total of 1,430,208 tons.

In addition to the above, freight worth $195,000 was reported, but the tonnage was not stated.

The total shipments reported amount to 2,537,622 tons, valued at $14,170,239.

I have read from the report of the engineers, who say that they made a careful investigation, that they could not obtain reports from all the parties who could use this waterway, and that this represents the minimum rather than a maximum of the commerce that would use this canal if converted into a free tidal canal.

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

Mr. SMALL. Yes.

Mr. HULBERT. Can the gentleman suggest a plausible theory upon which the Chief of the Army Engineers has predicated the recommendation that the acquisition of the canal from the Delaware River to Raritan Bay in New Jersey should be based upon the condition that the State of New Jersey should give the right of way, whereas the canal connecting the Delaware River and the Chesapeake Bay puts upon the Government the burden of purchasing the right of way from the stockholders?

Mr. SMALL. I can not yield further. I am not going to be diverted to any waterway across the State of New Jersey. I am talking about this waterway connecting the Chesapeake Bay and Delaware Bay.

Mr. HULBERT. My question related to this waterway, if the gentleman followed the question that I propounded.

Mr. SMALL. The question could be answered satisfactorily, but I do not wish to take up the time unduly. This project is for a depth of 12 feet, a bottom width of 90 feet, and a greater width over all, and is intended to be a tidal canal, doing away with the present locks. I have adverted to the commerce, showing the importance of this waterway, and I think I have given an answer to the queries suggested by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] as to whether, if this waterway were constructed according to the plans of the engineers, it would carry a large commerce and more cheaply than the railroads. Upon that question of cheapness, the value of a free canal may be stated as follows: Annual saving in freight, $551,933, as stated on page 99 of the report.

Now, Mr. Chairman, something has been said about a greater depth for this canal. When this report was submitted, the Chief of Engineers reserved the right to submit a supplemental report, which he did submit in House document 196, Sixty-third Congress, first session, dated August 12, 1913; and without taking up the time to read the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers, he said substantially that he recommended the purchase of this canal, its immediate deepening to 12 feet with adequate width, and that its subsequent deepening to 25 feet or more should depend upon the commerce it developed, its strategic value to the United States Government, and the question of cooperation from the States immediately contiguous to this waterway. So that the question of greater depth depends upon these considerations.

There was a later report submitted upon this waterway in Senate document 14, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session, and that report, in answer to a resolution of the Senate asking its strategic value as an arm of defense, and the price at which it could probably be purchased, contains a statement from the General Army Board, in which they unreservedly commend this waterway as a valuable arm of defense. It is true they say that it ought to be deeper than 12 feet for this purpose, but that is not the question now before the committee.

A depth of 12 feet will accommodate the commerce between Chesapeake Bay and Delaware River and will accommodate the through commerce originating from ports south of Hatteras with ports north of Hatteras, and the question of a greater depth to accommodate ocean shipping or to accommodate warships can well be left to the future after it shall have been improved to 12 feet, making a tidal canal a completed factor. I think it is fair to say that everyone who has ever investigated this waterway in the light of all the evidence submitted and of the reports, both from the engineers and commercial organizations, must reach the conclusion that as a commercial proposition, as a creator of water-borne traffic, as a saving of freight, it is worth acquiring and worth improving, and is one of the important, if not one of the most important, projects carried in this bill.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the motion of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR]. I believe the question before the Committee of the Whole is the striking out of this item of $1,300,000 for the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal. I am in favor of its retention in the bill, although not very much in favor of the project itself. I am in favor of it because it looks to me as though, if we hold that item in the bill, the canal will not be purchased, and I think that is an end very desirable to attain. We can not secure any price from the present owners of the canal. The officers of the organization do not seem to know who does own it; but, at any rate, every effort that has been made for the last 10 years on the part of committees or commissions to secure any price has failed.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Would not condemnation remedy all that?

Mr. TREADWAY. I would be very glad to touch on the subject of condemnation. The advocates of the taking over of this canal before the River and Harbor Committee desired that there should go into the bill a condemnation clause rather than the kind of an item that we did put in. I am betraying no confidence of the committee when I say that the committee were absolutely opposed to the condemnation item upon the very ground that there was no enthusiasm in the committee for the project, so that indirectly the committee are not favoring this project by having in the bill an item which it seems will not reach the purchase of the canal. The Agnus Commission several years ago appraised this property at twice the sum the bill carries. That was a disinterested commission, appointed by the Government; but even then no figure could be secured from the company itself. Consequently, in order that the Government should not embark on this enormous expenditure, it seems to me very desirable to leave this item in the bill as it is. If we are really going to take up this inland waterway, let us have money enough to carry it out, and let us have our own project. Do not let us take up somebody's discarded goods here and go ahead on that basis. I want to say, therefore, that I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] will not prevail, in order that in all probability the canal may not be purchased by the Government.

Mr. FREAR. In view of the fact that this item is certain to be increased to $2,500,000 in another body, just as it was four years ago, which may make it possible to purchase the canal, would it not be safer and better to strike it from the bill?

Mr. TREADWAY. I do not agree with the gentleman, because this project has friends on this floor. It has good, conscientious Members supporting it who would support it to the limit. They would support it to the condemnation figure, whatever it might be. Therefore I think this method of practically defeating it is very much better than trying to strike it out. In reference to the amount having been enlarged in some previous bill I take the gentleman's statement for that, but I recall that the item never became a law, and I know that if this bill should go to conference between the two Houses this House never would agree by its conferees to the acceptance of a larger figure than the committee now reports.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SWITZER was recognized.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the gentleman will pardon me, Mr. Chairman, I want to ask that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in five minutes.

Mr. MANN. I want five minutes.

Mr. HULBERT. I want two minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. I want five minutes, although I may not use them.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I will ask that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks that all debate on the paragraph and amendments thereto close in 20 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SWITZER. Mr. Chairman, I differ with my colleague as to the item now pending before the committee in the acquirement of the Delaware & Chesapeake Canal rights. I think the illustrations given by the gentleman from Illinois, in which he compares the future prospective commerce of this canal with other canals, are unfair. I have been informed that the Hennepin Canal across the State of Illinois has not been a success as a great commerce carrier, because it has never connected up the two great waterways and because the depth is only 6 or 7 feet. I am informed that it has been of great benefit to the people engaged in commerce by the effect that it has had on the reduc-

tion of railroad rates, especially on the Rock Island system. I understand that system paralleled this canal, and for years it practically held freight rates down lower than the actual cost of carriage in order that the railroad might put the canal out of business. Now, I say that that comparison is unfair. We have canals all through the State of Ohio from 2 to 6 feet in depth that carry no freight to-day, but why should I compare the benefits of the future prospects of this project with those unused canals throughout the State of Ohio.

On the other hand, we have the Ohio River, which has always been a great carrier of freight, and the Monongahela River, which has been canalized. The canalization of some streams has been a success and commerce on the stream has increased from 6,000,000 to 12,000,000 tons annually.

Anyone looking at this project can see at a glance that it connects two great waterways, the Chesapeake Bay and the Delaware Bay, or Delaware River, only a few miles. The commerce to-day is a million tons annually, not 10,000 tons, as it is on the Hennepin Canal, or as nothing on the many little ditches dug through Ohio.

What is proposed to-day is to increase the depth of this canal to 12 or 15 feet and eliminate the locks and make it a sea-level canal, eliminating the great expense in the future for upkeep. It seems to me that this is something worthy of consideration, especially when you are connecting up the channel which carries commerce between two great cities like Baltimore and Philadelphia.

Now, as to the method of acquiring the canal, I never have been in favor of condemnation proceedings only as a last resort. My experience is, and has led me to the conclusion, that condemnation costs more than when it is acquired by private arrangement or private contract. I believe that an appropriation of $1,300,000 will at least enable the War Department to close some bargain for this canal, and if it is acquired for something like $1,300,000 up to $2,600,000, I have no doubt the price is sufficiently cheap. Of the three routes proposed across this stretch of country, the two paralleling this canal, even at a maximum price, this route is much cheaper than any yet proposed. While I would not resort to condemnation proceedings only as a last resort that can be appealed to, I do think that this project is of sufficient importance, and I think any member of the committee who merely looks at the map will come to the conclusion that it is very desirable and should be embarked upon if it can be done at a reasonable expense.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I do not rise for the purpose of expressing especially either approval or disapproval of the item in the bill now under discussion. There are many arguments in favor of the proposition and very many arguments against it. The River and Harbor Committee has recommended it, and I think the House is going to agree to it. I never like to do a thing with subterfuge. I believe in being on the square with Members of the House.

Here is a canal proposition to-day that the committee recommend may be purchased for $1,300,000. In my judgment, if they had recommended the purchase of this canal at $2,600,000, the House would not agree to it. It is paying interest at the rate of 4 per cent on $2,600,000 of bonds. It has not increased its business materially. In the end, probably the canal would go more and more into disuse, because it probably can not maintain itself profitably and pay the interest on its bonds. I think if we buy it for $1,300,000, we are justified in doing it.

But what I want to know is whether it is the intention when this bill leaves this body to have the amount increased from $1,300,000 to $2,600,000, or some such sum, and then have that agreed to in conference, or whether it is proposed to put in the bill a provision that the Government shall condemn the property; because it is perfectly patent to anyone that if the Government condemns the property it will have to pay at least the cost of the bonds now outstanding, the interest on which has always been paid. Four per cent on bonds is not an excessively low rate of interest, and if we condemn this we will have to pay the value of the bonds. If we appropriate $1,300,000, and it stands at $1,300,000, these people will sell the canal for that price, because if they keep it their property depreciates in value.

I stood here when the new Panama Canal Co. made an estimate for what they would sell the Panama Canal to the United States for. I do not remember now whether it was a hundred and forty or a hundred and eighty million dollars, or just what it was, but I do remember that when we got down to brass tacks, although they had said to us repeatedly that they would not sell for any less—when we really got down to brass tacks and authorized the purchase for a certain sum, they took what we offered; and if instead of offering them $40,000,000 we had offered $20,000,000, they would have taken that. This canal company in the end will take whatever we offer.

I would like to know from the gentleman in charge of the bill if it is the intention to increase the offer through the operation of the Senate and the conference committee, and I observe that I do not get any reply.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois can get a reply, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. HULBERT. Mr. Chairman, convictions are very largely influenced by environment. Anyone born and bred in the State of New York and familiar with its canal system can be expected to be favorable to a proper enlargement of the Atlantic coast inland waterway system. Private capital has blazed the way, as it always does, in the construction of the Cape Cod Canal, which is now being successfully and profitably operated. I am not opposed to the construction of this canal, provided it is undertaken upon proper terms, but I fail to realize the distinction which will place upon the State of New Jersey the necessity for procuring at the expense of its citizens the right of way for the construction of the canal from the Delaware River to Raritan Bay, but will permit those to be benefited by the canal connecting the Delaware with the Chesapeake to obtain the means for acquiring the right of way out of the Federal Treasury. Moreover, I wish to dissent from the statement contained in the report of the Army engineers that the construction of this entire canal up to a depth of 12 feet is a proposition of national importance, and the deepening of the channel from 12 to 25 feet is a matter of local importance, and that the deepening to 25 feet or more should only be made in the event of local cooperation. Rather do I take the contrary view, that the channel of 12 feet is a channel primarily in the interest of local commerce, and that when it is deepened to 25 feet it becomes a national industry.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HULBERT] who has just taken his seat remarked about the lack of cooperation proposed in connection with the plans of the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal as compared to what New Jersey may have to do for the Delaware & Raritan Canal. I want to say to the House that the States of Maryland, Pennsylvania, and Delaware originally took stock in this canal company when the canal was dug some years ago. I merely wanted to reply to the gentleman who has just spoken, and my purpose in asking for time is to call the attention of the House to some of the military and naval uses that this canal may serve. Other gentlemen here to-day have told you of its commercial value, and they have covered every point, but very little has been said concerning the military and naval use to which this canal could be put. In 1906 Gen. Agnus, an Army officer, was chairman of the commission that made a report upon this project, and a great part of that report concerns the military and naval value of this canal. We all know what the Kiel Canal has been to Germany in this war.

If it were not for the Kiel Canal connecting the Baltic and the North Seas, the German battle fleet would not have been of any use to that nation in this war. This is a similar case. If it were in another nation, a canal would be constructed for military and naval uses, notwithstanding any opposition to the contrary, so far as it related to its commercial value. We see before us a stretch of coast line—the Atlantic Coast—about 3,000 miles long. Our battle fleet not only has to defend that coast, but it has to defend the coast line of the Gulf of Mexico, and through the agency of the Panama Canal that same battle fleet is expected to defend the Pacific coast. This Nation has the greatest vulnerable coast line of any first-class power, excepting none. It takes a battle fleet of great proportions to defend it. The Panama Canal divides in two the fleet that is necessary. This project here, if put through, will not cost when completed to a 33-foot channel what one dreadnaught or one battle cruiser would cost. In the Agnus report we find the following language:

> A geographical study of the Maryland and Delaware peninsula and the Atlantic coast line of the United States shows that this peninsula is one of the most vulnerable and suitable places for the location of a base of land operations should our Navy be driven from the sea.

This was demonstrated in the War of 1812 in no uncertain manner, when the British burned the very Capitol in which we gentlemen are now sitting. I can not in the few minutes I have call attention to all of the points in this report, but there is another sentence which concerns it very closely and which I desire to quote:

> The Civil War developed the enormous value of the present canal as a means of transportation of troops, supplies, and prisoners. While our railroad facilities have greatly increased since that time, it is

easily conceivable that in future wars or internal disturbances the proposed ship canal would very likely prove an important adjunct to rail transportation and possibly a vital factor in the campaign, should rail transportation be interrupted by accidents, strikes, or hostile raids.

Mr. Chairman, I maintain that it is a real question of preparedness, outside of the commercial value, and it is one that we should very seriously consider at a time when we are spending many hundreds of millions of dollars upon ships. The amount spent to put this canal through would not represent the loss of one battleship or battle cruiser, should it be lost by reason of its not having the proper means of communication between two of our greatest bays, the Delaware and the Chesapeake, and around which there are likely to be military and naval operations should war ever come.

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

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. Yes.

Mr. HULBERT. Does not the argument which the gentleman makes with regard to the question of preparedness apply likewise to the canal between New York and New Jersey?

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. It does; and I agree with the naval officers who say that this project from Boston down should be put through as a defensive measure; and the gentleman knows and I know that naval officers are not prone to advocate something for purely commercial purposes. It is really a defensive measure. [Applause.]

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield that three minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, in that three minutes I want to refer to the commercial importance of this project. That was the reason for the introduction of the original bill, but the Agnus report in 1907 indicated that commerce around about this section of the country was running all the way from fifty to ninety million tons. There are but two railroads that parallel the canal, and the tolls now charged upon the canal are equal to the tolls paid upon the railroads; and in spite of the fact that the tolls paid on the canal equal those paid on the railroads, the canal does a million tons of business a year. We can sometimes get quicker service for heavy freight over the canal to-day than they can upon the railroads. That much for the commercial side of the question.

Now for the national-defense side. I will quote from Admiral Benson, who only yesterday was designated to take the place of the lamented Admiral Dewey at the head of the Naval Board. In an address upon this subject, the admiral, after referring to the strategic situation and the fact that diplomacy does not always count in matters of warfare, said:

For this reason it is barely possible that the time may come—though we sincerely hope it will not—when it might be necessary for our vessels to keep in harbors and move from one to the other. Our coasts might be assailed by an overwhelming naval force before we could prepare ourselves fully to repel it. That being the case, you will easily understand what an advantage it would be if we could move our ships from one part of the coasts to the other. For instance, if the fleet was mobilized in Hampton Roads—

Down here [illustrating on map]—

and we had a canal connecting that waterway with Delaware Bay—

Here [illustrating]—

our fleet, or portions of it, could move from Hampton Roads to Delaware Bay.

Here is an attacking force outside [indicating on map]; our fleet is inside. The admiral wants to move on to this bay—the Delaware—to reach the opposing fleet in the rear if necessary, and so all along the coast at these other three openings. He says:

Again, if we had a canal leading from Delaware Bay into New York Bay, we could move on still farther with our battleships through Hell Gate into Long Island Sound.

You will readily understand that in order to offset our advantage in the way of such canals the enemy would be compelled to have four times the force that he would otherwise have to have in order to prevent ships coming out and attacking him successfully. That seems to be so obvious that it needs no discussion whatever. [Applause.] But regardless of the fact this condition might never obtain, the question of sending supplies from one point to another is of very vital importance to the Navy. We have navy yards and gun factories, for instance, here in Washington. At the Naval Gun Foundry here nearly all our guns for the Navy are constructed. They are proved down here at the proving grounds on the Potomac River, a few miles below. Practically all of our powder that we use in those guns is made down here at Indianhead, about 14 miles below the city. A great many of the projectiles we use are made here on the Potomac River.

In addition to that, we have at Norfolk one of our principal naval stations. Thus you see that in case we were building ships on the Delaware River—and there has been a wonderful development in the shipbuilding industry there recently, and also a great development of the Philadelphia Navy Yard, and a greater development is bound to come in the near future—we might want to send our guns, or we might want to send powder or various munitions of war from over in this immediate vicinity or from Norfolk to Philadelphia; and a small enemy cruiser hovering off the coast might be able to prevent our doing so unless we had a system of communication along the inside route that would allow us to send these munitions of war where needed. The same thing would be true with regard to communicating through from Delaware Bay to New York City, and it is also desirable to continue the same system of deeper inland waterways along the entire eastern coast.

It may not be known to you that for some years now we have been supplying our naval stations along this eastern coast with coal for their use from colliers, because it was impracticable to get the coal carried in the ordinary way; so the Navy colliers had to supply the navy yards with coal sufficient to run them.

* * * * * * *

Now, as I said in the beginning, we have a great number of small craft, and our coast is so formed that its defense must necessarily depend very largely on the submarines and the smaller craft; and in order to utilize what we have to the fullest extent there should be some means of moving this craft from one part of the coast to the other.

Our national means of defense, particularly from Key West north, would be through our inland waterways by our submarines. Not that the submarines are not able to go outside, for they are, and even our coast submarines are able to go to sea and cruise a hundred miles off shore successfully. They can go even farther; but what I refer to is the fact that they want to be protected. We do not want them exposed to the attacks of the enemy on the outside in case we desire to move them from one point of the coast to another, or in order that they may go out from various openings and attack the enemy. So you can readily see the tremendous advantage that improved inland waterways would be to the Navy in the event of war in moving submarines and destroyers through the inland waterways.

Of course, anything that helps commerce helps the Navy; anything that helps the Navy helps commerce; and whatever helps both helps the country.

This is the way Admiral Benson felt about it.

Here are the four points of attack to which the admiral refers: One is at the entrance of Long Island Sound, one at the entrance of New York Bay, one at the entrance of Delaware Bay, and one at the entrance of the Chesapeake Bay. Make the inside passages ample and safe and we will have four times the advantage in attacking the enemy first, and we can move from point to point for repairs or ammunition or supplies. So says Admiral Benson. Then there is the question as to the ability of the railroads to carry munitions in time of war. They might be disabled or absolutely destroyed along this coast, and then there may be strikes upon the railroads just when we need the railroads to carry munitions of war. In such an event the admiral says it would be an advantage; it would be absolutely essential to the welfare of the Nation for our boats to pass inland from point to point. And, gentlemen, all that is asked now is to give this project a start by connecting up these two great bays of the Atlantic seaboard. The Navy men want this done, the Army men want this done as a measure of national defense, and the great commercial interests of the country want it done because it will afford cheaper transportation and bring about that communication which has been so long denied. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired; all time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin, to strike out the paragraph.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Baltimore Harbor and Channels, Md.: For maintenance of Patapsco River and channel to Baltimore, including channel of approach at York Spit, Chesapeake Bay, $104,000; for improvement in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 799, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session, and subject to the conditions set forth in said document, $250,000. And the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to prosecute maintenance work in the inner harbor in accordance with the recommendation submitted in said document; in all, $354,000.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, first, that no contract for maintenance or improvement of harbors shall be let unless competitive bids are received from at least three bidders and bids shall not be accepted until personally approved by the Secretary of War.

The CHAIRMAN. Where does the gentleman ask that his amendment be inserted?

Mr. FREAR. At the end of the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman offers his amendment, to be inserted at the end of the paragraph.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, in the case of large harbors which carry a great deal of commerce I have never yet proposed a change of the recommendations of the Army engineers. I would not do so in this case, because I realize this is a great harbor carrying a great commerce. However, last night I presented to the House, and it appears this morning in the RECORD, the dredgers' agreement which was published before in the RECORD. It appears on page 1995 of the RECORD of yesterday, showing the procedure among the dredging companies to allot contracts in the past without having genuine competitive bidding, and I called attention last night to the further fact that the company which had headquarters in the city of Baltimore is the company whose president was once president of the

dredgers' association which in past years allotted contracts. I further called attention to the fact that the company had all the contracts, I believe, without exception, in the Baltimore district except one, for dredging, and all those cases where there was dredged sand and mud they received 26½ cents, level price, and the only other company that did dredging in that district received 9 cents for practically the same kind of work, so far as can be judged.

In order to have genuine competitive bidding, Mr. Chairman, there must be more than one bidder. And it appears, so far as we can judge from the record——

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. COX. Has the gentleman looked up to see what has been the policy of these various companies? Have more than one submitted bids heretofore?

Mr. FREAR. There is nothing before us that can show in regard to that. The Army engineers can disclose, but even if they did disclose that, from the very fact that the dredgers' association has controlled in the past, it would bring no return, because those bids might be for the purpose of making a show; but the determination would eventually be from the one that controlled the pool, if that procedure is still adopted. In Baltimore this one company has exclusive dredging contracts.

Mr. COX. For Baltimore Harbor?

Mr. FREAR. For Baltimore Harbor, just as it has to-day for other points in the Baltimore district, with one exception. I believe that is right.

Mr. COX. How many companies are engaged in this line of work along the Atlantic seaboard?

Mr. FREAR. Dredging companies?

Mr. COX. Yes.

Mr. FREAR. I have that in the RECORD. If the gentleman will turn to page 1996 of the RECORD he will see that I caused to be inserted there the names of a number of dredging companies that were making contributions or that were referred to as making contributions to the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. I can read those, if desired, but they appear there.

Mr. COX. Is the National Rivers and Harbors Congress a permanent organization? What is it, anyhow? What is its purpose and object? What does it seek to obtain?

Mr. FREAR. In its charter or constitution it says it is in favor of a policy, not a project, to have an appropriation of $50,000,000 made annually by the Federal Congress.

Mr. COX. How is it obtained?

Mr. FREAR. Presumably by contributions received from dredgers and various individuals throughout the country. And I have furnished the subscription list in the past to show——

Mr. COX. Voluntary contributions, or depending on the success in obtaining the amount of the contract?

Mr. FREAR. I take it that they are voluntary so far as the subscription list I filed and put in the RECORD two years ago.

Mr. COX. Then the purpose is to divide up the territory and divide up the contracts?

Mr. FREAR. The purpose of the Rivers and Harbors Congress, as shown on page 1994 and claimed in their report, is to divide up their appropriations. This Congress apparently is only used as an instrument under their direction. They are the ones that divide the appropriations among the States. The gentleman will notice on page 1994 the amount subscribed to the National Rivers and Harbors Congress by States is put side by side with the amount received from the Federal Congress of the United States, and 1 per cent is shown by their report, all that is necessary to receive a proportionate amount of $100 from the Government.

Mr. COX. Let me ask the gentleman: Did the gentleman himself compile this data on page 1994?

Mr. FREAR. Oh, no. That is taken from their official report, in which they make that statement.

Mr. COX. I see in this report that Pennsylvania contributed $4,295 for the maintenance of something, and got back in return $4,837,745.

Mr. FREAR. That report shows in the comparative table, placed just as it is here.

Mr. COX. I would like to know, if the gentleman can give me the information, and I am seeking information solely, what is the concrete purpose of these appropriations made by these dredging concerns?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin have five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. What are these contributions made for?

Mr. FREAR. The contributions by the dredgers?

Mr. COX. Yes.

Mr. FREAR. That is for the support of the Rivers and Harbors Congress. It purports to be, so far as the subscription list is submitted, for the support of this lobby, this river and harbor lobby, that claims to have something to do with the distribution of appropriations throughout the country.

Mr. COX. And the Rivers and Harbors Congress is supposed to bring pressure to bear on this Congress in order to get it to make appropriations for the various projects?

Mr. FREAR. That is a practical admission. I do not know how they would proceed to do otherwise. That appears in their annual report.

So, Mr. Chairman, I ask to have the amendment adopted. Surely there can be nothing objectionable in that, in order to insure active competition among dredgers.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Would not the amendment have a tendency to exclude the Government from securing three bidders on any work on a project at all?

Mr. FREAR. I think that would be a logical result, but it seems to me we would try to secure genuine bids in order that the project might be carried out.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If there was such a combination, there would not be any bids.

Mr. FREAR. We ought to discover if a combination exists, because the dredgers' association, holding up the Government of the United States——

Mr. SPARKMAN. If one exists, I am not in sympathizing with it.

Mr. FREAR. I understand the gentleman does not.

Mr. SPARKMAN. This amendment, if adopted, may cause the project to suffer.

Mr. FREAR. The Government would suffer if we are to accept the figures of one dredging company.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think the War Department can be trusted to take care of that.

Mr. FREAR. They have been taking care of these things with that unknown agreement in force in past years apparently, and that agreement has divided with the dredgers in the past the allotment of these contracts.

Mr. SPARKMAN. We put on an amendment on the floor of the House last year designed to protect against just that kind of situation.

Mr. FREAR. It could not reach that, if the chairman please, because the gentleman will observe that unless you have a Government dredge working along in that neighborhood there is no way of comparison.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Your amendment might stop the work entirely.

Mr. FREAR. That is true, unless you can have genuine competition. The purpose is to insist that we have genuine competition throughout the country on these dredging contracts, and particularly at Baltimore, where the evidence goes to show that this one company controls everything in the Baltimore district, as well as contracts far outside.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] attempts to show that there is an association which allots these contracts. The gentleman does not tell the House, however, that the letter to which he refers was dated on March 13, 1901, nearly 16 years ago, and that that organization went out of existence in 1905 or 1906, and that it has had no existence since that time.

The gentleman from Wisconsin also attempts to show that there is no competition. I have what data I could get from the engineers this morning, and the contract that is referred to principally by the gentleman is in connection with the rivers and harbors on the Eastern Shore of Maryland. The contract price there is $41,946.25. There were four bidders. The contract was awarded at 26½ cents per cubic yard. The highest bid was $45,892.50. The Maryland Dredging Co., which received the contract, bid nearly $4,000 less than the highest bidders. It is a small contract involving heavy expense in moving and installing the plant, all of which made the cost greater. Now, in the James River case the estimated cost was $39,000. There were four bidders—the Norfolk Dredging Co., the A. B. Walls & Sons, the P. Sanford Ross Co., and the Maryland Dredging Co. The Maryland Dredging Co. got that contract for $34,590, nearly $4,500 less than the estimated cost. The highest bid was $52,350.

In the Anacostia River case the estimate was $39,000. The Maryland Dredging Co. bid $44,000 for the contract, 5½ cents per cubic yard. There were five bidders. The highest bid was 8 cents, and the next lowest bid was 6 cents per cubic yard.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes.

Mr. FREAR. Why is it that the Maryland Dredging Co. received 5½ cents while the other concern that is doing the work on the Anacostia River received only 5 cents?

Mr. LINTHICUM. That is a pertinent question. In many of these contracts the material is soft mud, while in other cases it may be sand or gravel or rock. Take the Delaware River, for example, of which the gentleman spoke yesterday. The gentleman spoke of the Maryland Dredging Co. getting 14.7 cents per cubic yard while another company got only 9 cents. The truth is, the Maryland Dredging Co. is using a dipper dredging machine, lifting hard material, while another company is using a suction dredge and pumping the mud on the shore. It depends upon the kind of material you are dredging, whether it is soft mud or sand or gravel or rock, and it also depends on how far you have to carry the material that is dredged. That also enters into the cost of these matters.

Now, in the Delaware River case, the Maryland Dredging Co. bid 16.2 cents. There were five bidders. The highest was 19 cents. The total contract was $46,980 and the Army estimate was $55,000.

Mr. FREAR. Was there not a contract with the Maryland Dredging Co. for 24 cents?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I think so. That river was divided up into three sections. One section was mud and another was heavy material and a third section was a section where there was some rock. As I said, the price depends upon the class of material to be moved and where it is to be deposited.

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

Mr. LINTHICUM. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to see if we can get some agreement as to the length of debate.

Mr. FREAR. I only want to ask the gentleman one question.

Mr. SPARKMAN. How much time does the gentleman from Maryland want?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I asked for five minutes' time.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I ask, Mr. Chairman, that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto end in 12 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto end in 12 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Now, the gentleman from Wisconsin has laid considerable stress upon that letter to which I referred, but the gentleman has not called attention to the fact that that was something that happened 16 years ago. It was a circular letter and it was fully explained to the Rivers and Harbors Committee at that time, when Mr. Burton was chairman.

Now, the Maryland Dredging Co. is presided over by Mr. Frank A. Furst, and it is a large organization. Mr. Frank Furst is one of the best and most respected citizens of the State of Maryland. His word goes with the people of that State. He stands as high for character and credit as any citizen we have, and the intimation that he would enter into any arrangement by which contracts would be apportioned to the detriment of the Government is impossible for any citizen of Maryland to believe.

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

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes.

Mr. FREAR. Is it not a fact that in this statement he admitted the allotments were made at that time?

Mr. LINTHICUM. No. I do not think that statement applies in the sense the gentleman ascribes, any more than the statement that a banquet was given by Mr. Furst at which Congressmen were guests be a proof that there was any impropriety or corruption connected with it. I was told by Mr. Furst that there never was a Congressman at the alleged banquet. It was not what you would call a regular banquet. It was simply a few men gathered around a table to discuss business affairs and who at the same time enjoyed their dinner.

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

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. May I suggest to the gentleman that there is a convention of workingmen to be held in Washington soon, at which they may also have a banquet?

Mr. LINTHICUM. The gentleman speaks of the River and Harbor Congress. Certain Members of Congress are members of that association, which has for its purpose the development of rivers and harbors and not for the allotment of contracts.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. We may have an invitation extended to the gentleman to speak to the convention.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes; I may have the pleasure of being delegated to invite the gentleman to Baltimore.

Mr. FREAR. Is it not directly intimated by their annual report that they have some control over appropriations? Has the gentleman investigated that?

Mr. LINTHICUM. No. I am not a member of the River and Harbor Congress, although some Representatives and Senators are. I think it is somewhat like our Atlantic Deep Waterways Association, which is working for the construction of this canal, and the Rivers and Harbors Congress is working for the improvement of the rivers and harbors of the country, not to the injury of the Government, but for the betterment of the conditions of the country and the traffic arrangements throughout the land.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. There being 50,000 miles of navigable and nonnavigable rivers in the country, about one-half of which are nonnavigable, does the gentleman think it improper for any association of men interested in public development to advocate the improvement of the nonnavigable rivers?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I find that men in all walks of life are advocating the development of those things in which they are interested. I look upon the Rivers and Harbors Congress as of great benefit to this Congress, because of the varied information which they gather.

Mr. HULBERT. Is this document which the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] are referring to the communication that appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at page 1995, as a report of the board of directors of the Atlantic & Gulf Coast Dredge Owners' Association, dated March 13, 1901?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes; nearly 16 years ago.

Mr. HULBERT. Sixteen years ago. I notice in the RECORD the statement of the gentleman from Wisconsin, reading as follows:

> I submit a statement secretly issued by a dredgers' organization, and placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in a speech made September 29, 1914.

Can the gentleman from Maryland tell me, or will he permit the gentleman from Wisconsin, if we will do so, to state when this statement was secretly issued by the dredgers' organization, as it seems very singular that we have not learned of it until 16 years after the date that it bears?

Mr. FREAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULBERT. Certainly.

Mr. FREAR. If the gentleman had been a Member of Congress and had read the RECORD, he would have discovered that this was inserted two years ago when first received, and a resolution was introduced in Congress asking for an investigation at that time, to ascertain whether or not such a secret agreement for the allotment of contracts existed at that time or at this time.

Mr. HULBERT. Who introduced the resolution to which the gentleman refers?

Mr. FREAR. I introduced that resolution.

Mr. HULBERT. Has the gentleman ever demanded or secured a hearing upon that resolution?

Mr. FREAR. The resolution was referred to the River and Harbor Committee, if I remember correctly, and if the resolution had been considered of interest by the committee I take it that they would have asked for a hearing. I submit that was all I could do.

Mr. HULBERT. The gentleman knows I have not been at all backward in my attitude in regard to these matters.

Mr. FREAR. Oh, no.

Mr. HULBERT. The gentleman has never sought to interest me in it.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I hope this colloquy will not be taken out of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. It has taken place in the gentleman's time, and the gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I did not know that the gentleman's question was going to extend into a speech. I ask unanimous consent for two minutes more.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I have no objection to the extension.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent that his time be extended two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINTHICUM. As to the amendment which the gentleman proposes applying to Baltimore, there is no telling when we might get that work done. I was talking to the Engineer's Office, and I asked them about the competitive bids. They said that they had had a great many competitive bids until the last six months, but in the last six months there was so much private work going on, which seems to pay a better price than Government work, that they had not had as many bidders as formerly. If you put that amendment in there, and if we do not have the number of bidders that the gentleman speaks of, then the Baltimore work will be at a standstill; and this is a proposition which we have had before Congress for some years, a proposition which Baltimore absolutely needs, one which is necessary for the business that has developed in that great city in the last few years. The extension of this channel is necessary, particularly at Curtis Bay, where the Government colliers can not load to their full capacity with coal for the warships which you are building; and until that channel is of sufficient depth the colliers which supply a large proportion of the coal for the warships on the Atlantic seaboard will continue to go out loaded to only a part of their capacity, much to the loss of the Government.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The gentleman says this dredge owners' association went out of existence in what year?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Nineteen hundred and five or 1906.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Ten or eleven years ago?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Eleven years ago.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I will say to the gentleman that never until he made the statement he has just been making did I have any idea that this dredgers' association went out of existence so long ago. I do not think one Member of the House, outside of the two gentlemen who made the statement, knew that that was a fact. In 1914, when that statement was made here, everybody supposed that the dredgers' association was still in existence.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Oh, no; it has not been in existence for the past 11 years.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR], if they have any application or purpose whatever, mean that he charges a dredgers' association which has been out of existence for more than 10 years with combining or conspiring improperly to influence Congress. That is a serious charge, and the gentleman ought to have substantial evidence before making it as to any men engaged in private activities. If the gentleman has any purpose, he will probably have us infer that the United States Army Engineers, by reason of lack of skill or lack of integrity or lack of a disposition to preserve the rights of the United States Government, were improperly influenced by these dredgers. Does he mean to make that statement? The gentleman refers to the National River and Harbor Congress, a voluntary organization composed of delegates which attend its annual meetings held in this city, from substantially every State in the Union. Among them are reputable gentlemen from the State of Wisconsin, and yet the gentleman in his remarks about that association, if he has any purpose at all, would have us believe that these business men from all over the United States, presided over by the distinguished and honorable Member of the Senate of the United States, Senator RANSDELL, are engaged in improperly influencing the Congress of the United States. If he does not mean that, what does he mean?

Now, with reference to the amendment he offers I call the attention of the House to the river and harbor act of 1888, which contains this statute, and which is applicable at the present time:

SEC. 3. That it shall be the duty of the Secretary of War to apply the money herein and hereafter appropriated for improvement of rivers and harbors, other than surveys, estimates, and gaugings, in carrying on the various works, by contract or otherwise, as may be most economical and advantageous to the Government. Where said works are done by contract such contract shall be made after sufficient public advertisement for proposals, in such manner and form as the Secretary of War shall prescribe; and such contracts shall be made with the lowest responsible bidders, accompanied by such securities as the Secretary of War shall require, conditioned for the faithful prosecution and completion of the work according to such contract.

In every one of these proposals the right is always reserved to reject any and all bids. So we have sufficient law at the present time to accomplish the result desired, and makes the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin unnecessary. The only question here is whether the Secretary of War and the Corps of Engineers have the skill and integrity and ability to preserve the rights of the Government and to administer the law expending the appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired; all time has expired.

Mr. HULBERT. Mr. Chairman, I believe I was to have two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

Mr. HULBERT. I ask unanimous consent that I may have two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that he may proceed for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HULBERT. Mr. Chairman, I have no doubt it was more fortunate for the people of the twenty-first congressional district of New York that I did not represent that district in 1914, because my predecessor, the Hon. Henry George, jr., was a far abler and better man than I can ever hope to be. But in the two years that I have been a Member of this House, I have been endeavoring to familiarize myself with matters connected with the Committee on Rivers and Harbors; and although I have been diligent and given a great deal of study to matters connected with it, I never knew until the gentleman referred to it yesterday of the existence of the paper that has been referred to, nor to the resolution of investigation introduced by him before I became a Member of Congress. I hope I may profitably spend the two minutes allotted to me in getting further information.

I observe on page 1995 of the RECORD, in the article that the gentleman inserted yesterday, a series of subheads. At the bottom of the first column is "In union there is strength." In the next column is a subhead, "Quarreling over spoils," and below that is another subhead, "To throw all resources on projects." I would like to ask as a matter of information of the gentleman from Wisconsin whether those subheads were in the statement submitted by him or put in by him in order to add emphasis to the article which he has submitted to this House?

Mr. FREAR. They were inserted by myself as evidence of what the contract or agreement purported to be.

Mr. HULBERT. I suppose the subheads on page 1996, "Dredgers neglected the pork barrel" and "Board is to work for pork barrels," were also inserted by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. SWITZER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULBERT. Yes.

Mr. SWITZER. Does the gentleman know who wrote the article in the first instance?

Mr. HULBERT. I do not know anything about the article except the information contained in the RECORD, but I submit that if an article is inserted in the RECORD, having been prepared by a gentleman whose name is attached to it, that it is misleading for a Member of the House to insert subheads without putting in parentheses or indicate otherwise that the subheads are his.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Is the gentleman familiar with the system that is pursued in the office of a good many publications of this country of putting headlines over an article that by insinuation and inuendo reflects on the character or reputation of a man when the reading of the article does not bear it out?

Mr. HULBERT. I am not aware of the practice to the extent that I believe it is a system. If the gentleman from Washington has found any evidence that there is a system, the House of Representatives is the last body which ought to approve and adopt such a system here.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired and all time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Rockhall, Queenstown, Claiborne, and Cambridge Harbors, and Chester, Choptank, Warwick, Wicomico, Pocomoke, La Trappe, and Manokin Rivers, and Tyaskin Creek, Md.: For maintenance, $10,000; completing improvement of Wicomico River, Md., in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 1509, Sixty-third Congress, third session, and subject to the conditions set forth in said document, $17,100; in all, $27,100.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment to follow the paragraph.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of line 5, page 11, insert: "That no contract for maintenance or improvement shall be let unless competitive bids are received from at least three bidders and bids shall not be accepted until personally approved by the Secretary of War."

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I do not expect to offer any other amendment of this kind. This is one for a small contract and the other one that I offered was for a large contract. But I wish to reply to some statements that have been made here by these Members of Congress who are defending this dredgers' association that formerly allotted contracts to defeat the ends of justice and seeking to get money out of the Federal Treasury

by allotment. Was that right? Do you think it was honest? Did the Army engineers know it? The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL] says that I am charging the Army engineers with influencing Members of Congress. He is always defending the Army engineers when there is no necessity for it. Did they know of the secret agreement; did they know that the dredgers were allotting these contracts in these districts? I have no knowledge of the subject, but am sure they did not. The question is, Do you know it to-day here? The statement was put in the RECORD precisely as it was put in back in 1914.

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

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I would like to suggest to the gentleman that I do not think the criticism was intended to convey the impression that this House would condone any such agreement as that.

Mr. FREAR. Oh, no. I take it the chairman is right in that respect.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It was directed to the fact that the combination, if any, had gone out of existence some 10 or 15 years before. The discussion was therefore merely academic.

Mr. FREAR. The chairman would have the right to come to that conclusion and so would all others were it not for the fact that all of these contracts suddenly come into existence around this particular headquarters at Baltimore, and the fact that the official is the same who existed at that time. Who can tell us that the dredgers' association has gone out of existence? Who says it has? Who knows?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Oh, 30 or 40 years ago there were many conditions different from what there are now.

Mr. FREAR. According to the gentleman's understanding, it has gone out of existence.

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

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the gentleman tell me some of those contracts that the Maryland Dredging Co. has had around Baltimore.

Mr. FREAR. The ones in existence to-day.

Mr. LINTHICUM. That is only one contract in the Patapsco River. The truth is that the Maryland Dredging Co. has only dredged the Craighill Channel around Fort McHenry, and it is not doing any dredging there except some small contracts.

Mr. FREAR. There has been no charge that the Army engineers were connected with this, but I do say apparently the Army engineers were deceived by this association when they allotted contracts, and that is borne out by this statement or agreement.

As to the subheads of the article, those were put in in the original article, I presume, because it was inserted here just as it was inserted there, presumably with those subheads at that time. No one will believe that that was intended to change in any way the character of the statement that the association was supposed to allot these dredgers' contracts. Now, as to the gentleman who defends the Rivers and Harbors Congress, I say that that is a lobby. I say that it is for the securing of $50,000,000 in appropriations every year. That was a part of their constitution which has been quoted in the past. Here was a statement they filed. I do not ask you to take my conclusions. The statement which they filed is shown on page 1994, in which they show appropriations received from the Government by the various States and then that organization puts right up in juxtaposition the amount of money that is paid toward the association. Is not that true? Can you form any other conclusion? That is taken from their report. If that is true, what is your conclusion in regard to what they meant? What other conclusion could you come to but that for the purpose of securing appropriations from the Federal Congress it was necessary to belong to that association and to make contributions? Is not that a fair inference? Is not that the only conclusion that could be reached? That is taken from their official records, not from any statements upon my part. So I say that the criticism was not fairly directed when it is said that I am saying these things. I am taking the official record of that organization.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Has the gentleman any evidence that there was a combination between the dredging firms?

Mr. FREAR. Nothing except what I have given, and their own statement that there has been in the past.

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

Mr. LINTHICUM rose.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this paragraph and amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I asked the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] to name some of the contracts that the Maryland Dredging Co. had around Baltimore Harbor, and he has failed to name them.

Mr. FREAR. Only what the engineer's report shows.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Because he can not. The Maryland Dredging Co. has not had any contracts around Baltimore for some time—not since it dredged the Craighill Channel at Fort McHenry. It has a small contract for maintenance in the Patapsco River, and the facts about that are these: There were three bidders. The Maryland Dredging Co. bid 8¾ cents per cubic yard and the highest bidder was 15 cents. The Maryland Dredging Co. got that little contract in the Baltimore channel. Can anyone imagine this particular company doing the work for much less than 8¾ cents? In the work done about Baltimore, I think it was the Coastwise Dredging Co., of Norfolk which got the contract, and the Maryland Dredging Co. has not had any work with the exception of this small contract that I tell you about and it got that at 8¾ cents. The truth about the dredging business is that a large number of the dredgers who have been doing Government work in this country have gone broke in the last year or so because of the high wages and the high cost of coal and other things which enter into contracts. So that there is not very much profit in the work at this time. The Maryland Dredging Co., however, has a large force and they have a number of dredges and are doing the business on a large scale, and are thus able to do it more cheaply and make some money out of it, but the small men who have attempted the work have gone broke in nearly every instance.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Norfolk Harbor and channels, Va.: For improvement in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 605, Sixty-third Congress, second session, $270,000. The unexpended balance of appropriations heretofore made for improvement of channel to Norfolk, Va., is hereby made available for continuing improvement of said channel in accordance with the report submitted in said document.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the paragraph just read be passed over to be returned to later with a view to possible amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent that the paragraph just read on page 11 be passed over to be returned to later. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

James River, Va.: Continuing improvement and for maintenance, $56,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph, lines 8 and 9.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 12, strike out all of lines 8 and 9.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I do not expect that my amendment will go very far, but I wish to present this fact to the committee, that this project is one which the Army engineers, the men we quote so frequently, I understand, decided should be abandoned, so far as the 18-foot project was concerned, the last session, and so reported. However, the House in its wisdom and Congress overruled the Army engineers and insisted that this project should be carried on. At that time I voted against it, believing it was improper, and I simply raise the question again.

Mr. HULBERT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order the gentleman is not at liberty to state how he voted in reference to this item.

Mr. FREAR. Why?

Mr. HULBERT. In committee?

Mr. FREAR. No; I did not say in the committee. Appropriations have reached $3,440,000. That has been the appropriation for this project, and the engineers' report shows that $191,735 is on hand. The proposal here is for a small appropriation of $56,000. The amount estimated to complete this project to its full depth is $2,797,000 more. This is one of those other projects, which has been explained, for which the Maryland Dredging Co. had the contract. There is a good commerce, a large commerce, at Richmond, but Army engineers, to whom we appeal on all these cases for advice, have said that the original project ought not to be continued. We are paying at this place a large sum per square yard to excavate rock on this project. Nothing is paid toward the project by Richmond or the district that is to be benefited. We are carrying a channel way up into Virginia; that is, the Government is doing it. Now, when

it comes to improving channels down on the Texas coast we say to the people there, "You contribute and do your share. You make a payment if we are going to carry a canal or a river or an improvement; you must make a contribution to it." Here we say the Government will put in $2,700,000 more, in addition to the $3,400,000. I understand Army engineers have recommended the discontinuance of the full project and only ask for maintenance. For that reason I made the motion.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I wish to say to the committee that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] is mistaken in two statements. First, the engineers have not recommended a discontinuance of the original project, as stated by the gentleman from Wisconsin. They have recommended a modification of that project, and I need not accentuate to the committee that there is a very great difference between a modification and a discontinuance of the project. Secondly, I desire to say to the committee that the city of Richmond has been a large contributor to the execution of the original project incident to the deepening of James River, notwithstanding the statement of the gentleman from Wisconsin to the contrary. According to the Engineer's report the total sum expended under the existing project by the Federal Government is $2,485,296.42, and the city of Richmond has voluntarily contributed and expended for the improvement of the channel and the construction of public terminals the sum of $1,044,476.65, in round numbers nearly half of what has been contributed by the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, another word. James River is a great tidal water stream, extending over a hundred miles from the city of Richmond to its mouth. Its commerce is considerable, being valued for the year 1916 at $51,899,841, as against $33,523,461 for 1915, and I am conservative in believing that the commerce for 1917 will exceed in value the figures just given.

The report of the engineers suggesting a modification in the project of 1884 I will not now discuss, save to say to the committee that there has been no consideration given to any economic or commercial fact that underlies or supports the original project. Indeed, I venture to think that the engineers would never have suggested such modification of the existing project had they made an investigation not only of the existing commerce but of a far larger commerce which has been denied access to the river and the city of Richmond by reason of the failure of the Government to deepen this river in conformity with the plan and the plain mandate of Congress.

I have appeared several times before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors about this matter. The committee has also given hearings to citizens of my district, and the committee on one or two occasions have gone over all or some portion of the river itself. I welcome the fullest personal investigation by the committee, and, if possible, by the House itself, and would await with confidence the verdict of such an investigation.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I will.

Mr. TILSON. Does this bill provide, or is it contemplated that the appropriation here made is to be used in accordance with the modified plan or in accordance with the former plan?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, it was the intention of the committee, I will say to the gentleman, not to interfere with this project one way or the other. The question of adopting the modification, or inserting the language in the bill that would adopt the modification, was discussed by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and it was determined not to take that course. I will say further that this appropriation is of such an amount that its expenditure will come under either project, the old project or the modified project, should Congress later on conclude to proceed under the former or the latter.

Mr. TILSON. Then, who will determine how it is to be used, whether in accordance with the original plan or the modification of the plan?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Congress later on, if it desires to proceed in accordance with the modification recommended. In the meantime the sum will be used in a way not inconsistent with either plan. I want to say further that it is the purpose of the committee in the near future to inspect the river and investigate the project for themselves. They were not entirely satisfied with the report of the engineers nor fully with the statements made by parties who came before us in the interest of the improvement, and we wanted to go and see for ourselves.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SPARKMAN. We did not have time to go during this session of Congress and make the investigation the committee desired to make. That is an important work and we do not want to do any injustice to the project, to the peolpe there, or to the Government. Hence it was thought best to make the appropriation just as we have and under the old project, but of such an amount that its expenditure would be consistent with either.

Mr. MONTAGUE. My construction of the action of the committee is that this appropriation is made under the old project and not under the modified plan. There is only an appropriation of $56,000 for maintenance, an insignificant and negligible sum. There is justifiable criticism of the way the money has been appropriated.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, it is not now the intention of the committee to adopt this modified project, but to leave the matter open for future consideration.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Let me get that clear, then. I understand from the chairman that the committee puts this construction on it: That this appropriation is in no wise a committal to the modified suggestions of the engineers.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I just wished to get that clear for the RECORD. I do not care to take up any further time. On some other occasion I may give the committee or the House my views in more extensive form.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR].

The amendment was rejected.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, a message, in writing, was received from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House of Representatives that the President had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

On January 16, 1917:

H. R. 1093. An act for the relief of James Anderson.

On January 18, 1917:

H. R. 10007. An act for the relief of William H. Woods.

RIVERS AND HARBORS APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

Tangier Channel, Va.: Completing improvement in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 107, Sixty-third Congress, first session, $16,434.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 12, strike out the paragraph, lines 13, 14, 15, and 16.

Mr. FREAR. In connection with the last matter which was discussed, the James River, I only wish to say that the statement of the chairman that they overruled the Army engineers and refused to consider the modified project was the matter I had in mind, and my amendment to strike out was based upon that fact. If the modified project had been accepted there would have been no question but that we were following their judgment in the matter. In this project before us, which was contained in the bill four years ago, it is a small matter. The last one possibly was open to criticism fully as much as the one that is before us. That is a project that carries only $16,000, but there is a point in it I wish to call attention to.

On page 7 it states:

Unfavorable reports as to result of preliminary examinations made with a view to dredging a channel to this part of the island were made in 1891 and 1899.

And it mentions the Chief of Engineer's reports.

They continued to press their claims down here on this island for some time, until finally the district officer recommended in House Document No. 107 of the Sixty-third Congress as follows:

From the facts and reasons above stated, I am of opinion that Chesapeake Bay, with a view to providing a suitable channel at Tangier, Va., is worthy of relief to the extent of a channel 4 feet deep at mean low water and 40 feet wide, at an estimated cost of $8,525. The anchorage basin is not recommended at this time because of the proportionally large cost of the improvement including it. It is thought that if such an anchorage be found necessary, local interests should either provide it or contribute to its construction.

Now, remember the Army engineers originally refused to recommend this project, but a district officer later said that if they would contribute one-half, then it would be a proper item to put in.

Immediately following that, after the Army engineers had reported that there should be a local contribution on that sub-

ject, the board took up the subject and made its final recommendation, as follows:

The improvement * * * is deemed advisable so far as to secure an available channel depth of 5 feet and a channel width of 50 feet * * * with an anchorage basis 400 feet by 400 feet of the same depth * * * at an estimated cost of $16,434 for first construction.

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

Mr. FREAR. I ask for two minutes more, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. FREAR. I read further:

After due consideration of the above-mentioned reports, I concur in general with the views of the district officer, the division engineer, and the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, and therefore, in carrying out the instructions of Congress, I report as follows: That the improvement by the United States of Chesapeake Bay with a view to providing a suitable channel at Tangier, Va., is deemed advisable so far as to secure an available channel depth of 5 feet and a channel width of 50 feet increased at entrances and on curves, from Tangier Sound to Tangier, with an anchorage basis 400 feet by 400 feet of the same depth, following in general the methods described in the report of the district officer, at an estimated cost of $16,434 for first construction, this estimate being based on the supposition that the construction will, as now seems desirable and advantageous, be prosecuted under a first appropriation of the entire amount of the estimate.

That is signed by W. H. Bixby, Chief of Engineers, United States Army. In other words, notwithstanding the district officer recommended a contribution on this particular project, the Chief of Engineers and the board wiped it out and said that the Government could do it all.

Now, I presented that matter when this same project was up under the old bill, as I recollect, and, of course, there are some statements on the subject rather disparging of the project. I do not care to repeat them. There is some property owned by the steamboat company and piers which were used by the railway company for steamboats. I ask that the item be stricken out because the original condition as recommended by the district engineer was not complied with.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks to which I recently addressed myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR].

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Waterway from Norfolk, Va., to Beaufort Inlet, N. C.: Continuing improvement, $1,000,000: *Provided*, That the route of the waterway may, in the discretion of the Secretary of War, be modified in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 1478, Sixty-third Congress, third session: *And provided further*, That not more than $75,000 shall be expended in acquiring the necessary rights of way between Albermarle Sound and Pungo River.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to call the attention of the committee, and particularly do I want to call the attention of the country, to a fact that does not appear in the RECORD in reference to these items, and to the attitude of my friend across the aisle, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR].

Frequently during the early part of this debate the gentleman stated, in defending his attitude in reference to the bill, that when the vote was taken upon the last bill there were 141 Members who voted with him, and he refers to that to show that he does not stand alone in his opposition to river and harbor bills, and that he is in reality representing a large minority of this body. I have been sitting here most of the day. I was absent at the time the vote was taken upon the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal, so I can not speak as to that vote; but with that single exception, unless I am very much mistaken, on every vote taken here this afternoon the gentleman from Wisconsin has voted alone. There has been one vote in favor of his amendment, his own, and the rest of the House have voted against him. I think for the benefit of the country that fact ought to go into the RECORD, that the country ought to know the gentleman from Wisconsin is standing alone, and that if he is right in his contention then all the rest of the Members of this House are wrong. I simply want that to go into the RECORD so that the country may know what support the gentleman has here among his colleagues in most of his attacks upon the items in this bill.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin moves to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, in reference to the last remark made by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY], I do not indulge in these personal remarks. It is immaterial to me whether the vote is with me or not. Possibly on the final roll call there will be no one voting against this bill. I realize that 80 new projects have been added to the bill, and that men think very much of those projects. I could give the names of Members—I will not do that—who are quoted as saying that if their new projects did not go into the bill they would not vote for it. I know the interest that Members have, and it does not make any difference how they may vote eventually. I do believe that this bill will never become a law, and that is the thing I am anxious to impress on the House, under present conditions.

Now, referring to this particular project, it is one on which we have appropriated and are appropriating to-day $2,800,000. It is well known as the Norfolk and Beaufort waterway. There is $1,035,305 on hand. This bill asks for $1,000,000 more at this time.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I understood the gentleman to assert a moment ago that this bill will never become a law.

Mr. FREAR. No; I did not assert it. I said I did not believe it would.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Has the gentleman any inside information on that subject?

Mr. FREAR. Oh, no. If the gentleman wants to know why——

Mr. SPARKMAN. The votes here do not indicate that.

Mr. FREAR. The votes here do not; but if the gentleman wants to know why I think so, it is because it is my conviction that under present circumstances and the condition of the Federal Treasury this bill will never become a law.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. I yield; yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Does not the gentleman think he is wasting a good deal of time over a bill that will never become a law?

Mr. FREAR. I am very much assured that the work I am doing is valuable work, and it is a public duty that I am trying to perform, even though some gentlemen may not appreciate it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that is taken out of my time. This is a pretty big project, $5,400,000, and $1,000,000 contained in this bill. We all know it is a 12-foot channel. Here is a case where the office expenses and inspection in this one item, counting the balance on hand and the $1,000,000 new appropriation, reach $230,000. I think that is the amount. I have not the item right here, but it is something like that for office expenses and inspection at this particular time when surely the country is in need of every dollar that can be found. It is for a waterway that carries only an insignificant commerce; and in connection with this waterway I desire to introduce some letters in the RECORD in order to substantiate statements I have made frequently as to the additional distance and the way it will affect the people of Elizabeth City. It is intended and I presume it practically will ruin the business that is carried on down there, but I do not believe it is going to add to the value of the commerce of the South. It has decreased very materially during the past year—I think 30 per cent in the last two years. That commerce, deducting the timber and timber product, as I have it here, reaches a little over 80,000 tons.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman kindly inform the committee as to the character and the commerce on this inland canal of 12-foot depth?

Mr. FREAR. This canal?

Mr. STAFFORD. The Beaufort Canal.

Mr. FREAR. Deducting the timber products, it reaches about 80,000 tons, as I have it; and of that, 32,000 tons are coal.

Mr. STAFFORD. Eighty thousand tons over what length of route?

Mr. FREAR. Oh, it is 200 miles, I assume. It is quite a long distance from Beaufort to Norfolk. Of that 32,000 tons of coal, the statement has been made to me, which I can not vouch for, that that coal is largely used by the Government dredges. Remember that the Government dredges are performing or are expected to perform under this appropriation about one-tenth of the work, and private contractors perform the other nine-tenths.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is this entire tonnage carried throughout the length of the canal, or is some of it local?

Mr. FREAR. I could not say as to that. I know there are barges that travel the canal that carry lumber. Just how far they go I do not know.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. They carry lumber from North Carolina. They take it up at other points. Some of it comes from South Carolina and some from Virginia. It passes on up to Norfolk, where it is distributed.

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

Mr. FREAR. I ask unanimous consent for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that he may proceed for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman will permit——

Mr. FREAR. I want to continue. The gentleman is taking my time.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I thought the gentleman wanted information.

Mr. FREAR. Oh, I have the information. I know the facts.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Has the gentleman been over the canal?

Mr. FREAR. I have been down through it and lived there. Now, I can not yield to the gentleman further. These same timber products are counted at Beaufort, at Beaufort Inlet, and the same identical timber is counted as a part of the commerce at other points when it gets up here.

Mr. SMALL. Will the gentleman state again what the commerce is on this waterway?

Mr. FREAR. In 1913 it was 258,441 tons. In 1915 it was 158,644 tons. Deducting the forest products which could travel in very low depth of water, it reached 80,788 tons. Deducting the coal—and I want to say that it is proper to carry coal, I understand that, but it may be used by the local engineers or contractors—it left a balance of about 48,000 tons. I do not pretend to claim that coal is not a proper article of commerce.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BORLAND). The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in 20 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SWITZER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] says that the freight upon this particular canal is counted at one point and then at another and then at another, and when it crosses another canal and at some other point. Is not that same thing true of the freight on the Great Lakes with which he tries to make comparison? Is not that true in his comparisons on the first page of his report? The freight initiated at Ashland or Duluth is counted there, and when it goes through the Soo Canal it is counted, and also when it goes through the Detroit River, and when it arrives at Ashtabula or Cleveland or Buffalo it is counted again. And yet when he compares the tonnage on the Ohio River or some inland stream with that of Ashland and the other Great Lakes freight he makes no reference to the fact that that freight on the lake is counted four times.

There is another thing. In making comparisons of freight on these streams and this canal with the Ohio River, he says that the freight consists of sand, gravel, and coal and should be excluded from consideration, and yet when he compares it with the incoming tonnage at Ashland, of 700,000 tons, he did not state that over 600,000 tons are coal, and the outgoing tonnage of seven or eight million tons, practically every ton except 100,000 tons, is iron ore of a value of a little more than $2 a ton at Ashland where coal is valued at $3 a ton.

In ascertaining the tonnage of canals or that on the Ohio River, sand, gravel, and coal, he says, should be eliminated, and so he says that practically there is no tonnage on these waterways. Why does he not eliminate all the low-tonnage freight that is initiated at Ashland? If he did, he would only have a few thousand tons remaining.

I will say that some of the 600,000 tons of coal received at Ashland, Wis., in the first instance, I have no doubt is carried down the Kanawha River, 80 or 100 miles, which has been canalized. At the coal washery near my town during the high prices there is trainload after trainload of coal which has had access to other railroads than those that go into West Virginia, thereby relieving the hardships of the people. The same is true of Cincinnati, the coal comes out of the Great Kanawha and it has been taken to Cincinnati through most of the summer, and so this city has not undergone the hardship that other manufacturing centers have experienced during the recent coal shortage.

I think the gentleman should be fair, and when he asks this committee to exclude from its consideration river tonnage because the value is only $2 or $3 or $4 a ton, and makes a comparison with some lake port in his own State, he ought to eliminate all the low-priced tonnage from that port. [Applause.]

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the chairman of the committee a question. Last year there was a provision carried in the bill that a private contractor should not receive a price in excess of 25 per cent of the estimated cost of doing the work by Government plant. If I understand the hearings correctly, during the past year the Government has contracted for as much as 14 cents per cubic yard on this work, whereas the price paid to the private contractors before was only about 7 cents, and the price estimated to do the work by Government dredge was only about 4 cents. I have not the exact figures in my mind, but what is the reason that it is now costing twice as much to do the work as it did before we placed a limit on the amount allowable under private contract?

Mr. SMALL. I do not suppose the gentleman would wish me to consume undue time, but I have a letter here from the district engineer, to whom I wrote as to the facts in regard to that matter, which I will read into the RECORD in my time. I will say that the law has not been violated as to the difference between the contract price and the Government price. The law has been observed.

Mr. GOOD. If the letter goes into the RECORD, that will answer my question.

Mr. SMALL. Yes; but, as the gentleman will observe, the same provision is carried in the pending bill.

Mr. GOOD. Now, according to the report of the engineers, there has been appropriated for this item—I have not the figures as to what has been expended—$2,300,000, and I understand there is quite a large balance in the Treasury. I also observe that the tonnage for 1913 was 258,441 tons, while that of 1914 was 229,047 tons, and in 1915 it had fallen to 158,644 short tons. This is a remarkable showing. Here we have expended in the neighborhood of $2,000,000, with the net result that the tonnage has decreased from 258,000 to 158,000 tons, a loss of 100,000 tons, while this large expenditure has been going on.

Mr. SMALL. Does the gentleman wish me to reply to that now?

Mr. GOOD. No; I imagine the gentleman would want more time than I should be able to give him. But if this is a fair sample of what we are getting for our money for this kind of work, it will take more time than the gentleman has allotted to him to satisfy the people of the United States that this is a legitimate expenditure of the people's money.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I shall occupy very little time in discussing the general merits of this Norfolk-Beaufort waterway. It has been discussed in Congress perhaps every year since 1902. It has been examined under authority of Congress either by individual district engineers or by special boards of engineers, and reviewed each time by the reviewing Board of Engineers and by the Chief of Engineers at least five or six times since 1902. Every report has been favorable in every respect. None of these reports contains any criticism or cast any doubts upon its merit. If gentlemen can find any paragraph in any of these reports doing so, I will be glad to yield to them for that purpose, so that, so far as the Army engineers are concerned, after repeated investigations, it is a meritorious project.

Answering several criticisms which have been made, first, as to the commerce. Gentlemen are forgetful of what occurred in this body at the last session when the last bill was under consideration. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] speaks of the tonnage as being 158,644, and deducting various products, he assumes to reduce it to 80,000. His figures and deductions are not accurate, but it is surplusage to refer to the inaccuracies of the gentleman when it comes to figures. He seems to have acquired a bad habit in that respect, but I wish to make this statement regarding the commerce on this waterway, and I ask the attention of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD]. There were two privately owned canals from Elizabeth River, on which Norfolk is situated, to Albemarle Sound, N. C. One was known as the Dismal Swamp Canal, a lock canal, and the other as the Albemarle & Chesapeake Canal, a tidal canal. They were substantially competitive canals, having the same general terminii. The Government, under the recommendation of engineers, purchased the Albemarle & Chesapeake Canal. At the time of the purchase the Albemarle & Chesapeake Canal had deteriorated and was not in as good condition for commerce as the Dismal Swamp Canal. By reason of the deteriorated con-

dition of the Albemarle & Chesapeake Canal at the time the Government purchased it in 1913, and because the work of construction of that waterway has been going on since that time. the construction work itself thereby impairing progress and impeding its navigability, it has been even less navigable than it was before the work of construction began. Therefore loaded barges, loaded steamers of every kind have of necessity been compelled to navigate the old Dismal Swamp Canal and pay tolls, because they could not navigate this Government-owned canal, the Albemarle & Chesapeake, until after it had been improved to the projected depth of 12 feet.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman does not mean to say to the committee that these two canals both commence at Norfolk and end at Beaufort?

Mr. SMALL. They do; but I was adverting to the upper section, from Norfolk to Albemarle Sound. They each commence on Elizabeth River, Va., and end in Albemarle Sound, N. C.

Mr. GOOD. One of them serves a part of the country that the other does not at all.

Mr. SMALL. That is true only in a limited sense. I am not advocating any particular canal. The engineers, for reasons submitted, recommended the purchase and adoption of the Albemarle & Chesapeake Canal; and if the gentleman would read the report, which I assume he has not, he would be convinced that the conclusion of the engineers in recommending the purchase of the Albemarle & Chesapeake Canal was strongly fortified. To pursue the matter further, therefore, when the Albemarle & Chesapeake or the Government Canal is improved, that will, of course, being a free waterway, invite all of the traffic; but until it is completed this waterway is entitled to be credited with the traffic which goes through both canals. For the year 1915, the last figures obtainable, the traffic through this Government-owned canal, the Albemarle & Chesapeake, was, as the gentleman says, 158,644 tons. The traffic through the Dismal Swamp Canal was 413,679 tons, making a total of 572,323 tons, a very substantial commerce. The value of the commerce through the Government-owned canal now under improvement was $4,316,000. The value of the traffic through the Dismal Swamp Canal, the toll canal, was $10,310,000, a total of $14,627,000. I explained to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] this phase of the commerce more than two times, neither of which times did he enter any criticisms to the proposition which I made, and yet, forgetting that he had ever had any knowledge of that explanation, he rises in the House to-day and seeks to impress the House—it would not be parliamentary for me to say to mislead the House, and therefore I can not say it——

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

Mr. SMALL. Not now. Therefore he endeavors to create the impression that all of the commerce which is to be affected by the construction of this waterway is that which is now carried on the Albemarle & Chesapeake or Government-owned free canal when he knows that the conclusion is inevitable that when the improved waterway is completed to 12 feet in depth, with adequate width, being a free canal and a tidal canal all of the commerce will go through it. So I say it is proper to give consideration to this 527,323 tons, at a valuation of nearly $15,000,000, as the commerce to be affected by this waterway.

Something was said about the large balance on hand. The statement of the gentleman as to the large balance on hand on June 30, 1916, is correct; but the gentleman will remember that our last rivers and harbors appropriation bill did not become a law until some time in July, 1916, so that the appropriation was not available then. I have the statement of the district engineer, which I shall insert in the RECORD.

Mr. GOOD. Would any serious detriment be caused to this canal if we were to drop out this appropriation for this year? We have more than a million on hand.

Mr. SMALL. I was just going to explain that there is nothing substantially on hand at this time, except what is left for contingencies. I have the statement of the district engineers to the effect that all of this money has been contracted out. As to the question of the cost of dredging, I shall not have time to read all of this letter, but I shall insert it in the RECORD. This is a letter from Col. J. P. Jervey, district engineer, located at Norfolk, Va., who, at my request, based on the criticisms in the minority report of the gentleman from Wisconsin, has answered certain questions, and he gives a full explanation showing the difference in the cost of dredging for 1916, 1915, and 1914.

That difference arises from the difference in the material to be removed, such as roots and stumps, which adds to the cost, and it is all thoroughly explained in this letter, which I will insert in the RECORD and which I wish I had time now to read to the committee. Now, criticism is made of the engineers because, as the gentleman says, out of the appropriation on hand at the end of the last fiscal year something like $100,000 was reserved, they said, for contingencies, surveys, inspections, and so forth, and because a substantial amount was reserved for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, therefore waste of money or some other maladministration in the expenditure of this fund is of necessity attributable to the engineers. With reference to that, I would like to read this paragraph from the letter of Col. Jervey:

With respect to the item of $100,000 for supervision, given on page 525 of the annual report for 1916, I would state that it is not an unusual custom in all engineering work to add an item of 10 per cent for engineering expenses, supervision, and contingencies. In this office, in the past two years, there has been very little work other than that pertaining to the inland waterway. As a result, the greater proportion of the office expenses and drafting-room expenses in the Norfolk offices have been paid from the appropriation for the inland waterway. In addition, several survey parties are maintained, two houseboats, two inspectors on each contract dredge, launches, inspection boats, care of plant, and extraordinary repairs are paid for under this heading. Engineering, like every other profession, can not be made an absolutely exact science, and unforeseen contingencies always occur, which must be provided for under a blanket estimate. Considering, therefore, the specific items which I have indicated, and the fact that unforeseen contingencies are also provided for, the estimate of $100,000, or 10 per cent of the total, is a customary and reasonable one.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including the whole of this letter.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The letter is as follows:

JANUARY 22, 1917.

From: The district engineer, Norfolk, Va.
To: Hon. JOHN H. SMALL, M. C., House of Representatives of the United States, Washington, D. C.
Subject: Improvement of inland waterway, Norfolk to Beaufort.

1. I have your letter of the 20th instant, and in response to your request the following data is furnished you, covering cost of dredging in the inland waterway from Norfolk, Va., to Beaufort Inlet, N. C., for 1914 and 1915 (printed in Annual Reports for 1915 and 1916, respectively).

2. As shown in the Annual Report for 1915, page 486, the average cost of the work for the year with Government plant was 0.043 cent per cubic yard, place measurement, and the average contract price was 0.075 cent per cubic yard, place measurement. By referring to page 2324 of the same report it will be seen that about 74 per cent of the contract work was in Currituck Sound and lower North Landing River, where the material was almost pure sand, containing no stumps, and about 26 per cent in Coinjock Bay and North Carolina Cut, where a large proportion of stumps and logs were encountered. Where the contractor dredged in sand, dikes were constructed to keep the sand from being brought back into the channel in the exposed portions of Currituck Sound and Coinjock Bay, thus adding to the cost. For the Government dredge, in the same year, about 90 per cent was in sand, where no dikes were required. It may be noted that the contract dredging in Coinjock Bay and the North Carolina Cut for the year was 0.948 cent per cubic yard, place measurement, whereas the cost of the Government dredging in the Virginia Cut was 0.1399 cent per cubic yard, place measurement. The cost of the contract dredging in lower North Landing River was over twice the cost of the Government dredging in the same locality, but the Government dredge at the time was new and the cost of repairs nominal. During the present year the cost of repairs to the Government dredge has been very high, and the cost of the Government dredging for the year will therefore be increased.

3. On page 523 of the report for 1916 the average cost of the Government dredging for the year is shown as 0.1117 cent per cubic yard, place measurement; the average contract price is 0.1118 cent per cubic yard, place measurement. By referring to page 2175 of the same report it will be seen that over one-half of the contract dredging was in Coinjock Bay, North Carolina Cut, and the Virginia Cut. In the Virginia Cut the roots and logs encountered were excessive in number, and added greatly to the expense. For the Government dredging, about 75 per cent was in the Virginia Cut. It will be noted that the cost of the contract dredging in Virginia Cut for this year was 14 cents per cubic yard, place measurement; the cost of the Government dredging was 12 cents per cubic yard, place measurement. In lower North Landing River the cost of the contract dredging was 0.059 cent per cubic yard, place measurement, and the cost of the Government dredging 0.074 cent per cubic yard, place measurement. During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, considerable repair work was necessary on the Government dredge, and this, together with more difficult work, fully accounts for increased cost.

4. The contract for the present year is for 14¾ cents per cubic yard, place measurement, and this contract covers work in the Virginia Cut, in upper North Landing River, on the North River Bar, and in upper North River. These sections are all difficult, either on account of roots and stumps or on account of exposure. In addition, there are comparatively easy sections in lower North Landing River and lower North River. Since last year coal, which probably in the past amounted to 25 per cent of the expense of operating the dredges, has more than doubled in price. Wages have also been largely increased, both for the supervisory force and for the mechanical and laboring force. We have made careful comparisons, based on actual figures, of the estimated cost by the Government plant and by contract, of the work to be done this year, and I am satisfied that the bid of 14¾ cents per cubic yard, place measurement, is a fair average, and is not more than 25 per cent in excess of what the cost, under present conditions, would have been to the Government, using its own plant. These estimates were prepared in great detail and submitted to the Chief of Engineers with the abstract of bids. Considering these facts, I am satisfied that the criticisms contained in the minority report on the river and harbor bill as to the contract prices and prices of work done by Government plant on the inland waterway are unwarranted.

5. With respect to the item of $100,000 for supervision, given on page 525 of the annual report for 1916, I would state that it is not an

unusual custom in all engineering work to add an item of 10 per cent for engineering expenses, supervision, and contingencies. In this office, in the past two years, there has been very little work other than that pertaining to the inland waterway. As a result, the greater proportion of the office expenses and drafting-room expenses in the Norfolk office have been paid for from the appropriation for the inland waterway. In addition, several survey parties are maintained, two house boats, two inspectors on each contract dredge, launches, inspection boats, care of plant, and extraordinary repairs are paid for under this heading. Engineering, like every other profession, can not be made an absolutely exact science, and unforeseen contingencies always occur, which must be provided for under a blanket estimate. Considering, therefore, the specific items which I have indicated, and the fact that unforeseen contingencies are also provided for, the estimate of $100,000, or 10 per cent of the total, is a customary and reasonable one.

6. With reference to your request for information as to the difference in distance between Elizabeth City, N. C., and Norfolk, Va., via the Albemarle & Chesapeake Canal route and via the Dismal Swamp Canal route, I have to state that careful measurements, made from large scale maps in this office, show that the distance from Elizabeth City, N. C., to Norfolk, Va., via the Albemarle & Chesapeake Canal route is 89.4 statute miles, and via the Dismal Swamp Canal route 51.7 statute miles. This information was furnished as part of my recent testimony before the Rivers and Harbors Committee.

7. I would be glad if you would communicate with the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, before using this letter in connection with the debate on the bill. I am sending a copy of this letter to the Chief of Engineers to-day.

J. P. JERVEY,
Lieutenant Colonel, Corps of Engineers, United States Army.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Manteo Bay, N. C.: For maintenance, $500; completing improvement in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 864, Sixty-third Congress, second session, $28,000: *Provided*, That no expense shall be incurred by the United States for acquiring any lands required for the purpose of this improvement; in all, $28,500.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph; that is, all referring to the new project. It is at the top of page 13, leaving in the item for maintenance.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 13, strike out all of lines 2 to 7, inclusive.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, this is what is known, I take it, as the Shallowbag Bay, Manteo Island. I have been on this project—that is, I have gone there in a canoe years ago—and I know what it is. This project has already had $18,750, which is a small appropriation; $4,791 is the balance on hand, according to the statement, and $5,000 is asked for maintenance, which, of course, is reasonable. The project has been completed, and the balance of the funds are to be used, as stated by the engineer's report, for dredging and for superintendence, and so forth. The total commerce is about 12,000 tons, and a large portion of that is ice. Under this new project, which is contained in Document No. 864, I will just read briefly two or three matters that occur there:

If the commerce on this inland route ever amounts to anything, this bay, which is the only landlocked harbor on the route through the sounds, will certainly increase in importance.

We do not know it is going to amount to anything, and that is rather anticipating the future. On page 9, it says:

Existing terminal and transfer facilities are considered adequate to meet the needs of present commerce. It is probable that the construction of private terminals will keep abreast of the needs of commerce as it may develop.

On page 11 it says:

The proposed extension of the upper limits of the town of Manteo can not be regarded as entirely free from a local or terminal improvement character. Under the existing project, however, a channel was dredged up Doughs Creek in front of the wharves to nearly, if not quite, the limit of the basin, as shown on the drawing. If no basin for turning were provided, the approach channel improvement could not be of great advantage. If the turning basin constructed just at the head of the approach channel, the East Carolina Transportation Co. would be the direct beneficiary of the improvements and all other interests might be damaged, as competition might be eliminated. Although to some extent local in character, the dredging of the basin, both up Doughs Creek and toward the marine railway, would undoubtedly give a great impetus to the general commerce of Manteo.

In the hearing the Member of Congress was there in a representative capacity, and special stress was laid upon the inadequacy of the present proper depth on account of the depression of the water surface at tide. All I care to say in regard to this is that I am somewhat familiar with the proposition, although I have not been over this for years. We have made some improvements, and there is no evidence that necessitates this project being put in at this time. In order to save a little money to the Treasury with which to meet conditions which now confront us, I have moved to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I do not think this paragraph ought to be stricken out. I am very sorry to take issue with my friend from Wisconsin. If he had not called attention to the fact I would not have known this item related to Shallowbag Bay, because the item read "Manteo Bay, N. C." I am delighted, however, that the gentleman from Wisconsin has once sailed the waters of Shallowbag Bay——

Mr. FREAR. In a canoe.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. He tells me he did that in a canoe many years ago. They used to sail on the Tombigbee River, but I question whether many of them would risk it on Shallowbag Bay. Shallowbag Bay is a very wide stretch of water and canoes might not navigate it with entire safety. Now, I do not know when the gentleman from Wisconsin was at Shallowbag Bay. It must have been in the days of his youth, which, of course, was not very long ago.

But I traveled over Shallowbag Bay several years ago in an effort to reach the island of Manteo, and it was one of the most interesting and instructive trips of my life, because on the island of Manteo I was able to visit the little five-pronged fort, which was the scene of the celebrated lost colony. It was within the circle of this fort that the first white child was born in what is now the United States. Virginia Dare was born on the island of Manteo, in the little old fortification, remnants of which still remain.

Now, the gentleman opposes an appropriation to reach through from the mainland of North Carolina to Roanoke Island, where the first English settlement was made, and where Sir Walter Raleigh's colonists first landed; and the gentleman objects, because in his youth he sailed gaily over the waters of Shallowbag Bay in a frail canoe. I have met the people of Manteo, and I have observed that they have very scant communication with the mainland; that they transact their business there within the narrow confines of Roanoke Island the best they can, and that there are still some people upon the island of Manteo who have never seen the mainland and who have never had the opportunity to ride upon the railroad train or to get out of the way of a trolley car. And the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] will deny these people the right to visit the great world beyond the island of Manteo and fraternize a little bit with the common citizenship of this land, for the mere pittance of a paltry appropriation intended to widen the channel by which vessels of commerce and those carrying passengers can travel back and forth from the island of Manteo and the mainland.

Now, this is protected water, in a sense; and it is water in which the oyster grows quite prolifically. It is an opportunity that the Government has to say to one set of its people, remote from the centers of civilization, that they can get out of the narrow confines in which they have been circumscribed from the beginning of their career and see something of the world. Business is done on the island of Manteo. Communication is had in a scant way with the mainland. The vessels that go back and forth are of a very shallow type, of a very limited capacity, and why should we not say to the people who are there that with the expenditure of this small amount of money we will open up the channel through Shallowbag Bay and let them get steamers in there so that they can run back and forth from the mainland.

Mr. SMALL. In order that there may be no misunderstanding, I wish to say that this bay is located at Roanoke Island, of course entirely surrounded by water. The bay leads up to Manteo, the county seat, a county whose population is entirely engaged in fishing. The town has a population of about 2,000, and they have no means of transportation except by water. I know personally that the statements in the report of the Army Engineers as to the necessity for a deeper channel are true.

Mr. FREAR. I would like to ask the gentleman if he does not think that the gentleman from Pennsylvania gave ample reason for this appropriation when he said, or practically said, that this would result in making this channel a sort of monument to the first white child born in the United States?

Mr. SMALL. I think that was ample, and I only rose in order that my silence might not be misinterpreted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR].

The question was taken and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Thoroughfare Bay, N. C.: Completing improvement of channel connecting Thoroughfare Bay and Cedar Bay, N. C., in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 1125, Sixty-third Congress, second session, $5,200.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 13, strike out all of lines 8 to 12, inclusive.

Mr. FREAR. I realize, Mr. Chairman, that this is another monument that may be erected, and, of course, with that con-

clusion and that construction it will be entitled to be passed upon favorably by the House, and yet there are some things to be said. There is no white child born here for the first time in America, surely. They can not have that honor. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is so prolific in explanation it is hard to meet him on that ground, and I can not anticipate what he has here. But what the report says, in House Document No. 1125, is as follows:

At the west end of Thoroughfare Bay there is a ditch averaging about 200 feet wide and 5 feet deep, which extends for a distance of about 1½ miles through the marsh to the head of Cedar Bay and bears evidence of having been cut through by hand at some remote date. Local tradition has it that this work was done by the Indians. Cedar Bay opens on the south side of Neuse River. Its mouth is 39 miles easterly from Newbern and 53 miles southerly from Washington, N. C. * * * There is some navigation through this waterway at present, it being used, whenever the tide is high enough to permit of passage, by boats plying between Newbern or Washington and Core Sound points, and by vessels engaged in oystering. The commerce thus carried is necessarily small, due to the conditions of draft at either end.

In other words, it is the second waterway that has been there. It says on top of page 6:

It is not believed that any great permanent increase of the commerce in oysters will result from the proposed improvement, as conservation of the oyster beds is not practiced. There is however, a strong probability that the improvement would hasten the agricultural development, and a greatly increased commerce should result from this source.

It is a small project, and I realize that the gentleman who represented the district was before the board, and with commendable energy he presented the matter, I assume, and it was again put in the Engineer's report and favorably approved.

Now, Mr. Chairman, one thought occurs to me that I almost forgot. A few moments ago when we were discussing the Beaufort Canal, it was suggested that on a little harbor up in my State I omitted to refer to coal and other traffic carried there, but did mention it when it was on some of these rivers and inland waters. That was not because it is not a valuable product anywhere. That was not the thought at all. Where coal is carried from Ashland and from the Duluth-Superior region they require large depths, and I think 600 miles would be the average length of haul.

Now, Mr. Chairman, on the Mississippi or the Ohio, or whatever river it may be, there was more coal carried 30 years ago than there is to-day. That is what I had reference to. It requires a far deeper draft in these large harbors, but the coal has been carried for years and scores of years down the Allegheny, down the Ohio, and down the Mississippi; and the statement was made that it does not require an increased draft for that kind of commerce. It is not but that it is just as valuable. The same is true as to timber products. You do not need it on the Tennessee more than 30 years ago. That was the reason it was deducted in the statement which was made. The reason was not because it was not valuable, but the statement is made that a draft of 14 or 20 feet is needed on the Lakes for carrying these large cargoes, whereas less than half that draft by far is the average on the rivers.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto end in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent that debate on the paragraph and amendments thereto end in five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HOOD].

Mr. HOOD. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of the rivers and harbors bill. I firmly believe that the improvement of our rivers and harbors is essential to the welfare of the people of this country.

I believe that the expenditure providing for continued work on the inland waterway between Norfolk and Beaufort is wise and proper. I know that when this link is completed it will be a godsend to coastwise travel, thereby obviating the necessity of traveling around Hatteras.

I hope the day is not far distant when liberal appropriations will be made to complete the link of the inland waterway between Beaufort, Cape Fear, and other northern and southern points.

I represent the people along the coast practically all the way between Beaufort and Cape Fear, and I know they are anxious for the completion of this link, as they realize the great benefits to be derived from it.

In addition to the various appropriations made for the maintenance of the rivers and harbors in my district and the continuance of existing projects, I have two new projects which are worthy and meritorious. I earnestly hope that these projects will be approved by the Members of the House. There is an item in this bill for $15,900 for the improvement of Beaufort Harbor.

The necessity for an anchorage basin in Beaufort Harbor is imperative because of the constantly increasing number of boats operating from this point and the congestion of the harbor, where these boats are compelled to anchor in the narrow channel running parallel with the water front of the town. There is no sheltered locality provided by nature in the vicinity and to prevent the boats from catching aground on ebb tide, and for shelter from storms anchorage is made in the narrow channel, which, with a southerly wind, barely affords swinging room by the piers. It is a very difficult matter at times to reach the piers for this reason. Quite a number of these vessels are engaged in the menhaden industry, and they invariably go out of the harbor between 3 and 4 o'clock a. m., and about 50 per cent of the time come into harbor after dark. The proposed anchorage basin for which this bill provides will be located at the nearest approach to the harbor, and will accommodate not only the boats operating regularly to and from Beaufort, but will afford a sheltered anchorage basin for the great number of yachts making their trips from northern points to Florida.

There is another item appropriating the sum of $5,200 for the improvement of Thoroughfare Bay to the extent of providing a channel 5 feet deep and 50 feet wide connecting Core Sound and Pamlico Sound near the mouth of Neuse River.

Maj. H. W. Stickles, the district engineer at that time, in his report of preliminary examinations, says:

The northerly winds during the oyster season frequently render passage from Pamlico Sound to Core Sound via Harbor Island Bar exceedingly rough and dangerous, and it is a frequent occurrence for these oystermen to have to make a harbor and wait for two or three days before they can make the passage.

These oystermen are largely dredgers, using boats from 250 to 800 bushels capacity, drawing from 3 to 5 feet when loaded. Their main dredging ground is around the mouth of Neuse River, and by the deepening of the proposed channel to a depth of 5 feet would save some 25 miles of travel to reach the market for their oysters.

This improvement would undoubtedly save the vessels about one-third of their time in going to Washington, Newbern, and other points which are the largest markets in that section. In considering the extra miles of travel, with the present entrance to Core Sound via Harbor Island Bar, due consideration should be given the fact that this bar has filled up until it is dangerous for boats drawing as much as 5 feet of water, and one-half of the extra distance to be traveled to reach Core Sound, to wit, the distance from the northern entrance to Thoroughfare Bay to Harbor Island Bar, is over the roughest body of inland water in the State.

A report has reached me in the last few days of the serious damage to a schooner laden with oysters on the Harbor Island Bar, and I am informed that it is not an unusual occurrence for vessels to be stranded at that point.

Total receipts:

Oysters in shell	bushels	368,000
Merchandise		$131,661
Coal	tons	300
Lumber	feet	35,000
Wire fencing	coils	100
Fertilizer	tons	175
Wood	cords	1,275
Fresh fish	pounds	1,211,250

The people of this section are largely engaged in gathering water products, and the tonnage passing through this waterway would more than justify the small expenditure asked for.

I believe that hundreds of thousands of bushels of oysters and hundreds of thousands of pounds of fresh fish will be transported annually through this waterway, together with a very large percentage of merchandise, for points in Core Sound which have no railroad facilities.

I know that this proposed improvement will be a wonderful benefit to several thousand of as good, loyal, intelligent citizens of Carteret and Pamlico Counties as will be found anywhere in this country. I respectfully urge the Members of the House to vote favorably upon these projects. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time and ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SWITZER. Mr. Chairman, I want a few minutes in which to make a reply to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR]. The gentleman suggests that you do not need deep water to carry coal on the Ohio River as they do on the Great Lakes. I do not know how he reaches that conclusion. If he had read the report that was made when the Ohio River project

was adopted in 1910, and had read the letter written by Col. Sibert, he certainly would come to a different conclusion. I desire to read the statement of Capt. William L. Sibert. In that letter he says:

It is estimated that the cost of carrying 3,500,000 tons of coal from Pittsburgh to Louisville in the present state of the Ohio is 45.8 cents per ton, and that if the river were permanently deepened to 9 feet the cost would be only 24.1 cents per ton.

That was before the adoption of this canalization project.

He further estimated that with the improved river the rate per ton from Louisville to New Orleans would be only 53.38 cents, as against 89.2 cents at that time. The saving would thus be 21.7 cents per ton from Pittsburgh to Louisville, and 35.82 cents more from Louisville to New Orleans.

But, Mr. Chairman, that is not all. It is true that coal was floated upon the Ohio River before the building of any locks and dams, and before any of those things were constructed. But recollect that that was only during the high-water periods of the river. These great coal barges carry from 500 to 1,000 tons of coal at 6, 7, 8, or 9 feet of water, just the same as they do on the Great Lakes; that is, if you want to get a very low rate of carriage.

But that is not all. Since the canalization of the Great Kanawa River and the Monongahela River coal is brought down in the low-water period of those streams, such as we had last summer, as I stated a while ago, and taken to the great Northwest at a time when the people actually needed the coal, whereas it would probably have lain along the banks of the stream until fall or next winter, or next spring maybe, at a time when the people would not be in such great need of fuel. It is this certainty of having access to this coal by this great permanent waterway channel from Pittsburgh to Cairo and out of these tributaries that is at least of the greatest advantage to such places as Louisville, Portsmouth, Cincinnati, and Huntington, W. Va. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Cape Lookout harbor of refuge, N. C.: Continuing improvement, $425,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, is it in order just now to ask unanimous consent to close debate?

Mr. FREAR. After I have made my statement.

The CHAIRMAN. After there has been some debate on the paragraph it will be in order.

Mr. FREAR. I desire to talk on the paragraph.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I did not want to cut the gentleman out of his time.

Mr. FREAR. I just wanted to make a statement in regard to the project; that is all. I do not care to reply to my friend from Ohio [Mr. SWITZER], who seems to be anticipating that there will be some criticism of the Ohio River. He has vigorously defended it, and I do believe that will be necessary to justify the large appropriation it receives.

On this Cape Lookout harbor of refuge proposition a peculiar state of affairs is presented. We appropriated $1,426,000, and have $96,000 on hand; and this is a proposal to appropriate $425,000, although the Army engineers, as I understand, ask for $850,000 at this time. The expenditures in 1916 included $13,776 for office expenses.

But this is the part that I desire to present more particularly: This is a harbor project in which the Army engineers refused, as I understand, to make a recommendation. I ask to be corrected if I am mistaken. That is, they rejected it, in other words, until finally a report was presented.

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

Mr. FREAR. Yes; certainly.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wish to say that the Army engineers recommended that project. Otherwise we would not have adopted it.

Mr. FREAR. I am not criticizing the action of the committee.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The only engineer who reported against it, as I recall, was Gen., then Col., Kingman, who thought that a harbor of refuge in that vicinity should be constructed, if at all, at another place.

Mr. FREAR. This is the situation, as I understand the record: Gen. Kingman, who was the recent Chief of Engineers, as an underofficer, opposed the construction of a harbor of refuge at either Cape Lookout or Hatteras. I so understood. But Congress directed a report as to which was the more desirable—a harbor at either Lookout or at Hatteras—and it was finally determined, so that there was no chance of refusal on his part, and then he decided to place it at Lookout, at a cost of $1,426,000. Is that right, Mr. Chairman, that Gen. Kingman opposed a harbor at either place, but eventually Congress directed him to report at which of the two points—Point Lookout or Hatteras—was the more desirable, and Congress overruled his objection, and then he reported favorably to Lookout?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Gen. Kingman thought that Cape Hatteras was preferable to Cape Lookout for a harbor of refuge, if one was located at either place.

Mr. FREAR. But he was opposed to either, as I understand it.

I do not move to strike it out, because I realize that we are committed to the project. I refer to this to show the policy pursued by Congress. This engineer seeks as best he may to oppose and prevent what he believes to be an unnecessary project. Then Congress directs him to go on with the $3,500,000 project which we are now completing.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Beaufort Harbor, N. C.: For maintenance, $4,500; completing improvement in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 1108, Sixty-third Congress, second session, $15,900; in all, $20,400.

Mr. FREAR. I move to strike out all after the figures "$4,500."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. FREAR: Page 14, line 16, following the figures "$4,500," in line 16, strike out the remainder of the paragraph.

Mr. FREAR. This is a new project. We have appropriated on this harbor $112,000, have $10,037 on hand, and $14,000 is proposed as maintenance, although that has been cut in the bill.

I wish to read from House Document No. 1108, Sixty-third Congress, second session, a very interesting statement by Gen. Kingman, which was made May 1, 1913, in regard to this project. This is for the new project. He says:

1. I am of the opinion that this project is not worthy of a survey. I do not believe in the policy of attempting to provide an anchorage basin sufficient to accommodate all the vessels which may go to a harbor of this kind; such a thing would be entirely impossible, not even thought of in connection with most of our harbors which do fifty or one hundred times as much business as this one does. It seems to me to be foolish to attempt to excavate and maintain a basin which the district officer thinks must be more than a half mile long and 500 feet wide to accommodate 25 little vessels having an average length of less than 65 feet each. I don't see any necessity of these vessels anchoring right in front of the town. They should go to the wharves to receive and deliver freight, and afterwards, if they want to anchor, they should go to whatever sheltered locality nature provides in the vicinity.

2. I do not recommend the expenditure of any money for a survey or preparation of any plan for a larger turning basin or an extensive anchorage ground.

After that, on page 3, it shows that two representatives appeared before the Board of Army Engineers, and on page 2 occurs this very remarkable statement from the same gentleman who before had recommended against it, but who subsequently approved it. He says:

After due consideration of the above-mentioned reports, I concur with the views of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, and therefor report that the improvement by the United States of Beaufort Harbor, N. C., with a view to providing a suitable turning basin and anchorage area in front of the town of Beaufort, is deemed advisable to the extent of excavating to a depth of 10 feet at mean low water the triangular area shown in solid lines on the accompanying map, at an estimated cost of $15,900 for first construction and $1,100 annually for maintenance. The full amount of the estimate should be provided in one appropriation.

Here is a situation where the officer, first as a division officer, reports against it, and subsequently reports in favor of it after a hearing has been had.

Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the item.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Scuppernong River, N. C.: For maintenance, $3,500; completing improvement in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 1196, Sixty-second Congress, third session, $31,800; in all, $35,300.

Mr. FREAR. I move to strike out all of the paragraph following the figures "$3,500."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 14, strike out the paragraph beginning with the word "completing," in line 2, and ending with line 5.

Mr. FREAR. On the old project we have spent $34,900, and have a small balance on hand of $1,408, which calls for $3,500 for maintenance. The proposed amendment does not strike that out.

The project was completed in 1909. There is a small commerce upon it, but I wish to read from this proposal for the new project. Reading on page 5 of House Document No. 1196, Sixty-second Congress, third session, it says:

The improvements made to date have resulted in placing the commerce upon a substantial basis, except for a severe blow received in 1908.

Mr. Chairman, here is a situation that arises quite frequently, and I call the attention of the House to it:

Prior to that time there were no railroads in this section, and all transportation of products to market at Edenton, Elizabeth City, and Norfolk was dependent entirely upon water. During 1908, a branch of the Norfolk Southern Railroad was extended to Creswell and Columbia, along the west shore of the river, connecting with the main line of this road near Mackeys Ferry on Albemarle Sound. This, combined with the financial panic of that year, resulted in a great decrease in river commerce, the tonnage falling from 68,630 in 1907 to 12,515 in 1908.

The following year it rose again.

Generally speaking the depth of water appears to be ample for the 1 steamer and 25 schooners that navigate this river, but they dislike to go above Cross Landing on account of the great difficulty they have in navigating this portion of the river.

On page 6, it says:

There are eight wharves at Columbia, all owned by private parties. The Norfolk Southern Railroad Co. has a wharf with rail connections here, where freight may be transferred from rail to water, and vice versa. There are eight landings between Columbia and Spruills Bridge. There are two wharves at the latter place, owned by private parties, which are open to the public at the rate of $3 per day.

Mr. Chairman, it does not seem to me that sufficient necessity has been shown in the case of this new project to require its insertion in the bill, and I move to strike it out.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Northeast, Black, and Cape Fear Rivers, N. C.: For maintenance of Northeast and Black Rivers and of Cape Fear River above Wilmington, $5,000; completing improvement of Northeast River, in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 1356, Sixty-second Congress, third session, and subject to the conditions set forth in said document, $25,375; in all, $30,375.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out all of lines 17 to 21, inclusive. That leaves the item for maintenance.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 14, by striking out all of the paragraph beginning with line 17 and ending with line 21.

Mr. FREAR. In regard to this project we have expended so far $43,000. This carries $30,375. Now, House Document No. 1356 says that the total tonnage for this stream is given as 150,019 for the calendar year ending December 31, 1911, valued at approximately $1,800,000, of which about 42,000 tons, valued at about $770,000, is credited to that portion of the lower river where improvement is desired. Owing to the recent completion of a third fertilizer factory it is expected that the commerce for 1912 will be considerably larger.

The improvement proposed extends about 2¾ miles above the mouth of the river, about 1½ miles above the present deep-water project in front of the city of Wilmington.

On page 14 it says:

If the improvement is worthy of being made at all, it is worthy of being made in the way that I have described. If we spend $50,000 in making a 150-foot channel, it is my prediction that we will spend $50,000 more in the next 10 or 12 years in keeping it open, and we will have an unsatisfactory channel most of the time.

He says that a personal inspection of the plants located on the banks of this portion of the river has been made by the present district officer, a thorough examination being made of two of the fertilizer plants and all the details of their operation. The parties interested were communicated with as to cooperation, and a letter from this office and reply, dated August 29, 1912, are attached thereto.

This seems to be a proposition in favor of a fertilizer factory, and I submit there is no excuse for the Government spending money for that purpose.

Now, referring to the Army Engineer's report, it appears that they have by the use of money appropriated by Congress attained an additional depth at the Highway Bridge of one-tenth of a foot—that is 1 inch—and below that point is an additional depth of half a foot.

It seems to me that as long as this is near the mouth of the river and of benefit to a fertilizer factory alone, there ought to be a contribution.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is this the Neubegen River?

Mr. FREAR. This is the Northeast River.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I want to ask the gentleman a question. He is advancing new ideas here all the time.

Mr. FREAR. I want to state to the gentleman that this is an unusual proposition for a private concern, as I read the report.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. But the gentleman is stating ideas to the House, some of which I think are worthy of discussion. The gentleman objects to the improvement of the stream up to the fertilizer factory. This is a section of the country where they use fertilizers.

Mr. FREAR. You might just as well put in a sidetrack from a railroad as to dig a trench from this river up to that factory.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Several years ago I had an inquiry made as to the cost of transporting fertilizers from a city like Philadelphia or Baltimore to Wilmington, N. C., and I found that to send it over the rails it would cost about $4.80 for a short ton of 2,000 pounds, while to send it over the inside waterways would cost $1.80 per ton of 2,240 pounds. It did seem to me that there ought to be some relief for the farmers of the South who desire to obtain fertilizers from the northern factories. The gentleman from Wisconsin has several times discussed the question of economy and saving money by not passing the river and harbor bill. I want to ask the gentleman whether he thinks we are saving any money by refusing to pass this bill when we have appropriated $20,000,000 for the erection of a nitrate plant which may involve——

Mr. FREAR. I may agree that both are extravagant, but let me ask the gentleman, does he believe it is a proper thing for the Government to dredge a ditch or channel up to an individual fertilizer factory?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think if the enterprise is established, the plant is constructed, the men are employed who must go back and forth, and if the fertilizer factory is removed far enough so as not to interfere with the resident portion, that we ought to afford them means to get back and forth. If the gentleman has ever lived near a fertilizer factory he will understand the conditions. [Laughter.]

Mr. FREAR. If this be the policy of the Government to furnish this facility to a factory, it is a different policy from what is generally understood, because this is for an individual institution. It is not for the general public. We might just as well, Mr. Chairman, say that the Government should build a sidetrack up to this particular fertilizer factory for a mile and a half as to say that it should dig a channel. It does not seem a proper use of public money.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask some member of this committee a question, and I do not care who gives me the information. This is a proposition to improve the Northeast River in North Carolina in accordance with the recommendations in House Document No. 1356, Sixty-second Congress, and so forth. I hold in my hand the report of the River and Harbor Committee. I am not interested in the discussion as to the advisability or nonadvisability of this proposition, but on page 14 of this document it says:

After careful consideration the board reports that in its opinion the conditions, present and prospective, justify the Federal Government in participating in this improvement under proper conditions of cooperation, and that it is advisable for the United States to undertake the construction of a channel 150 feet wide and 22 feet deep, as proposed by the district officer, at an estimated cost of $50,750 and an annual maintenance charge of $3,000, provided local or other interests will contribute one-half the estimated cost, $25,375, of first construction.

What I want to know is whether this bill provides for that local contribution?

Mr. SMALL. No part of this appropriation will be available or expended until the local interests have contributed an equal amount, and that sum has been deposited with the treasurer.

Mr. COX. What is the plan of the War Department; what do they require before the work begins as to the raising of the money?

Mr. SMALL. The War Department does not attempt to control the manner in which the money shall be raised.

Mr. COX. No; but the War Department does not begin its work until an equal amount has been furnished by the people—by the local interests.

Mr. SMALL. Not until the local interests have raised that amount of money and placed it in the bank.

Mr. COX. The proposition is based on this report, and it carries with it the local aid as recommended by the committee?

Mr. SMALL. Yes.

Mr. COX. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, just a word. I think it fair to say that no one can read the report upon which this item is based without being convinced of its merit. While it refers to several rivers, as a matter of fact, the improvement embraces only about a mile and a half of the Northeast River. For a mile and a quarter from the mouth of the Northeast River, the Northeast River emptying into the Cape Fear River, it is included in the

general project of the Cape Fear River, at and below Wilmington. This project begins at a point one mile and a quarter above the mouth and extends therefrom a mile and a half above. There are large fertilizer plants located on this stretch of river. It is an anomalous proposition that industries located along a river should constitute an objection against the improvement of that river. It has been supposed that industries along the river which increase the commerce of the river offered an additional reason for its improvement, but as the engineers find that these industrial units will be benefited by the appropriation, they recommend that the Congress shall only appropriate for half and that such half shall only be available when local interests contribute the other half. It is a proposition which is worthy, and ought to be approved.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Newbegun Creek, N. C.: Completing improvement in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 24, Sixty-third Congress, first session, $5,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 14, amend by striking out lines 22 to 25, inclusive.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, the only reason for this is that this is another of those new projects which, it seems to me, ought very well to be left out of the bill. I read from House Document 24, page 5, Sixty-third Congress, first session:

12. It has not been possible to obtain complete statistics as to the annual commerce of the stream, owing to the partial destruction by fire of the records of the gasoline boat, but from the data that could be obtained it is estimated that the annual commerce amounts to about 5,000 tons, valued at $300,000.

That is to say, the gasoline boat was burned, and that destroyed all the evidence they had of commerce. To continue:

13. This is the first examination of this creek that has been directed by Congress, and no work has ever been done upon it by the United States, but about 30 years ago an attempt to improve the bar was made by a local steamboat company, which excavated the southern channel now used.

14. The work desired by the community is the provision of a narrow channel available for boats having a maximum draft of about 4½ feet. This would require a channel of about 5 feet deep inside of the creek proper, while to allow for wave action the depth over the bar should be not less than 6 feet.

15. The creek is fairly free from logs, snags, or similar obstructions, those that exist being of but little importance to navigation. In connection with other improvement, however, there are a few snags which it would be well to remove.

16. On account of the extremely small amount of sediment in the creek and the absence of caving banks and consequent snags it is believed that the cost of maintenance of the improvement should be almost negligible within the creek. Even over the bar the maintenance of a channel would not be very difficult, judging from the condition of the small channel dredged 30 years ago and still plainly apparent.

17. The total amount of work suggested above is small, and the cost would probably not be great, but what this cost will be can only be determined by a survey.

It seems to me that a matter of this kind is not of sufficient importance to be placed in the bill at this time. It carries $5,000, and while it is a small item to object to, yet we spent an hour, as I remember, before this bill was taken up in determining whether or not we would allow $300 to the Military Committee to have its hearings indexed, so that it does not seem to me that I am taking up too much time in presenting to the House the item in this way.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Winyah Bay, S. C.: Continuing improvement and for maintenance, $150,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of making a statement in regard to both these projects. The first is in reference to the Cape Fear River. That is a project with considerable commerce. We have expended $6,281,168 upon that. There are now on hand $152,524 according to the Engineer's report. One hundred and twenty-three thousand dollars is the amount asked for and allowed in this bill. It has quite a large commerce, but a very large amount of money has been appropriated for that stream.

Coming down to the other project, Winyah Bay, we have made appropriations of $3,232,991, and have on hand a balance of $107,374. The appropriation here is $150,000. The commerce is 183,746 tons, and of that timber products amount to 156,300 tons. That leaves an actual commerce, deducting the timber products of only 27,446 tons. The statement in the Engineer's report further says that the freight rates on lumber and crossties advanced 20 per cent during the year upon this waterway. Notwithstanding the fact that the Government has put all of this money into the waterway, the freight rates on lumber and crossties has advanced. In other words, the Government has no way of determining the water rates. It can not exercise any influence, although it puts $3,000,000 into the proposition, or in the case of the Cape Fear proposition $6,000,000. We have no authority to say these rates should be controlled. I am speaking of this because it relates directly to a proposition which I proposed in a bill for a waterway commission, in which that commission is given authority to control waterway rates. It does not seem right that the carrier should have unlimited leeway in fixing rates after the Government has gone on and put money into the stream and improved it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. How much in the way of lumber did the gentleman say went down that stream?

Mr. FREAR. I said timber products and the commerce amounted to 183,746 tons.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I understood the gentleman to say that the actual commerce was not so very much. Is not lumber actual commerce?

Mr. FREAR. Oh, yes; but it usually can be barged in light-draft boats. Here are $3,000,000 that we have put into this waterway.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is actual commerce.

Mr. FREAR. Surely; and so are logs. Take the stream that runs through my home town. At one time when the lumber trade furnished a great deal of the commerce of the Northwest that stream was a very important stream and carried a commerce greater than the Mississippi River. At that time raft after raft of logs and lumber was carried down every day from many mills upon the river. What was known all over the great Northwest as the great lumber industry was still in existence, but to-day there is nothing; the last raft went down two years ago, and nothing is there to-day. I am speaking of that because it is only a temporary commerce and it does not require deep-draft boats.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Does not that section of the country in which the gentleman lives have some other resources which would keep up the commerce of his town?

Mr. FREAR. There is practically no commerce there. It has a river a mile wide, which floats the largest boats on the Mississippi River. We have got a channel right up to the town. There are probably a dozen towns altogether, one of which has a population of 10,000, and there is practically no commerce.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Does the population of the town indicate anything as to the condition of the commerce?

Mr. FREAR. No. We have no use for the waterway, except for the purposes of excursions.

Mr. SPARKMAN. What I wanted to inquire was whether the population is growing?

Mr. FREAR. Yes; it is growing. It was urged differently yesterday, or a day or two ago, to which I did not care to reply, but this town contains about 4,000 inhabitants, and across a little stream of a few feet in width is another part of the town that employs some 500 men in the shops.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In that country, does not the gentleman regard lumber as commerce?

Mr. FREAR. It is temporary commerce; that is all.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Well, it is temporary in a sense almost everywhere.

Mr. FREAR. The Mississippi River does not float a raft to-day.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is less temporary in a State like Florida, for instance, because the timber is growing all the time the year round, and it reproduces more than in more northerly States. But usually in any section of the country there are other activities, other resources, which should develop the commerce, even when the timber is exhausted.

Mr. FREAR. Let me say this in reply to that commerce. One hundred and eighty-three thousand seven hundred and forty-six tons of commerce, of which timber products were 156,300 tons; that leaves 27,446 tons, of course, of other commerce which can be carried on this waterway on very small or shallow boats, as it does not require deep-draft boats. But does not the chairman think that $3,312,000 deserves a larger commerce than 27,000 tons? One more question which I think is a far more important one than that. Here the Army engineers say the freight rates on lumber and crossties advanced 20 per cent during the year. Now, ought not there to be some way by which the Government, after improving a harbor by expending so much money, could control waterway rates as well as through commissions we now control railroad rates?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That may be true, but we have not that question before us at this time.

Mr. FREAR. I understand; but it is a question which has suggested itself.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Whatever control the Government may have of such things is the result or will have to be the result of legislation. But we have not now that matter before us.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Did the gentleman move to strike out the Winyah Bay item?

Mr. FREAR. No; I moved to strike out the last word.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I want to say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that I think this appropriation should be made for Winyah Bay. The gentleman discussed the lumber commerce of the country and rather disparaged it, because he did not think the value would be as great as that of ordinary merchandise. Commerce here is not confined to lumber. Several years ago I took a Clyde Line steamer and went into Winyah Bay, destined for Georgetown. The steamer had a mixed cargo of merchandise. It also had passengers, but it did not reach Georgetown on time, because, although it only drew about 13 feet of water, it stuck in the mud, and we had to wait for the tide to help us into Georgetown. It seemed to me then that this historical old town, named after "the Father of His Country," or rather King George, ought to receive some consideration at the hands of the Federal Government. The vessel I traveled on was carrying general merchandise; it was part of a regular steamship line, which ought not to be subject to a mud bath every time it tried to get into the town named after King George.

Mr. LEVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania knows, of course, because he knows everything about river and harbor improvements——

Mr. DYER. Except the Mississippi River.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Coming from the farmer's special friend, I am delighted with the compliment.

Mr. LEVER. That one of the largest sawmill companies in the world is located at Georgetown, S. C.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is true.

Mr. LEVER. And the gentleman must know that within the last two months there has been growing up a large immigration from the State of Indiana——

Mr. COX. Good people.

Mr. LEVER. Of farmers who are going into that section about Georgetown, buying up land and going into the business of intensive agriculture, so that that section of the State promises to be in the near future one of the most progressive agricultural sections of the entire southern country.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I wish to say to the gentleman from South Carolina that, entirely independent of the information he has given to the House as an expert, which he is, on the subject of farming, I have traced out, through experts in the Department of Agriculture, the fact that the land in this vicinity—which has not been opened up because of the lack of railroads and the wretched condition of many of the waterways—is of the richest sort, and simply awaits an improvement of this kind to induce settlers to go there and make the land fructify and engage in world-wide commerce.

Mr. COX. The gentleman need not worry. Indianians have gone down there, and they will make it fructify.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. So long as the gentleman from Indiana is on the job he will hold the Indiana farmer where he is; but as soon as that farmer can break away——

Mr. COX. If the gentleman can introduce some plan to get some Indiana farmers over into Pennsylvania, they will reduce the price of his eggs.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. We have been paying enough for them; but I am glad to see the gentleman from Indiana with us on this proposition. We do not like to have vessels stuck in the mud when they are trying to get into Georgetown with Indiana products or the products of any other State.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Do I understand the gentleman from Pennsylvania is insisting that the people contribute down there toward this improvement? If he is insisting now that those people there be called upon to make further contributions than they have already made——

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. No; I am making no such proposition.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Or is this to be spent on the Atlantic seaboard?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am frank to admit that this is a part of the general project. And I think the Government will get an ample return for its expenditure.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Then I withdraw my objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Great Peedee River, S. C.: For maintenance, $5,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I trust my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] will not leave at this moment, because this is for the purpose of permitting him and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HUMPHREYS] to finish that discussion on the subject of the flood-control bill. I am frank to say that I think the gentleman from Mississippi has really the best of the argument so far, notwithstanding the experience and the ability of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who could see in the last project that Georgetown was named after the "Father of his Country."

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It might date back further than that. It might have been named after King George.

Mr. FREAR. The Great Peedee is now under discussion. We have spent $340,300 there, or that has been the amount of the appropriation in the past; $5,000 on hand, and $5,000 is here proposed in the bill. I have simply made a pro forma amendment because I realized there may be some maintenance that will be necessary down there. But the report says, on page 604:

A railroad recently built has caused the marked falling off of the river business.

Now, we have made our investment. We have considerably over a quarter of a million dollars in this stream. A railroad has been built in there. We have put $340,000 in the project, and this further amount is to be put in the Great Peedee and be continued for all time to come. I ask the gentleman in all seriousness what could be the reason for continuing a large project on that river?

Mr. LEVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. I have only made a pro forma amendment, and I want to get the expert opinion of my friend from Pennsylvania, although I will yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. LEVER. I wish to inquire if the gentleman predicates his opposition to the proposition on the theory that a railroad has been built paralleling the river, and that therefore the Government ought to abandon the improvement of the river in the interest of the railroad?

Mr. FREAR. That is a very proper question. My answer to that would be that I think the Government ought to insist on minimum rates, so that a railroad can not drive commerce off the waterway. And I think the gentleman would probably join me in that.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman thinks by abandoning the river projects you will get these rates?

Mr. FREAR. No; I do not propose abandoning it.

Mr. PLATT. The gentleman believes that we should raise these railroad rates so that commerce can live?

Mr. FREAR. If we are going to put money into the stream we ought to protect the Government's investment after it is put there.

Mr. PLATT. I agree with the gentleman, that if we conduct these on business principles we would have to raise railroad rates all over the country to enable the streams to do business. There is not the slightest doubt of that.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of the committee to the shipping bill passed at the last session and approved September 7, 1916. Section 18 gives the Shipping Board authority to fix the rates by water carriage in interstate commerce, and reads as follows:

SEC. 18. That every common carrier by water in interstate commerce shall establish, observe, and enforce just and reasonable rates, fares, charges, classifications, and tariffs, and just and reasonable regulations and practices relating thereto and to the issuance, form, and substance of tickets, receipts, and bills of lading, the manner and method of presenting, marking, packing, and delivering property for transportation, the carrying of personal, sample, and excess baggage, the facilities for transportation, and all other matters relating to or connected with the receiving, handling, transporting, storing, or delivering of property.

Every such carrier shall file with the board and keep open to public inspection, in the form and manner and within the time prescribed by the board, the maximum rates, fares, and charges for or in connection with transportation between points on its own route; and if a through route has been established, the maximum rates, fares, and charges for or in connection with transportation between points on its own route and points on the route of any other carrier by water.

No such carrier shall demand, charge, or collect a greater compensation for such transportation than the rates, fares, and charges filed in compliance with this section, except with the approval of the

board and after 10 days' public notice in the form and manner prescribed by the board, stating the increase proposed to be made; but the board for good cause shown may waive such notice.

Whenever the board finds that any rate, fare, charge, classification, tariff, regulation, or practice, demanded, charged, collected, or observed by such carrier is unjust or unreasonable, it may determine, prescribe, and order enforced a just and reasonable maximum rate, fare, or charge, or a just and reasonable classification, tariff, regulation, or practice.

It does not give authority to fix the minimum rate, but it does have authority to control and regulate the rates and to require interstate-water carriers to file the maximum rate for transportation between such points in interstate commerce, and goes a very long way toward giving the Shipping Board complete control over rates of water carriers in interstate commerce.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Santee, Wateree, and Congaree Rivers, S. C.: For maintenance, including the Estherville-Minim Creek Canal and the Congaree River as far up as the Gervais Street Bridge, Columbia, $30,000; for improvement of Congaree River in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 702, Sixty-third Congress, second session, $50,000; in all, $80,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out all of the paragraph after the $30,000 item for maintenance.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 15, by striking out, after "$30,000," in line 18, the remainder of the paragraph down to and including line 21.

Mr. FREAR. Referring to the Congaree River: On the Santee, Wateree, and the Congaree Rivers the Government has appropriated $1,268,395. On the Congaree River it has appropriated $668,298, of which $43,101 was the last balance reported on hand, and $30,000 is the amount asked for in the bill, which is not objected to, because it is a maintenance proposition. The commerce upon this river, as I have it—and I desire to be corrected if I make a mistake—is 4,324 tons. That hardly seems possible. I desire to be corrected if I am not correct.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. I would like to read from the next report, if I may. It says practically all the commerce of this river was conducted by one old stern-wheel steamer of 132 tons, which made 36 trips. That was after $168,238 was expended. I think I was right about the commerce, because I see that the total commerce on this river for three years reached only 14,000 tons. The engineers have asked for a large amount here for bank protection.

Now, beginning with the new poject, which is objected to, reading from page 4, it says:

A steamboat line has been established upon the river and is now in operation, its terminal being just below the lock. The commerce reported amounts to about 4,000 to 12,000 tons annually. It appears there has been a material saving due to the operation of the boat line.

As a matter of fact, we find by taking the report of 1916 that in three years after this large investment of money the total commerce reached only 14,032 tons.

This is document 702. It says:

There is at present nothing which could be described as a "terminal" possessing "terminal facilities," in the usual meaning of these terms. There is only the ordinary river landing, with a small tent to protect the freight at Granby. There are no wharves nor public space available for wharves.

And, reading back, it says:

It appears from the report considered that the required project depth can be secured by dredging, but that with the small dredge in use the time required is so long that before the work is completed a new freshet season has arrived and new shoals are formed, so that at no time is the channel unobstructed.

It appears to the special board that inasmuch as the dredging and staging have not been able to maintain the project, the Government should adopt more adequate means of improving the river. That is in addition to the $168,000 that has already been put in the stream, I take it.

I move, Mr. Chairman, to strike that part of the paragraph out regarding the new project.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to take the time of the committee in discussing this item, but in view of what the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] has said I think it very well, for the RECORD at least, that the facts in this case should be known, and I shall use only my allotted time.

The item of $50,000 proposed to be stricken out is for revetment work on the Congaree River. The situation is this: This system of waterways, the Santee, Wateree, and Congaree Rivers, makes a distance of 208 miles, connecting with Winyah Bay, at Georgetown, as the end of navigation and at Columbia, the capital of the State, as the head of navigation.

Under a project adopted more than 30 years ago a 4-foot channel was guaranteed on this river for 12 months in the year. There has been some navigation under the existing project. There have been repeated efforts to put on a substantial boat line. But the difficulty has been found in the fact that at two points on the river we have caving banks and sand bars, which have made it almost impossible to carry on a 12-month, all-the-year navigation, with the result that boats could not keep their published schedules at Georgetown, where they connect with the Clyde Line, and therefore in a large measure commerce failed to materialize as hoped and anticipated.

It is true that there has been expended $668,000 on this proposition, but with an expenditure of $50,000, as recommended by the engineers advising the committee, it is proposed to make this a navigable stream 12 months in a year, with a 4-foot channel for a distance of 208 miles.

The Chief of Engineers in his report, Document No. 702, says:

I therefore report that the further improvement of the Congaree River, of South Carolina, seems advisable to the extent of obtaining a 4-foot navigable channel assisted by a properly devised bank protection—

And so forth.

The $50,000 proposed in the bill is for the purpose of protecting the banks at Gill and Congaree Creeks, so as to prevent the sand from coming in and filling up the channel.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. Not now. Let me make just one further statement. I read further from this document, to this effect:

Unless the channel below the lock is made more stable and permanent and the low-water depth of about 4 feet secured, the expenditures already made—

Six hundred and sixty-eight thousand dollars, as the gentleman from Wisconsin properly said—

will be of little benefit. It seems advisable, therefore, to undertake some additional work, with a view to securing a permanent channel of about 4 feet depth at low-water stages under proper supervision.

Now, then, the proposition is to make available to the public the benefits of an expenditure of $668,000 by appropriating $50,000 more. If that is not a proposition of sound, common, ordinary, South Carolina, Wisconsin horse sense, I do not know where you can find one. Here we have expended our money. We have made our river navigable, with the exception of two points, involving a distance of 7 miles, which can not be put into good condition except by revetting the banks and keeping them from rolling into the river, at an expenditure of $50,000. And yet, with that sense of economy which some of us can not understand, some gentlemen are willing to fall back into the breast chains and declare we will not spend the other $50,000. It does not seem to me to be good business. It may be in Wisconsin, in the gentleman's district. It is not in South Carolina.

Now, one further point: It is true that the commerce of this river does not show very large in comparison with that of some other rivers and with some other projects, probably, and yet it is due to the fact that we have not had the 4-foot channel which was guaranteed to us by Congress in 1885, more than 30 years ago. If you will give us a 4-foot all-the-year channel, I think I can safely guarantee that in a year from the completion of the project the commerce of this river will have doubled, tripled, quadrupled, even more than that; and as proof of that I desire to read into the RECORD a statement received recently from the secretary of the Chamber of Commerce of Columbia, S. C., which reads as follows:

Since our last conference with you, and at the time of the meeting when you addressed us so forcibly on the subject of this work and the efforts you would make to secure this appropriation, a great deal of interest has been stimulated in the larger development of traffic on the waterway between Columbia and Georgetown, and I am pleased to report that we have interested some parties who have expressed their willingness to join our merchants in the organization of an adequate navigation company and the construction of terminals and warehouses. This work is estimated to cost between $150,000 and $200,000, and in addition to the terminal facilities will consist of a fleet of powerful towboats and barges capable of handling an enormous amount of tonnage on the river. Of course, the organization of this company is predicated upon the fact that we will have all-the-year navigation, and continuously without interruption on a minimum depth of 4 feet. Another incentive to the establishment of this line is the prediction being freely made that there will be a considerable advance in the rail rates between the East and Columbia within the near future, and this would naturally give a larger margin of profit to the water line, and therefore increase the ability to maintain such line on basis of a fair and remunerative revenue.

That is the latest statement that we have upon the proposition. Make available this $50,000, which will give us this 4-foot channel, and here is a guaranty of the beginning at once of a barge line involving an expenditure by private individuals and citizens of Columbia of $200,000. Now, let me say this further to the gentleman from Wisconsin——

Mr. FREAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. In just one moment. The head of navigation on this river is the city of Columbia, S. C. That city is in the very center of the State of South Carolina. From it radiate nine great trunk lines of railroad reaching every part of the State

of South Carolina. It has been my hope and my dream that by the improvement of the Congaree River Columbia, S. C., will become the wholesale distributing depot for heavy freight for practically the entire State of South Carolina. With these facts, does not the gentleman think we have made a good case?

Mr. FREAR. I think the gentleman has made an unconscious misstatement. I know he would not do it purposely. On page 615 of the last Army Engineer's report it says—

A channel suitable for 4-foot navigation at all but extremely low-water stages has been secured by snagging——

Mr. LEVER. What report is that?

Mr. FREAR. This is the Engineer's report for 1916, just out. We have spent $668,000 on the stream. We have secured only 14,000 tons in three years, or a little over 4,000 tons a year, which is only approximately one trainload a year. I do not question, of course, but what eventually there may be some commerce, but it seems to me that is a fair test, and we have 4-foot navigation for the project, according to the report.

Mr. LEVER. I desire to extend my remarks on this proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

Mr. FREAR. I offered an amendment to strike out the new proposition, I think.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Altamaha, Oconee, and Ocmulgee Rivers, Ga.: Continuing improvement and for maintenance, $40,000.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do this to make an inquiry from any of my good friends from Georgia in reference to these three rivers. I find from the engineer's report that we have expended on the Altamaha River, $259,000; on the Oconee, $279,000; and on the Ocmulgee, $492,000. The engineer also says that the Macon-Atlantic Navigation Co. operated a new self-propelled steel barge from Macon to the mouth of the river during the last five months of the year and anticipates putting on another self-propelled barge, whatever that may mean, about August, 1916. My inquiry has to do with the hearings held by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors last year, in which the advocates of the proposition at that time testified about this boat line. They had had a good deal of trouble to get a boat of light enough draft to run on the river and had tried all kinds of experiments. Mr. Long testified that finally they did find a European article which would draw little enough water so that they could put it in a boat and bring it over here. They selected "the Bollinger engine, manufactured at Stockholm, which requires 28 cents an hour to run it," so the gentleman testified. He goes on and describes what a great engine it is. I am coming now to my inquiry. The testimony continued—

We put an electric plant on this boat. We can blow a horn, or rather a whistle, by electricity, and do various other things. We have a number of conveniences—

And so on. I think I brought this matter up last year, and I would like to make inquiry whether on any one of those three rivers up to date any one has ever heard that remarkable whistle blown? After the expenditure on the three rivers of something over $1,000,000 it is well worthy of knowledge whether that great event, the blowing of the electric whistle on the one boat running on those rivers, has ever been heard up to date? [Laughter.] It is a wonderful thing. We ought to know all about how that whistle sounds, which seems to be about all the result the Government has secured for such an enormous expenditure.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Satilla River, Ga.: for maintenance, $2,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in line 18. I have made no motion in reference to some of the items which have been presented to me, but it occurs to me that it is well for us to see where our investments have gone in past years, and what results we are getting on the money that is being expended. Taking the proposition that was read a moment ago for Fancy Bluff Creek, Ga., it is only a small appropriation, it is true, but in 1915 the office expenses were $725, and there were no operations at all on the river. The commerce was 2,513 tons, of which 1,565 was timber and ties rafted, leaving only 948 tons of commerce on that creek. The cost for office expenses, for carrying on the work on that river, for overlooking it, according to the engineer's report, was $725. One launch makes trips on the river. I submit that that is a situation that calls for criticism somewhere at sometime. Why are we paying $725 for office expenses for an annual tonnage of 948 tons?

Take Satilla River, Ga., the item that has just been read, for maintenance, $2,000. It is a small item, but in 1915 there was no operations on the river, yet $519 was spent for office expenses last year. The commerce was 67,000 tons, which looks reasonably large; but logs, timber, and timber products reached 63,000 tons—more on that stream than on the other—leaving a net of a little less than 4,000 tons. One steamboat makes two trips a week; it does not say where; but this is a situation where, as on the preceding stream, we are performing no work at all, we are making no improvement, and yet on the former project we spent last year $725 for office expenses for 948 tons, and on this project $519 for a little less than 4,000 tons outside of the timber. These facts speak for themselves.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion of the gentleman from Wisconsin, whatever it was. My attention has been called to a point which I neglected to state in connection with the three rivers of which mention was just made. I infer that our honorable colleague and friend from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] attended a performance in town last evening, in which a steamboat was one of the principal features displayed. Instead of a whistle, such as the boat to ply on the three rivers just mentioned has, bells are prominent in the sketch. In the course of the performance, there is a lady who seems to have various gentlemen friends aboard of the boat who are particularly cordial to her. Her husband says she is a somnambulist and follows bells. Naturally each gentleman begins ringing a bell to attract the attention of the unfortunate but handsome lady. Now, I suggest that the advocates of the Altamaha, Oconee, and Ocmulgee Rivers take the electric whistle and use it as an attraction for the lady somnambulist. I know of no better way in which this appropriation could be used if the Government is to receive any return whatever for this expenditure of public money. If there is water enough to float the boat, the wonderful whistle might call to the shores the beautiful girls who no doubt live along the banks.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I know of no better time to say a serious word than the present. The gentleman from Massachusetts, a member of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, who is going to support the bill although he thinks it has some objectionable items, not including Boston Harbor, of course, has made merry over the Altamaha, Oconee, and Ocmulgee Rivers, and is inclined to satirize the power boat that seems to be doing service down there.

Having been in this vicinity, and having observed that men in good faith undertook to improve local conditions by putting a steamboat service on these rivers, I am not inclined to make fun of them. It is an easy thing for one coming from a great city having large appropriations to make light of a smaller community, where the river has not been improved and where men are making desperate efforts with the small means at their command to do business. But if we are to improve the big streams we can not consistently deny assistance to the smaller streams which are the feeders of the larger streams. These three rivers feed larger river territory. These three rivers penetrate a country that is not penetrated by railroads or by navigable streams through which the people can get their products to market. Now, what comes out of these three streams?

Mr. TREADWAY. Mud. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Cotton, fertilizer, naval stores, lumber, staves, timber, and a variety of merchandise, and at the mere mention of these substantial things a few gentlemen from the larger cities cry, "Mud." Well, it may be "to laugh" with them; their items are secure in the bill, but it is not a square deal to the smaller communities who have just as much right to consideration as the larger cities. [Applause.]

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. SLOAN. Am I correct in the impression I have that the gentleman is in favor of this bill? [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think the gentleman's question carries its own answer. I have been in this section of country, and I want to say solemnly and seriously that many views I formerly had of rivers and harbors and the river and harbor bill have changed. After the Civil War these streams were blocked up and stagnated by reason of the conditions over which the people of the community had no control. Great plantations that had formerly used these streams had gone to pieces. Boats had been sunk in these rivers, the logs and timbers had fallen, and fever and ague prevailed.

Why, I have listened to some very eloquent gentleman upon this side of the House discuss the days of fever and ague in

Illinois and Indiana, and I have observed that after their streams were improved the health of the people improved, and the streams began to carry commerce back and forth. I have come to believe that the far Southern States have as much right to have these waterways of theirs clarified and purified and made navigable as did the people of Indiana and Illinois and as do the people of Pennsylvania and New York. [Applause.]

I venture to say that no man who scans this bill item for item will be able to produce a table showing that there is any undue contrast between the amount appropriated that goes into the Southern States and the amount appropriated that goes into the States along the northern tier of States. The showing will not be prejudicial to the South. To improve these choked-up rivers is not only an aid to navigation, it is in the interest of the public health, and it is the least we can do, for we are in constant contact with the people of the South, to aid them in cleaning out these streams. It is doing something for the general welfare when we say to the man upstream who has only a few bales of cotton to sell that we will help him to put that cotton on a barge and carry it downstream to Macon or Savannah in order that it may go aboard the big ships that carry it to the great cities of Boston, Philadelphia, and New York. I for one want the man in the interior to have that chance.

Here is a steamboat that carries lumber, cotton, staves, and other commodities from Macon to Savannah. I am told there are now two steamboats in operation. The gentleman ridicules it because it has a whistle. It seems to me that that whistle will sound louder in the world of progress than any echo emanating from any Member of Congress who is dissatisfied with this bill. That whistle means that they are taking a new interest in industry in the South and are struggling to get out of the backwoods. We ought to give the southern farmer a chance to come out and amount to something in this world. [Applause.] He can do it on the waterways.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

St. Marys River, Ga. and Fla.: For maintenance, $7,000; for improvement in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 540, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session, $15,000; in all, $22,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of referring to this project, and, incidentally, to suggest something in regard to some remarks of my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE], who seems to think that the reason for the loss of traffic in these southern streams is because these streams have been blocked up, and that after all these years a boat has finally been placed on them because of improvement. There is one thing that the gentleman said in his interesting speech in which I concur very strongly, and that is that there should be no distinction between improvements for the North and improvements for the South. No one believes that there should be. There has been no such criticism. My criticism was made as much on northern projects as on southern.

The upper Mississippi is one of the best channels in the world to-day. Senator Burton said there was 4½ feet throughout the upper Mississippi, but the commerce is practically gone, not because the river is blocked up. You will see some commerce mentioned in the report. When we get to it I shall refer to it and tell you what the commerce is, because I have been up and down there, and I will also give you the report of the people along the stream; but I say now that it has lost 90 per cent of its commerce on the upper river, not because the stream was blocked up, but because conditions have changed. That condition will continue to exist with reference to the smaller streams unless the suggestion of the gentleman from South Carolina can be put into effect, respecting the enforcement of minimum rates, and thereby prevent railroad competition from carrying traffic away from the stream.

I wish now to refer to the St. Marys River. According to Document 540, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session, they have a channel of 17 feet at mean low water, and they desire to have a 20-foot channel. The reason for that, which seems to be urged strongly, is that over at Fernandina they have a deeper channel, and they ought to have similar conditions at St. Marys. I read further from this document, beginning on page 5:

The entrance to Cumberland Sound has been improved, at a cost of $3,500,000, and affords a depth over the bar of 24 feet at low water. Very extensive jetty work has been built at this place and an enormous amount of material has been scoured out by the action of the current alone. Work has also been done by dredging, and more is contemplated, with a view to widening and also straightening the channel. No advantage at present can be had from this extensive and costly improvement, except what results to the harbor of Fernandina, Fla. This harbor is situated on Amelia Island and is difficult of approach by rail.

4. In any commercial harbor the land approaches are just as important and worthy of consideration as the water approaches, and it is readily seen by an examination of the map that Fernandina is not conveniently accessible by rail to a wide extent of country. St. Marys, being situated on the mainland of Georgia, in a part of the country which is rapidly developing, might well become an important commercial harbor, but to become so it must be usable, and the work of improving the waterway must precede the construction of the land approaches.

The St. Marys has only had small appropriations thus far—something like $22,000. This bill carries $7,000 for maintenance, outside of a new project, but the commerce is largely logs and timber, the same as on these other streams, logs which, of course, are floated. It is said that the commerce amounts to 100,000 tons; but, deducting those products, it resolves itself down to less than 5,000 tons.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I suggest to the gentleman that if he will deduct the remaining five thousand, there will not be any left.

Mr. FREAR. Oh, yes; that is true; but I am speaking about a 17-foot channel for timber products which you now have, and yet you ask for a 20-foot channel, not for the timber products, but for the 4,901 tons remaining. The project is completed, and yet here is a new project. I am not moving to strike out the project. I simply call attention to the fact as shown by the reports.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Tampa Harbor and Channels, Fla.: For maintenance of Hillsboro Bay, $60,000; for improvement in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 1345, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session, and subject to the conditions set forth in said document, $300,000; in all, $360,000: *Provided*, That nothing in this bill nor in the act approved June 25, 1910, entitled "An act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes," shall be so construed as to prevent the use of any part of the Ybor Estuary zone for industrial or other legitimate purposes when the same is not needed for commercial uses, nor to exclude the building and operation of a railroad or railroads by private parties or railroad companies under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe, subject to the right of the city of Tampa to construct and operate a municipal railroad on said estuary zone as set forth in said report.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "*Provided*," at the end of line 2, page 18, insert the following:

"That the Secretary of War may enter into a contract or contracts for such materials and work as may be necessary to complete the said project, to be paid for as appropriations may from time to time be made by law, not to exceed in the aggregate $1,125,000, exclusive of the amounts herein and heretofore appropriated: *Provided further*."

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, my reasons for offering this amendment are twofold. In the first place, it seems to me that in a large harbor like that of Tampa, where the Government takes on such a project as this, and as meritorious as we know it to be, the Government can very readily enter into a continuing contract and thereby save quite large sums of money. I realize that at times this principle has not been advocated, but nevertheless it is a good business policy. I simply have offered the amendment in accordance with the report of the engineers, which will make this improvement of Tampa Harbor a continuing project, and to the amount that is called for by the engineers' report in House Document 1345, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session.

That is the business standpoint from which I offer the amendment. I also offer it from a sentimental standpoint. It has been my privilege to serve upon the Committee on Rivers and Harbors in the past two Congresses, during a period of four years. During all of that time the honored chairman of the committee has served this House, Congress, and the Government with great ability, capacity, and success. [Applause.] I know others will say words of praise of the chairman of the committee at the completion of the reading of the bill, but it will not be my place at that time as one of the younger Members to be accorded that privilege. I think, Mr. Chairman, that after a Member has completed 22 years of faithful service in this House on one committee, having been for three Congresses chairman of that important committee, and when he has performed the duties of that position solely as he has seen them from the standpoint of public welfare, with no selfish interests whatsoever, and when he is about to leave these Halls, Congress could do no better service to itself and to the country than to allow him to return to his home city feeling that the one project in which he has been personally interested—during my connection with the committee at least—shall be carried to completion, and that the authorization of that completion should be made during the time that he himself is a Member of this House. I do not need to say, I am sure, that neither the gentleman himself nor any member of the committee was aware that I was to offer this amendment, but I do it in all sincerity, realizing it will not cost the Government

as much money to adopt it to-day as it will to continue the project during the period of four years, and I also do it out of the feeling in my heart of regard for the gentleman in whose district the project appears and who so richly and worthily deserves our commendation. [Applause.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am very deeply grateful to the gentleman for the kindness which prompts the amendment he has offered. I appreciate it more than I can express in words, but I really must ask the committee not to adopt it. I realize, Mr. Chairman, it would have been better if every project in this bill for which appropriations are made insufficient to complete the various projects could have been put under continuing contract. In many, perhaps in all, cases it would cost much less, as the work could be done more cheaply in that way than by annual appropriations. There are about 25 or 30 of these new projects, for the completion of which no provision is made in this bill. As I stated, I would have preferred if provision by cash or continuing contract could have been made for the completion of all of them, but under the circumstances, in view of Treasury conditions, in view of the idea prevailing that there might be a deficit later on, although I do not think now there will be such at any time, the committee could not see its way clear to provide for the completion of these projects, and I do not think it is right for me to accept for myself what I did not see my way clear to advocate or recommend for others, and for that reason I must, though reluctantly, ask the committee not to adopt the amendment. This I do reluctantly for two reasons——

Mr. MEEKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. In just a moment—reluctantly, first, because of the appreciation I have for the spirit that prompted the amendment, and, secondly, for the reason that I think the committee would be doing an injustice to others by thus favoring me. I therefore request the committee not to adopt the amendment. Now I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MEEKER. If this amendment be adopted, would not the ultimate completion of that work be done for less money?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think so.

Mr. MEEKER. And the intent of Congress is evidently to complete the work?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is true. The same may be said, however, I think, of every other uncompleted project in the bill. I think it would have been a good business proposition to have placed them all under the continuing contract system if we could have seen our way clear to have done so.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, during my service upon committees very seldom have I voted against the wishes of the chairmen, but this is one time that I trust that the committee will not follow the wishes of the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. [Applause.] It will not add any more to the cost of this project, but will probably reduce the cost. It is a meritorious project, and under the circumstances it ought to be unanimously voted in, notwithstanding the protest of our honored friend from Florida.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I want to indorse what has been said. The amendment is for a commercial proposition, and it is one that is well worthy, and, as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] very well said, it is economy for the Government to do it. I believe that nothing could be better than for the chairman of this committee to set an example that ought to be observed by the Government in authorizing contracts that are necessary and which will eventually be performed cheaper by this very course. We can all testify to this fact by voting against the chairman's wishes, and I think it will be the best expression that he can make of doing business in a businesslike way and at the same time extending a deserved compliment to a gentleman whom we all so highly admire. [Applause.]

[Mr. HULBERT addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. SWITZER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY], and ask the committee to ignore the request of the chairman. It seems to me that, owing to the importance of the port of Tampa and this particular project and the long services of the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, that this committee could in no way better show its appreciation of the long and valuable services of the chairman than in voting to put this particular item upon the continuing contract basis. It will not cost the Government a single dollar more, but will probably save money in the end, and it insures the completion of the project, regardless of whether any river and harbor bill will be passed in the future. I think one and all will bear me out when I say that to know the distinguished chairman of this committee is to like him. He is easily approached; he is painstaking and considerate on all occasions; and I think one and all will bear testimony that the many acts of kindness and courtesy extended will ever grow in the recollection of his colleagues and associates through their journey of life in the years to come, and I desire to say at this time that it matters not wherever his life's journey hereafter may take him, whether into the civil walks of life or again back to the Halls of this Congress in answer to the call of legislative duty, I wish for him prosperous hours and pleasant days, and trust that it will vouchsafe for him joyous smiles, radiant as when first he greeted me. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to. [Applause.]

Mr. HULBERT. I ask unanimous consent that I may have read from the Clerk's desk a very brief article from to-day's New York Times.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read the article referred to.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

To WOODROW WILSON,
President of the United States:

Our country is to be congratulated upon your true presentation of Americanism. Every American devoted to the Declaration of Independence must regard your message to the Senate with pride and approval.

The quality, the representative Government, and the pursuit of happiness, the keystone of the Republic, you have accurately expressed. While it is true that traditional American policy is opposed to entangling alliances with European nations, it is also true that this opposition is predicated upon the dangers such entanglement with imperialism would bring to democracy. If the world espouses our ideals, the danger no longer exists.

I would consider myself recreant to every activity in which I have been engaged, to every word I have uttered and written on this matter, if, in view of all that has been said and done, I did not commend your twentieth century promulgation of Americanism to the world.

In speaking of Poland as a concrete case, you have spoken for Ireland, Belgium, and other small nations. The document is the greatest American paper since Lincoln's emancipation proclamation. It is my earnest wish and, I know, the wish of every member of our society that it may reestablish truth and justice in the world, for such a world is a world of peace.

JEREMIAH A. O'LEARY,
President American Truth Society.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask to have an editorial published in to-day's Washington Times read at the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that an editorial published in to-day's Washington Times be read at the Clerk's desk. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

THE PRESIDENT'S PEACE ADDRESS.

President Wilson's address to the Senate yesterday reveals him as the great American peril. If we are destined to be entangled in the near future in war or in minor embroilment with any or all of the powers now at war, it may be set down as certain that the catastrophe will be the outcome of his amazing indiscretion.

His address is calculated to give greater or less offense to every country now at war except Germany and Austria, and it must convey small satisfaction to these latter. It is, in fact, so vague in its conceptions and so indefinite in its expressions that almost any meaning may be read into its more or less flowing periods, and every Government or people that chooses may take umbrage at some one or other of the implied proposals. The truth of this will become more and more apparent as the views of the European newspapers are matured and recorded—probably in a day of two, when they sufficiently overcome their astonishment to size up the real purport of this strange upwelling of inchoate humanitarianism.

Perhaps the strangest sentence of all is that in which Mr. Wilson says, "I am speaking as an individual." How can the President of the United States speak on world politics as an individual? He seems to see the point in the next sentence, but the perception of his responsibility as "the head of a great Government" does not check him. He goes on to settle the affairs of the universe in the first person singular with a rapt conviction characteristic rather of Peter the Hermit or John of Leyden than of a serious twentieth century statesman. Indeed, the speech as a whole is rather a dithyramb than a political thesis. So far as it means anything, it is epileptiform in its fatuity, but for the most part it baffles all serious interpretation in the complicated beauties of its own verbiage.

Its essential vacuity does not prevent it from being full of injurious possibilities. There is the passage, for instance, regarding "a united, independent, and autonomous Poland." What does it mean? Is it an indorsement of Germany's impudent hoax, the erection out of Russian territory of a buffer State under Prussian domination for the protection and aggrandizement of the central powers? If so, how will England, France, and Italy receive the idea? Or is it an indorsement of the Russian plan for a Poland built up out of Prussian, Austrian, and Russian conquests? If the latter, what will they say of it in Vienna and Berlin?

Then there is the pronouncement on that sounding but absolutely hollow and meaningless phrase, "the freedom of the seas." What is Mr. Wilson's idea of such freedom? Does he contemplate giving over the Bosphorus and Dardanelles to Russia? Or does he mean driving England out of Suez and Gibraltar? Does he contemplate excluding Italian and Austrian warships from the Adriatic or to forbid Britain

to blockade the Ems and the outlet of the Skager-Rack? May Germany bind England in a ring of submarines, or may Russia blockade the Baltic ports of Germany? And what of the Panama Canal? Are we to give up all jurisdiction over it?

It makes the average man's head swim to regard the various possibilities of "the freedom of the seas," "free access to the open paths of the world's commerce." These phrases are a German invention, dating back to the end of 1914 or beginning of 1915, when the economic pressure of the British fleet began to tell in the war. They mean the disarmament of England—simply this and nothing more. How are we to expect England will receive Mr. Wilson's solemn indorsement of the proposition, uttered in the august presence of the United States Senate?

Besides, there are so many things left unsaid in the President's harangue. Poland, indeed! But what word is there of Belgium or Serbia? What allusion is there to the martyrization of Armenia? To the new threat against Switzerland? There is to be no victory in the war; only a peace between equals! "Mankind is looking now for freedom of life, not for equipoises of power." We confess to inability to get any distinct significance from this portion of the President's remarks. His ideas seem to us to belong to the realm of dreamland, where everything is balmy but elusive, roseate but shifting, and unstable as the forms in a kaleidoscope.

This is the sort of peace which the United States will not be allowed to help in concluding, but which this country is, nevertheless, to set the seal of permanence upon by becoming its guarantor. In doing this it appears we are not violating the tradition which comes down to us from the Father of His Country, warning us to avoid entangling alliances with the nations of Europe, for the curious reason that "there is no entangling alliance in a concert of power." Plainly it must differ in some occult way from a concert of powers, which, as Mr. Wilson himself inferentially, if not directly, shows us is the surest way to competition, jealousy, hostility, and belligerency.

No greater puzzle for the historian has ever been placed upon the page of time than this move of Mr. Wilson, sprung without warning upon a dismayed people and a disconcerted world. What was the genesis of it? Who prompted it? What is the true motive? What does Mr. Wilson expect to accomplish? Conundrums to the ordinary mind, without an answer consistent with honor and common sense!

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by having printed therein a joint resolution of the California Legislature, asking that Congress enact certain legislation for the benefit of certain oil operators in the State of California.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, has this resolution heretofore been incorporated by the action of another body?

Mr. CHURCH. Oh, no. This resolution has just been passed during the last week.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The following is the resolution referred to:

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, Frank C. Jordan, secretary of state of the State of California, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the annexed copy of assembly joint resolution No. 2 of the Forty-second Legislature of the State of California with the original now on file in my office, and that the same is a correct transcript therefrom and of the whole thereof. I further certify that this authentication is in due form and by the proper officer.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and have caused the great seal of the State of California to be affixed hereto this 19th day of January, A. D. 1917.

[SEAL.]

FRANK C. JORDAN,
Secretary of State,
By FRANK H. CORY, *Deputy.*

Assembly joint resolution No. 2, relating to the oil industry of the State of California.

Whereas the oil industry of California is in a demoralized condition, caused by litigation instituted and threatened by the United States Government against bona fide operators, who entered upon and were developing public lands in good faith at the time of their withdrawal, and continued such development under the law, as they were legally advised it to be, until by such efforts they greatly increased the production of oil and, in some instances, were the means of opening up new oil fields; and

Whereas unless Congress settles by a law these vexatious disputes the present litigations will probably continue for many years, resulting in great hardship to the operators by preventing the marketing of their oil, and to the public by reason of constantly increasing the price of gasoline and oil due to the stoppage by the Government of the operation of large areas of this land, and also resulting in many instances in bankrupting the small operators who have not the resources to stand years of expensive litigations against the United States Government; and

Whereas we firmly believe that justice requires that the Government shall legalize the claims of all locators who were actually developing such land in good faith at the time of its withdrawal: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully request the Congress to enact such legislation as will legalize the rights of these operators; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be, and he is hereby, directed to send a certified copy of these resolutions to each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress, to the President of the Senate, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Attorney General, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Interior.

C. C. YOUNG,
Speaker of the Assembly.
WM. D. STEPHENS,
President of the Senate.

Attest:

FRANK C. JORDAN,
Secretary of State,
By FRANK H. CORY, *Deputy.*

The Clerk read as follows:

Apalachicola Bay, Fla.: For maintenance, $14,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do that for the purpose of calling attention to the last two items, and in view of the fact that another item that we are approaching will be considered in that same connection.

Apalachicola Bay has received $516,000 thus far. Eleven thousand dollars balance on hand, and by this bill it carries $14,000 more. The commerce upon that stream is 22,947 tons, of which the timber products reach 9,334 tons, or a balance of 13,613 tons. After expending over half a million dollars on this stream we have a total of less than 23,000 tons, and after deducting timber products, about 13,000 tons or a little over that is about a dollar a ton for interest and maintenance.

Now, the St. Andrews project has had $264,563. This bill asks for $36,000 more. The project has been completed. The average maintenance expense, I understand, is about $35,000 per year. The commerce on this stream is 130,479 tons, according to page 2354 of the Engineer's report. Timber products reach over 100,000 tons, leaving a net commerce on this item, deducting timber products, of about 29,925 tons.

Timber is a fair commerce, although temporary. There is no criticism as to that. But why not have local contribution when the cost is so heavy. Beyond that, Mr. Chairman, I call attention to the fact that, with the timber commerce eliminated, the commerce on the stream on which we have paid over half a million dollars is only 13,613 tons; and the St. Andrews stream affords only a little more result for the large expenditure of money we have made on that stream.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Oklawaha, River, Fla.: For maintenance, $5,000; for improvement in accordance with the project set forth on page 17 of House Document No. 514, Sixty-third Congress, second session, and subject to the conditions set forth in said document, $100,000: *Provided,* That the channel outside of the locks provided for in said report shall be constructed to a depth of 4 feet above the mouth of Silver Springs Run; in all, $105,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out all after line 21.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 18, beginning with line 22, strike out the remainder of the paragraph.

Mr. FREAR. This refers to the Oklawaha River, and for the new project that has been proposed, and in reading the preceding statistics regarding the other two streams I did it to show the waste of money which we are proposing when we adopt this project. After an expenditure of about $100,000—$98,000 is the appropriation that we have made, but, of course, there is a large expense for water hyacinth and other expenditures the Government has made upon that stream—I want to read, because I was corrected yesterday, and improperly, as I believe, from statistics as shown on page 2302 of the Engineer's report for 1916. Here is what it shows:

Logs, cypress and pine, 27,624 tons; total commerce on that river, 29,393 tons—

which puts it at the identical figures, as I said, and that is something over 1,700 tons after an expenditure of over $100,000.

The Oklawaha River, Mr. Chairman, has been discussed quite frequently. It has been suggested that it is partially a reclamation project. The cost as proposed by the Board of Engineers, an estimated cost, as proposed here, is $733,000, in addition to what we have put into the stream for original construction, and $12,000 per annum for maintenance, subject to local conditions, recommended by the board. The first recommendation asked for by the Army engineers is $175,000. The subsequent appropriation should be sufficient to complete the work in four years. This bill does not propose to carry out the wishes of the Board of Engineers.

I call attention at this time to the enormous waste of money in view of those other two projects which I read. Here we propose, for 1,700 tons of commerce, to expend three-quarters of a million dollars, cost of $12,000 for maintenance a year, and substantially about $18,000 a year for interest, which means about $30,000 a year for interest and maintenance that we will have for this stream and for the small commerce which has been shown.

I read from page 5 of House Document No. 514, Sixty-third Congress:

It is believed that the present and prospective commerce is sufficient to warrant the United States in undertaking this improvement along

the lines proposed by the district officer, at a total estimated cost of $733,000 and $12,000 annually for maintenance, provided that any land necessary for the construction of the waterway shall be given to the United States without charge.

And then it is suggested that this is the condition on which this improvement is to be made: That they shall establish and operate a boat line over this waterway which will be competitive with the railroads and not subject to control or purchase by a railroad or other corporate interest.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, the absurdity of that condition being placed in the Army Engineer's report—that a boat line is to be established there that will be competitive with the railroads and not subject to control or purchase by a railroad or other corporate interest.

What is the method of providing for that? Say that a boat is to be placed upon this stream. I presume there is no regular boat there now, although there may be pleasure boats there. They must place a boat line there that will not be interfered with. How long? For 5 years or for 10 years? What is the restriction to be placed by the engineers? Upon that simple restriction it is proposed that an expenditure, approximately, of three-quarters of a million dollars shall be made.

On another page of the report it is said that—

At this time a railroad was built from the St. Johns to Fort Mason. At that time transportation on the St. Johns River was provided for by a line of steamers by the means before mentioned. Railroad and lake navigation at the head of Lake Oklawaha was afforded reasonable facilities to markets at reasonable rates.

So that this project, it seems, is purely for the purpose of providing waterway transportation, notwithstanding railroads reach close to the river at various points. If there be any question of trying to force railroad rates down, as is presented in some of these reports, that can be done by going to the State railroad commission.

Now, I do not intend to take any more time on this, except to suggest that I have before me a report dated Washington, December 11, in which the Army engineers refuse to recommend the improvement of the St. Croix River, which runs beside the town in which I live, because the commerce only reaches about 7,000 tons. During the summer season 8,500 passengers were carried on that river. This stream runs to the great park region a few miles above. I presume that a hundred thousand passengers are carried on the trains, largely to those places. That has been in past years one of the greatest streams of the North, so far as logging and rafting are concerned. I believe the engineers did right. That stream runs past my home. I can not see how justly, in view of the facts as I know them to exist, they could propose to increase the appropriation for that stream beyond maintenance, although it was asked for by some local people.

Recently there was a proposition that a canal be put on that river, to cost something like $8,000,000. The Army engineers were not in favor of it. There was nothing to justify it, because the canal would have been a wasteful project, so far as we could ascertain, and they decided against the people of Wisconsin and Minnesota who came down in behalf of that proposition. I believe they decided right in the action that they have taken.

Under leave I add to this statement the following concerning the Oklawaha project:

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 3, page 937, appears an extract from the Leesburg (Fla.) Commercial, of December 29, 1916, placed in the RECORD by Mr. CLARK of Florida. In that article extended in the RECORD with commendable dispatch after its publication appears the statement:

It is true that this recognition was never given until the South had sent into the Senate and House of Representatives so many men of force and ability that recognition was literally choked from the unwilling throats of those who had long done all the shouting and all the planning and had reaped all the harvests. * * * Now that the South is coming somewhat into its own, now that the waters of the South are being offered to the attention of the Nation * * * there has arisen a cry of "pork." * * * Mr. FREAR is from Wisconsin, and to those who are near enough to see the development of his cry of crookedness (the Oklawaha River) his purist pleas are grotesque. * * * For instance, he holds up his hands in horror, figuratively speaking, at the dreadful waste of three-quarters of a million dollars upon a few hundred swamp dwellers along the banks of a crooked river, the Oklawaha. * * * He never heard of Leesburg and Eustis and Tavares and Mount Dora.

THE CAUSE FOR OPPOSITION.

The country expects Congress to do justice to the Oklawaha, to Leesburg, and to Florida without fear or prejudice. In response to suggestions in the article, let me say that anyone who arrays section against section for the purpose of exciting prejudice is not performing any public service; but if sectionalism results in extravagance, it ought to be frankly discussed. So far as I know, the people of Florida, individually and collectively, are just as good as the people of any other State; and with this admission made in good faith, I desire briefly to reply to criticism coming from the Leesburg purveyor of knowledge, inserted by the gentleman from Florida's second district, and to discuss further the merits of the Oklawaha $733,000 new project contained in the pending bill.

The charge is that the South, by literally choking the North, has come into its own because so many men of "force and ability" are now coming from the South. I do not question the force and ability of any Member, North or South, nor the fact that, viewed from the Leesburg standpoint, Florida has come into its own. My objection is that Wisconsin and the country is largely paying wasteful bills for Florida and many other localities, and as a citizen and Representative of my State and of the country I seek to secure public understanding of the fact that taxpayers are paying for waste wherever located. Further, that it is unjust to the tax-paying public for Congress to load such burdens upon them.

MONEY GIVEN WITHOUT CHOKING.

In order to show long-continued generous treatment by the Government of Florida's waterways, permit me to say that, as nearly as can be estimated, Florida has received about $20,000,000 in waterway appropriations. Some of these waterways are interstate and a small portion, possibly 10 per cent, should properly be borne by the adjoining State of Georgia, if any such division be deemed necessary. For the same reason it is impossible to say exactly what portion is properly chargeable to a particular district, but the second district, recently reapportioned, has been generously treated. For many years this district was represented by the gentleman who inserted the article in the RECORD. Recently his district was changed to exclude several old counties and include several new ones; none of the latter, however, have any considerable waterways. For that reason, and in order to show exceptionally generous treatment by the Government of Florida and the second district, whether choked from the North or given voluntarily, I append projects formerly in that old district with two in the new. The list following indicates liberal appropriations compared to the actual commerce served, whatever may have been the inducement:

WATERWAY PROJECTS CREDITED TO THE SECOND DISTRICT.

St. Marys River, Nassau County	$22,450
Savannah to Fernandina, Nassau County	508,608
Fernandina and Cumberland, Nassau County	3,647,510
St. Johns and Cumberland, Nassau County	202,065
St. Johns River, Duvall County	7,527,341
Key West, Dade County	815,500
Indian, St. Lucia County	177,500
Lake Crescent, St. Johns County	25,000
Oklawaha, Marion County	92,621
Cutting Hyacinth, Marion County	161,416
Swaunee, Levy County	85,890
Withlacoochee, Levy County	335,269
Total	13,601,170

While several of these streams are interdistrict and one or two interstate, it is also true that all the waterway projects in the old district are not included in the above list.

WHO PAYS FLORIDA'S BILLS?

Florida, and the second district in particular, having received liberal treatment in both waterways and also public buildings, we find that last year Wisconsin contributed $12,993,916 to the Federal Treasury (Internal-Revenue Report, 1916, p. 50), while Florida's contribution was $1,816,214. The income tax for 1915 was $1,338,284 for Wisconsin and $242,151 for Florida, or Wisconsin's contribution was about five or six times that of Florida. Of course, New York, Illinois, and other large States, paid far more than Wisconsin, but for practical comparisons these two States can be considered. Illinois contributed $10,745,840 for income taxes and $65,287,404 in all, while New York contributed $45,200,057 for income taxes and $104,910,480 in all. Apart from the objectionable practice of wasting public funds either North or South, the injustice of the present locality burden borne by direct locality taxation is emphasized.

So far as can be determined Florida will receive $746,000 in the pending river and harbor bill for old projects, while Wisconsin, with the second largest waterway commerce in the country, receives $82,000, not counting the upper Mississippi, which is a wasteful project, possibly as bad as many of those in Florida, and with an insignificant actual commerce. But this does not tell half the story of Florida's appropriations, because, in addition to $746,000, which is appropriated by this bill to continue old waterway projects in Florida, the bill also carries $457,700 more with which to start several new projects in Florida that engineers estimate will cost $2,215,700 before completion, which will require constant additional appropriations to complete and increase the maintenance charge many thousands annually.

This bill, then, carries for Florida 20 different items, reaching $1,203,700 in cash, and assumes new waterway burdens in that State reaching $2,311,700.

Wisconsin, with many times the actual waterway commerce of Florida, receives $82,000 for old projects and $77,000 for new projects, or a total of $159,000. Can anything be more unfair from a business standpoint, or more unjust to the taxpayers of the country?

If, then, Wisconsin, with a great waterway commerce, pays $6 for every dollar paid by Florida, and receives about 11 per cent of the amount spent in Florida for waterways in 1917, is it not time to inquire why three-quarters of a million more is to be expended on the Oklawaha, which engineers report is a "crooked" stream with practically no commerce, but recommended for another three-quarters of a million?

THE OKLAWAHA PROJECT.

The new project for the Oklawaha, contained in this bill, is for $733,000.

Oklawaha River has received in appropriations from the Government $98,710 thus far, and a good share of $161,416 appropriated for cutting water hyacinth on Florida waters has also been spent on that stream. Apart from a new project involving three-quarters of a million dollars for this same stream, the pending bill contains an item for maintenance of the present project. The Oklawaha is not materially different from many other streams or creeks in Florida and elsewhere contained in every river and harbor bill. In the limited time afforded by debate on one item, in a bill which covers over 350 different items, I desire briefly to present some of the facts disclosed from official reports.

After an expenditure of considerably over $100,000 on this creek, including hyacinth cutting, the 1916 Engineer's Report, page 2302, shows statistics of 29,393 tons of commerce. Of this traffic, 27,624 tons consisted of pine and cypress logs floated on the stream somewhere and were only weighed in the fertile imagination of the Engineers' Department. Of the remaining 1,769 tons of commerce, 1,011 tons consisted of "miscellaneous freight," valued at exactly $10 per ton and hauled blank distance, according to the report. Two passenger boats may carry freight, but the report is not specific. Five per cent of "trade," it is estimated, is carried by water, indicating that the entire trade, apart from logs and miscellaneous, is not large. On page 690 of the 1916 report it is stated that after spending over $100,000 "no effect on freight rates has been observed." Tabulated, the commerce statistics show as follows:

		Tons.
Commerce		29,393
Logs	27,624	
Miscellaneous (doubtful)	1,011	
		28,635
Net total commerce		758

On page 2301 of the 1916 report it appears that $1,398.26 was spent by Army engineers last year, of which $823.26 was for "field work" and $675 for office expenses. In other words, "office expenses" almost equaled the cost of taking out overhanging bushes, snags, and so forth, that were in the way, and taking out 60 cubic yards of rock, to increase the depth to 4 feet at extreme low water over shoal places. That depth is greater than the depth developed in the channel of the Mississippi River below Keokuk at different times of the year, according to personal knowledge, which is supported by the experience of captains and pilots on the greatest river in the country, and in any event sufficient to provide for 1,769 tons of doubtful commerce distributed throughout 365 days of the year. And for this creek and commerce the Government must now pay $733,000 more, with the single condition that a "boat line" will be put in operation.

PERSONAL KNOWLEDGE OF THE OKLAWAHA.

While I have relied on facts set forth by the Engineer's report, it has been charged that I have no personal knowledge of the Oklawaha. If anything additional to the official report is needed, let me say that a Mississippi River pilot from my own district, who approves my opposition to the enormous waste on the Mississippi, has given me first-hand information of the Oklawaha. He knows the river and has even handled the pilot's wheel on that river. Another man of standing and former high official position, for whom I am sure every member of the Minnesota delegation would vouch, has also voluntarily given me his personal observations of the Oklawaha. A third man from my own district, who owns a winter home on the Oklawaha, has also given me his personal impression of the river. Three men whose standing is high have each confirmed my judgment of the Oklawaha. That judgment is determined by official reports from which I have quoted.

Any disinterested person who reads the Engineer's report—No. 514, Sixty-third Congress—on the Oklawaha must inevitably come to the same conclusion that the new project is indefensible.

LOCALITY PREJUDICE.

It has been claimed that locality prejudice causes opposition to this extravagance. I never care to defend from unjust insinuations and will not do so now, leaving my own condemnation of Mississippi River extravagance along my own district to speak for itself. However, as stated before, another project runs past my own home. It is known as the St. Croix River, which averages about a mile in width for 20 miles near my home, and floats the largest boats that ever run on the Mississippi River. The navigable river is about 75 miles in length, and extends up to the Interstate Park, maintained by Minnesota and Wisconsin, and visited by presumably over 50,000 people every year.

Before a dollar was ever spent by the Government upon that river, I saw continuous rafts of logs and lumber, reaching many millions of tons annually, floated down the river to the Mississippi. Barges of grain and boat loads of freight were sent down daily by a score of steamboats that then plied the river.

During the past 35 years a total of $158,656 have been spent on the river, or about as much as on the Oklawaha, counting hyacinth cutting. After floating several hundred million tons of commerce, according to the judgment of old river men, the 1916 report quotes 1915 commerce at 7,172 tons of lumber and lath and 8,500 passengers, which it may be suggested compares favorably with the Oklawaha. A dozen or more cities and villages are along the river, running in size from cities of over 10,000 population to villages of several hundred.

Nothing has been spent on the river for several years, and in a recent statement the Chief of Engineers said it would be unprofitable for the Government to undertake any new project. Although the river is as large as the upper Mississippi where they join, and has been one of the great commerce-bearing streams of the upper Mississippi Valley, I do not question this finding. Yet if located in Florida, I submit this river would be entitled to millions of dollars of public funds.

I offer this statement not by way of justification for opposing waste, but because I desire to approve of an economical act by the Chief of Engineers, to which my attention has been directed, in refusing to approve any extravagant new project for the St. Croix.

WHY SPEND $750,000 MORE ON THE OKLAWAHA?

Returning to the criticism by a paper published in the village of Leesburg, which was inserted by the Representative from Florida's second district, and which declares appropriations for Florida are now "literally choked" from the taxpaying North because of the force and ability of Florida Members, I will say that whether the waste is North or South, it deserves condemnation, and the new $733,000 Oklawaha project, carrying an annual interest maintenance and lock charge of $27,000, is one of the most wasteful, in my judgment. The Florida paper asks if we have never heard of Leesburg (844 population) or Eustis (529 population), or Tavares (218 population), or Mount Dora (150 population), according to the 1910 census. We have, and in submitting these few remarks I would, indeed, be chargeable with oversight if I failed to mention them separately, and to speak of them with all due respect; but after studying their relative importance in the commercial world, accompanied by the 2-ton or 5-ton per day creek on which they are located, I am yet unconvinced that Wisconsin and other Northern States should put three-quarters of a million dollars more into the Oklawaha. Let Florida do it.

A suggestion that Kissimmee, which gets a public building in the 1917 bill, is not on the Kissimmee River project must be fought out by the belligerent Leesburg village Commercial with the Chief Engineer of the Army. On page 704 of the 1916 report that official says the full project has been completed on the Kissimmee River "from Kissimmee to Istokpoga Creek," all of which is interesting from a geographical viewpoint, if not valuable commercially, in view of the condition of the Kissimmee during eight months of the year. The Kissimmee gets $47,000 additional in this bill, which fact speaks for itself as to this "new project."

With this brief explanation I am content to leave the subject, believing that taxpayers throughout the country will oppose the waste of another three-quarters of a million on the Oklawaha and $47,000 on the Kissimmee, which are only two of scores of indefensible projects that are now hammering at the Treasury doors for public money.

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

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield a moment until I can ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I will ask leave to extend my remarks, also, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] has very peculiar ideas about his opposition to these items. I want to say—and I will put that in the RECORD—that I received a letter, written on January 3 of this year, from the chairman of the local committee at Leesburg, Fla., advocating this improvement—Leesburg is at the head of this improvement—asking me to invite the gentleman from Wisconsin, who had heretofore attacked this item, to make a visit to Florida, stating that they would regard him as their guest from the time he left Washington until the time he got back to Washington; that they would provide him with a boat and a guide, so that he could see this whole stream; and only asking that he would come back here and get upon this floor and state what were his real impressions of the situation.

Under date of January 5 I sent to the gentleman that invitation, and I desire to put into the RECORD my letter to him, in which I stated that if he would indicate when it was convenient for him to start I would see to it that all the arrangements were made.

The gentleman from Wisconsin did not treat me with courtesy enough to answer my letter, but he wrote to the chairman of the committee at Leesburg, under date of January 6, declining that invitation; so that the gentleman stands here to-day opposing this project when he has absolutely no knowledge of the Oklawaha River at all. When I went before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors to present this project and to lay before that committee the facts as to it the gentleman from Wisconsin, who is a member of the committee, was conspicuous by his absence. He heard none of the hearings on this project; he absolutely declined to go down there and learn the exact truth, and yet he is willing to stand in this presence and oppose it. What must be thought of a legislator who will recklessly brand as unworthy a project which all the engineers have approved when the facts show beyond question that the legislator is utterly ignorant on the subject?

The correspondence I have referred to is as follows:

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Leesburg, Fla., January 3, 1917.

Hon. FRANK CLARK,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CLARK: We understand Congressman FREAR is fighting our Oklawaha project and is making many assertions about it that are not correct.

Thinking that perhaps Mr. FREAR will be fair enough to make a personal investigation, if the opportunity is offered him, we want to ask you to extend him on behalf of this committee an invitation to make a personal inspection of the Oklawaha River as our guest from the time he leaves Washington until he returns. The only condition attached to this proposition being that Mr. FREAR agrees to state on the floor of the House the exact impression he gains from the investigation.

The Oklawaha River, if improved as per the bill which passed the House in 1914, will save in freight rates in the first year the territory it will serve as much as the project will cost.

Mr. J. D. Young gave Mr. FREAR this same invitation two years ago and it was not accepted. If you will extend this invitation on behalf of our committee and urge that it be accepted, you will very much oblige us.

Very truly, yours, G. G. WARE, *Chairman.*

JANUARY 5, 1917.

Hon. JAMES A. FREAR,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: I am inclosing herewith the original of a letter just received by me from Mr. G. G. Ware, chairman of the Oklawaha River improvement committee of the Chamber of Commerce of Lake County, Fla., wherein you will observe he authorizes me, in behalf of his committee, to extend to you an invitation to make a personal inspection of Oklawaha River as the guest of the committee named from the time you leave Washington until you return here.

You will note that the only condition attached to the invitation is that you will agree to state upon the floor of the House the exact impression you may gain from such investigation.

You have for some time been attacking the river and harbor bills reported to the House, and the Oklawaha River project has been one of the special objects of your attack and therefore it seems to me that this is a proposition which is eminently fair to the project, to the people behind it, to the Florida delegation who advocate it, as well as to yourself.

If you simply desire that the facts may be known and that justice may be done, this is your opportunity to learn at first hand what these facts are. I cordially join with this committee in inviting you to go to Florida at any time convenient to yourself. If you will advise me as to when it will be convenient for you to make the trip, I will see to it that all the necessary arrangements are made.

Trusting that you may find it convenient to accept the invitation of these good people and learn the exact truth as to this waterway and the proposed project, and asking that you will extend me the courtesy of an early reply, I am,

Yours, very truly, FRANK CLARK.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 6, 1917.

Mr. G. G. WARE, *Leesburg, Fla.*

MY DEAR SIR: Yours of the 3d instant, addressed to Mr. CLARK, has been transmitted to me, together with the article from the Leesburg paper, inserted in the paper by a Florida Representative.

If information is needed further than that furnished by the Leesburg paper, the Government engineers' reports, and disinterested people of excellent standing who are familiar with the river and whose judgment has been given, I will write you for additional information.

The speech to which you take exception was made nearly three years ago, during the 1914 debate on the river and harbor bill, which bill was the last one, and only one, to contain the new item for the Oklawaha. Though passed by the House, the item was stricken out by the Senate committee, together with the Kissimmee new project, before the bill was reported to the Senate. That bill was subsequently defeated. Apparently the Senate committee, acting on its own initiative, came to the same conclusion regarding the inadvisability of appropriating three-quarters of a million dollars for the Oklawaha.

Very truly, yours,

JAMES A. FREAR.

I desire also to file for printing in the RECORD a telegram which I have received to-day from the Ocala (Fla.) Board of Trade advocating this improvement, which reads as follows:

OCALA, FLA., *January 22, 1917.*

Hon. FRANK CLARK, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.:

Ocala, Leesburg, Umatilla, Eustis, Tavares, Marion County, and Lake County, together with adjacent territory, are dependent on improvements of the Oklawaha and Silver Springs Rivers to give them reasonable and competing rates of freight. Our many thousands of tons of incoming and outgoing freights per annum would double the first year after the water rates were given by the improvement of the rivers. The rapid development of this, the most fertile and resourceful section of the State, would be unprecedented in a very few years. The billions of tons of phosphate and lime, the billions of feet of manufactured lumber and saw logs, with millions of crossties, shingles, piling, hundreds of thousands of tons of agricultural products, cattle, hogs, horses, and mules, together with thousands of boxes of oranges, grapefruit, and vegetables. We respectfully urge the undivided support of our Senators and Members of Congress to do all in their power to give us the relief prayed for by the improvement to the Oklawaha and Silver Springs Rivers.

MARION COUNTY BOARD OF TRADE,
L. R. TRAMMEL, *Secretary.*

Permit me to say that Ocala is a city of some eight or nine thousand people, a very progressive city, in the center of a magnificent agricultural section and in the heart of the hard-rock phosphate region of the State of Florida and tributary to the Ocklawaha River.

Permit me to state, Mr. Chairman, that this river is about 125 miles in length. It rises in a chain of lakes near Leesburg, and a number of other cities and towns in Florida grace the shores of these lakes, and flows in a northerly direction, emptying into the St. Johns River at Welaka.

The engineers surveyed the river. The local engineer, the Chief of Engineers, and the Board of Engineers all concurred in recommending this improvement as a meritorious and worthy one. This project was in the river and harbor bill of 1914 and passed this House. It was killed in the Senate, because that was the time when the Senate struck out all items and appropriated a lump sum for the old improvements.

Mr. SHERWOOD. When was that report made?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. The report of the Government engineers was in 1914. I want to state that Leesburg is just about the same distance from Jacksonville, Fla., as is Sanford, Fla. Sanford, Fla., enjoys water transportation, being near the head of navigation on the St. Johns River. It also has rail transportation. The freight rates from Jacksonville to Sanford are just about one-half what the rates are from Jacksonville to Leesburg, and the improvement of this waterway will save to the people of Leesburg and that vicinity $400,000 or $500,000 annually in freight, as shown by the report of the engineers.

I want to say further that Ocala, a city of some eight or nine thousand population, is within 5½ miles of Silver Springs, at the head of what we know as Silver Springs Run, which is navigable, and which flows into the Oklawaha River. Ocala and all that surrounding country will be tributary to this waterway, and there will be a saving on freight to the people of Ocala and the country tributary to it of $500,000 or $600,000 additional, making a saving in freights on the commerce there to-day of approximately a million dollars a year to the people of that country by this improvement.

Since this report was made various other enterprises have gone into that country. In the Oklawaha River Valley the lands are as rich as any lands on the earth. Right in front of the Speaker's desk now is a picture of a part of a cornfield of 1,000 acres which last year produced 100,000 bushels of corn without a particle of fertilizer. There is no land in this country that can excel that, even in the corn belt of the West; a thousand acres with 100 bushels of corn to the acre clear through it is a yield that can be equaled in but few localities.

Our people down there have recently begun to raise hay. There was a time, only two or three years ago, when practically all the hay used in the State of Florida was shipped into it from the West. Since the Agricultural Department has found Sudan

grass and Natal grass and Rhodes grass our people have been experimenting with these grasses, and Natal grass especially finds a home there. Only last year in this very same valley there were over 30,000 tons of Natal grass hay raised.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, may I have five minutes more?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent that his time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Will $100,000 complete this work?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. No. The engineers recommend $733,000 for the whole improvement. Mr. Chairman, this waterway strikes right through the very heart of the State of Florida. It runs 125 miles in length through the very center of the State.

The gentleman from Wisconsin speaks of the fact that they have a railroad there. That is true. There are two railroads that strike Leesburg and most of the towns in this community, but there are great sections of country where the railroad lies 50 or 60, and in some places 75 miles from the river, and there is that great stretch of country in there with absolutely no transportation on the face of the earth to-day. The people are going in and settling it up. Right across is one of these little towns, Howey, just established. They have built a hotel with 50 rooms, stores have sprung up, they have electric lights, and it is quite a flourishing little village. The people have gone into clearing this hammock land, which is the richest on earth. They are raising hogs and cattle and grain and hay, and all of those products which are heavy in their nature and which can and will take advantage of water transportation.

I want to say, further, that right contiguous to this waterway are great beds of kaolin, infusorial earth, and phosphates, and in the county of Lake, where these lakes are, the headwaters of the waterway, there are millions of tons of the finest of road-building clay in the world. There are many counties in our State which have not the clay to build these hard roads which they have bonded themselves to build, and the clay is being shipped into other counties for road-building purposes. It is too expensive to ship it on the railroad. If these waterways are improved, millions of tons of clay will be shipped into other counties. I might say that different counties in Florida have bonded themselves within the last year or two to the amount of $12,000,000 to build these hard roads, and the time is not far distant when there will be a perfect network of hard roads all over the State. As I say, some counties have not got this clay, and this material will be shipped into those counties. Lake County has an abundance of it, and if this waterway is improved all the counties in the middle section of the State can avail themselves of it and get the benefit of cheap transportation for road-building material. Mr. Chairman, the engineers have approved of this item, and I sincerely trust that it will stay in the bill. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, as I have previously stated, there is to-day enough of commerce tributary to the Ocklawaha River upon which, if this improvement is made, there will result in a saving to the people living in that territory approximately $1,000,000 per annum in freight charges. Surely an undertaking which will produce such beneficent results can not be a bad investment for the Government. Enterprises are to-day awaiting the action of Congress with relation to this improvement, and as soon as this project is adopted, these enterprises will take form, and both population and commerce will increase by leaps and bounds in that favored territory. With millions of acres of the most fertile and productive soil under the sun; with vast areas of timber and timber products; with millions of tons of phosphate, kaolin, infusorial earth, or kisselguhr; with unlimited quantities of as fine road-building clay as can be found on this hemisphere; with our cattle, hogs, farms, groves, and gardens; with our incomparable climate and progressive people we only need this waterway to give the world an object lesson in progress such as has not been witnessed within the past half century.

As to the merits of the project, we have the solemn official report of the Army engineers, men skilled in their profession and charged with the duty of investigating all such propositions and making report upon their official honor. These officers have no interest in this project, and they say that this project is a meritorious one and one worthy to be undertaken by the Government.

On the other hand, only one man in this great body opposes it. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] is that man. What does he know about it? Nothing. Is he an engineer skilled in his profession? No. What knowledge has he as to this project? None; absolutely none. I say this, Mr. Chairman, and I am warranted by the facts in saying it. The gentleman from Wisconsin is a member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, but when the committee held the hearing on this project the gentleman from Wisconsin was not present and did not hear one word of it.

The good people down in Florida who live in the section to be benefited by this proposed improvement, desiring that the gentleman from Wisconsin should see this waterway and the country bordering it, and thus for himself get the truth of the matter, invited him to come down there as their guest, without any expense to himself, and the gentleman declined the invitation. What must we conclude from this action of the gentleman in declining to visit the waterway and in absenting himself from the hearing on this project? Does it look as though the gentleman really wanted to know the truth? Does this conduct indicate that he is seeking to treat this matter fairly and justly? It may be the gentleman will claim he did not visit the river because Congress was in session and he was busy. It will be noted he did not give that excuse in his letter to Mr. Ware, but suppose that was his real reason for declining the invitation; what does the gentleman say about the same invitation extended to him by Capt. Young last year? Ah, Mr. Chairman, in view of all the facts in this case and in view of the fact that the gentleman went out of his way to denounce another bill lately pending in this body as a "sectional bill" constructed in the interest of the South, when there was not a scintilla of evidence to support such contention, we must conclude that the gentleman from Wisconsin is actuated in this matter by his lofty and patriotic desire to emit the venom of a pent-up provincialism upon a great section of our common country. No man rises to the full stature of American citizenship until he is big enough and broad enough to stand for the progress, the betterment, and the glory of every portion of our great Republic. No man is a true American who can not in good conscience plant his feet upon the soil of any State in the Union and say, "This is my own, my native land." No man whose patriotism is not broad enough and deep enough to encompass every section of the Republic is fitted to be a Representative on the floor of the American Congress.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I shall append to these remarks the hearing on this project before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. As heretofore stated, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR], who is a member of that committee, was not present. The hearing was with relation to the Oklawaha and Kissimmee Rivers, but I shall only insert the portion of it referring to the Oklawaha:

OKLAWAHA AND KISSIMMEE RIVERS, FLA.

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 8, 1917.

The committee, at 12 o'clock m., proceeded to the consideration of the project for the improvement of the Oklawaha River, in the State of Florida.

STATEMENT OF HON. FRANK CLARK, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF FLORIDA.

Mr. CLARK. I want to say, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, that I think it hardly necessary for me to go into this matter very fully, because it has already been gone into heretofore and the committee, in 1914, reported the item and it passed the House. But as you gentlemen know, it went out in the Senate because that was the time they adopted a lump sum and struck out all items.

The report (Doc. 514), with which I have no doubt the committee is thoroughly familiar, contains a very full exposition of the whole subject. I want to call the attention of the committee to some of the commerce that is tributary to this waterway as shown at that time, and also to the freight rate and the question of its effect upon this commerce. The committee will remember that Sanford, Fla., is about the same distance from Jacksonville as Leesburg, on this waterway, and the freights, as given here at the time of this report, show that the rates were just about one-half from Jacksonville to Sanford of the rates from Jacksonville to Leesburg, the proposition being, of course, that if this waterway is improved it will mean a tremendous saving in freights to the people tributary to that waterway.

The country adjacent to this river has improved a great deal since then, and I especially want to call the attention of the committee to some of the things that have transpired to make this very much more important now than at that time, and I expect I am going to say something that is going to surprise the committee very much. I know it would surprise some others of the members of the committee if they were present. Since this report was made there is an instance of a thousand acres of land tributary to this waterway which has been developed, planted in corn this last year, and 100,000 bushels of corn gathered from that thousand acres. To show you something of the fertility of the soil and something of the productiveness of it, and something of what is going on in that country, I have here a picture of a portion of that corn field that I would like very much for the committee to look at while I am calling attention to some other facts with reference to it. And I want to state that there are very, very, many thousands of acres of land undeveloped just as productive as this thousand acres which has been put into cultivation. And also tributary to it is a Natal hay field. The people down in that country have just begun raising hay. This is a new hay which was introduced into our section of the country by the Department of Agriculture. The fact has been that until late years all the hay used in the State of Florida has been shipped into it; but the people have found by actual test that Rhodes grass and Sudan grass and Natal grass all grow to perfection in that country, and they are now engaged in raising immense quantities of hay, and they are raising corn, too.

It was thought for a long time down in our particular section of the country that corn could not be grown to any advantage, but the fact is that the heavy hammock lands in that section of the country are just as rich as the Valley of the Nile, and just as productive, and there is an actual demonstration of it when 1,000 acres in a body of land produced 100,000 bushels of corn.

Mr. BOOHER. What do you mean by hammock land?

Mr. CLARK. Hammock land is what you call bottom land in your district. It is a heavy soil covered with oak, hickory, and magnolia.

The CHAIRMAN. All of the hardwoods grow in that section?

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. As a rule, there is very little pine timber on it?

Mr. CLARK. Very little. Occasionally you will find some; you will find very many palmetto trees scattered about.

The CHAIRMAN. Hammock land is covered with hardwood as distinguished from pine land?

Mr. CLARK. Yes, sir.

Mr. COSTELLO. What is the approximate value of land like that on which this corn was grown?

Mr. CLARK. That is slightly over $200 an acre.

Mr. EDWARDS. That is in its cleared state?

Mr. CLARK. That is in its cleared state and put in cultivation. There are 22,000 acres in that tract, and you can not buy an acre of it.

The CHAIRMAN. It is worth more than $200 an acre. I apprehend you could not buy that hammock land for $200 an acre.

Mr. CLARK. After it is in cultivation I presume you could not; but I presume if you would take a large body of land you would get a good deal of that hammock on it, and probably you would get it for $50 an acre.

Mr. EDWARDS. What is the nearest large town to this improvement?

Mr. CLARK. There are a number of towns, Mr. EDWARDS, that are tributary to it. There is Ocala, and the country tributary to Ocala would be largely benefited by this improvement. Ocala is a town of six or seven thousand population, in the center of a very large agricultural country. Then there is Leesburg, and although the census shows only about 1,500, I think, within the corporate limits, it has really about 4,000 population.

Mr. EDWARDS. Is Ocala below the frost line?

Mr. CLARK. There is a question about where the frost line is. It is not very cold there. They grow citrous fruits there all right.

Mr. EDWARDS. They do at Leesburg all right.

Mr. CLARK. Oh, yes. I want to state further that there has been established, since this report was made, at Leesburg (which is practically at the head of this improvement), I mean on the lake at the head of the Oklawaha River, a station for the gathering of hides, furs, bones, iron, rags, paper, and other articles, by-products, and junk, which needs water transportation. This handles not less than 100 tons a month. A moss-refining industry is being established at Leesburg with a capacity of 5 tons daily, which needs water transportation. A company is being organized to establish a boat line from Leesburg to Jacksonville, with two trips weekly, carrying passengers and freight. Stock to the amount of $4,500 has been subscribed to date. If the greater depth is granted, this line will make daily sailings and will put on large freight boats.

Steps have been taken for the establishment on the shore of Lake Griffin Canal of a bonded warehouse for Natal hay, of which there is approximately 30,000 tons produced each year along the river and on the shores of the lakes. And the growing of this Natal hay is just a matter of the last three or four years. The people have just begun to get started. I think—in fact, I know—it originated with the Department of Agriculture in sending out these little packages of grass seed. I sent a good many of them all over that country, and I know the rest of the delegation did, and it got started in that way, and it is undoubtedly the hay for that country. And they are making the best of it.

I want to call your attention to an article here, gentlemen, on the subject of this improvement and advocating the improvement. It says:

"By far the greatest development of the past year in the domain of this project is the bringing under cultivation of the rich muck land in the Oklawaha Valley below Lake Griffin. This year there was one field of corn, 1,000 acres in extent, which produced approximately 100,000 bushels of corn. From that field alone 3,400 tons were carried by water, and water transportation was the only possible hope. If it had been necessary to haul that corn to a railroad for shipment, it would have required a haul of 4 miles and a return of the same distance with empty wagons. The road is both hilly and sandy, and the loads would have been small. It would have been a task to daunt the most valiant. So it was lightered in shallow barges at great inconvenience and with ever-present danger of striking a twist in the stream that the barge could not be drawn around.

"Across Lake Harris from Leesburg is the new town of Howey, which has added a great deal to the tonnage this year. This town has a new hotel of 50 rooms, the material for which was brought to Howey by water. In fact, there is no other way to reach Howey except by team or auto. There are upward of 500 tons of material and fixtures in this building alone. Then Howey has imported farm machinery, tools, electric-light equipment, dynamite, and other industrial supplies to the extent of approximately 1,000 tons more. Food supplies and other products, with furniture and hardware for the homes, add considerably to the total, making the tonnage for this one little community not less than 2,000 tons. This is all new in the past 12 months, and it is not only permanent but is merely a start toward a great tonnage that will grow larger from year to year.

"There are now over 12,000 acres of land in Lake County alone producing hay. The average production is 2½ tons to the acre for the year, making a total now of 30,000 tons. Less than one-fourth of this is consumed on the farms where it is produced, but must be shipped to the open market for redistribution. That gives a total of 22,500 tons of hay which moves now, and with a constantly growing acreage this will grow by leaps and bounds. To go back three years, it is found that the total production was about 100 tons of this hay. A jump from 100 tons to 30,000 tons in three years is something that transportation facilities must be prepared to meet, and when it is known that the acreage being cleared for this Natal hay is greater now than ever before the great increase in the immediate future can be seen very readily.

"There is one great industry which is only awaiting the providing of water transportation to spring into being, furnishing a tonnage that will be greater than any industry now affords. This is in road clay.

"Lake County is underlaid with a peculiar formation of clay, and this is of particularly good quality for road building in the section adjoining the lakes. All along the Oklawaha and the St. Johns Rivers are counties where road material has to be imported. The 250 miles of good roads in Lake County can be reproduced in any of these river counties when it is possible to float barges of the clay that is so plentiful in Lake County, but in order to make it profitable or even possible to transport this clay it must be moved in large lots.

"The supply of this clay is practically inexhaustible and the demand so great that it insures a permanent commerce if water transportation is provided.

"All of these things that have been presented are new."

I have the figures, and I will file them with the committee. At Ocala—Ocala, you gentlemen will remember, is about 4½ miles from Silver Springs. Silver Springs Run empties into the Oklawaha River and is tributary to it. The people of Ocala at one time had a small boat or two running on that run and going to Jacksonville, in fact. They have a hard road, and there is a railroad right to the spring at the head of the run. There is a strong movement on foot to build an electric line now from Ocala to Silver Springs, which would make that entire country there tributary to this waterway. So that if this improvement is made, it not only means all these towns along these lakes and along the Oklawaha River proper, which are Leesburg, Eustis, Mount Dora, Tavares, Tangarine, Lisbon, Harvey, and other towns, but it means a benefit to the business of Ocala and that whole surrounding country, which is immense. I have a statement from the Ocala Board of Trade showing the freights which they paid last year, and Ocala is about as far from Jacksonville as Sanford, and the rates which obtained from Jacksonville to Ocala would be about the same as to Leesburg. They paid in freights $996,000 and some odd—practically a million dollars in freights. And it is figured that this improvement would cut that practically in half, which would be a saving for the Ocala country of at least $450,000 to $500,000 in freight rates.

Now, I want to call your attention for a moment or two to what Maj. Slattery (Capt. Slattery at that time) said with reference to this:

"I am of the opinion that a material development of this country would follow the construction of a reliable waterway from Lake Dora to the mouth of the river, suitable connecting waterways being provided to points on the shores of the lakes at the headwaters; that the improvement of the river is worthy of being undertaken by the United States, notwithstanding the fact that the cost will be great, compared with the commerce that will be benefited at the present time and for some years hence; that three plans of improvement should be considered. * * *

"The canals at Leesburg will provide public terminals under the control of the municipal authorities, and it is stated by those interested in the improvement that similar facilities will be provided at other points.

"Along the banks of the river there is much marshland, which would be highly productive if reclaimed. It may be possible to coordinate the reclamation of this land with the improvement of the river in the interest of navigation."

The CHAIRMAN. That has not been done in this project?

Mr. CLARK. No.

The CHAIRMAN. No reclamation of land is involved?

Mr. CLARK. No; I understand not. He mentions that, though, in his report. I just mention it to show his opinion.

Mr. KETTNER. You have read the proviso on page 2, have you, of that report?

Mr. CLARK. Yes. There would be no difficulty about that at all, Mr. Kettner. The people understand that thoroughly, and are willing for that sort of a condition to be attached to it, so far as that is concerned. They are willing to meet it.

Now, gentlemen, if you have noticed the map attached to this report—I wish you would look at it for a moment, if you have not noticed it—you will see that the Oklawaha River begins in this chain of lakes up here near Leesburg. Leesburg is between Lakes Harris and Griffin, an immense chain of lakes. There is Lake Harris, at this point, and Leesburg is located right here, between Lake Harris and Lake Griffin [indicating on map]. Here is Lake Eustis, Lake Dora, and all of this chain of lakes here [indicating], and the river comes out of Lake Griffin, goes in a northerly direction here [indicating]. Here is Silver Springs Run, here is Silver Springs, and here is Ocala [indicating]. Silver Springs Run comes out of the spring which, by the way, is an immense body of water. I was on it last fall, and it is some 60 or 70 feet deep; and I would like to say for the benefit of the committee that, although I have lived in Florida for about 33 years now and I have been to Silver Springs, I never really realized what it was until that trip. There is nothing in the United States any more wonderful than Silver Springs, right there near that place.

Mr. EDWARDS. Why is it so wonderful?

Mr. CLARK. Well, you go out in a glass-bottom boat they have there, and the water is so clear and crystal you can see a 10-cent piece on the bottom of the lake, sometimes 60 or 70 feet deep.

Mr. EDWARDS. Can you see anything besides money on the bottom?

Mr. CLARK. You can see anything; yes. It is perfectly clear, and there are great caverns, apparently, under there. There is one place called Christmas Eve, with a lot of beautiful trees, which look like Christmas trees, on the bottom, apparently covered with tinsel. And there is one scene of a snowstorm down there. The water coming up from the bottom, I presume, throws little fine particles of rock into the water, presenting the appearance of a snowstorm. It is a wonderful place, and there is plenty of water there, and the boats come right up——

Mr. EDWARDS. Is it sulphur water?

Mr. CLARK. No; it is not strong with sulphur.

Mr. EDWARDS. Does it have any health-giving qualities?

Mr. CLARK. I do not know that it has, Mr. Edwards; it is just a clear, pure water.

Mr. KETTNER. Has the gentleman ever visited the Catalina Islands?

Mr. CLARK. No; but I would like to. And I want you to see Silver Springs, too. I was going to say this river runs up here, and there is Silver Springs; there is the run coming down into the Oklawaha River, and then the river goes on up in a northerly direction and comes into the St. Johns River at Welaka, which is in Mr. SEARS's district.

Mr. BOOHER. What is the distance from the source of the river to the mouth?

Mr. CLARK. I should judge it must be 125 or 150 miles—isn't it, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. What is that question; I did not catch it?

Mr. CLARK. The distance from the source of the river to the mouth?

The CHAIRMAN. About 125 miles.

Mr. BOOHER. What part of that is this proposed improvement to cover?

Mr. CLARK. The improvement, as I understand it, is to cover from the source here to Silver Springs Run.

The CHAIRMAN. There may have to be some work down below?

Mr. CLARK. Yes; there may be some work to be done below; but, as I understand it, that part is in pretty good condition at the present time.

Mr. BOOHER. How far is the river navigable now; or is it navigable?

Mr. CLARK. Oh, yes; it is navigable up to Silver Springs.

Mr. BOOHER. And then from Silver Springs, or Silver Springs Run; is that where this improvement is to be made?

Mr. KETTNER. No; from Lake Harris to Silver Springs.

Mr. CLARK. Lake Harris is down at the source of the river.

The CHAIRMAN. It extends to the head of Silver Springs Run.

Mr. CLARK. It is over here [indicating] and runs to the head of Silver Springs Run.

The CHAIRMAN. And the upper end of the improvement is at Lake Dora?

Mr. CLARK. Yes; at Lake Dora; and there are canals connecting those lakes.

The CHAIRMAN. Lake Dora is near Tavares?

Mr. CLARK. Yes; at Tavares. Tavares is the county seat of the county in which Leesburg is situated.

Mr. BOOHER. How long is the river before it goes into the St. Johns River?

Mr. CLARK. About one hundred and twenty-five or thirty miles; something like that. And I want to call your attention, too, to the fact that this stream runs right through the heart of the State. It touches the very heart of the State of Florida. It goes through some of the most productive lands in the whole State. Anything can be grown there except apples and wheat; but almost anything else in the world can be grown right there tributary to this waterway, and if they can get a permanent watercourse there that will be navigable at all times—and the engineers say we can—it is going to develop a wonderful commerce through that country between all this lower country from here to Jacksonville [indicating on map].

Mr. BOOHER. What are the rail facilities through that country? Have you railroads through that country?

Mr. CLARK. Yes; the Seaboard Air Line and the Atlantic Coast Line.

Mr. EDWARDS. There is an immense area there that is without transportation except on the coast.

Mr. CLARK. Oh, yes; so is this area here [indicating]; there is no railroad here at all.

Mr. HULBERT. The Oklawaha River runs parallel to the railroad, doesn't it?

Mr. CLARK. Yes; but some distance from it.

Mr. BOOHER. Is there a railroad on both sides of the river?

Mr. CLARK. Yes. Here is the Atlantic Coast Line right here.

Mr. BOOHER. How close does that get to the river?

Mr. CLARK. Oh, I do not know how close.

Mr. BOOHER. What is the average distance from the river of the railroad on the west?

The CHAIRMAN. The Atlantic Coast Line is the nearest.

Mr. CLARK. The Atlantic Coast Line is the nearest. I can not say what the average distance is; it is so crooked.

The CHAIRMAN. It varies, probably, from 5 to 10 miles.

Mr. BOOHER. From the river?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. BOOHER. How far is the river from the other railroad?

Mr. CLARK. This is the Atlantic Coast Line on this side [indicating]. That is a very great distance; you see up here it is two-thirds across the State.

Mr. BOOHER. Then it is 100 or 200 miles from this river?

Mr. CLARK. It must be at least 100.

Mr. HULBERT. Is Lake George navigable?

Mr. CLARK. Yes; Lake George is part of the St. Johns River.

Mr. HULBERT. And the Atlantic Coast Line, which you have just referred to, parallels Lake George and its connection with the St. Johns River?

Mr. CLARK. Yes, sir.

Mr. HULBERT. So that that section of the State is served by the Atlantic Coast Line and also by a navigable lake, Lake George, and the St. Johns River?

Mr. CLARK. Yes, sir.

Mr. HULBERT. And the west side of the State is served by the Ocala Northern Railway and the Oklawaha River, which parallel one another.

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. There are minerals which are being produced there, kieselguhr and kaolin earth?

Mr. CLARK. Yes, sir. That was all covered in the former report, you know.

The CHAIRMAN. That is rather heavy freight?

Mr. CLARK. Yes; extremely heavy.

The CHAIRMAN. I understand that they will constitute one of the important items of commerce down this river whenever it is improved; at least, that is the purpose of it?

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Kieselguhr is something that enters into the manufacture of explosives, I believe, and kaolin is used in making chinaware.

Mr. COSTELLO. And they use it for filtering purposes.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is there any potash along the proposed improvement?

Mr. CLARK. We have phosphates.

Mr. TAYLOR. Phosphates, I mean.

Mr. CLARK. Oh, yes; there is a great deal of phosphate all through that country, and that would be transported that way.

I do not think of anything else, unless the committee desires to ask some questions, as everything is so thoroughly set out in that report of Maj. Slattery's.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Would you point out on this big map where this improvement is located?

Mr. CLARK. Here is Ocala right here; Silver Springs is here——

Mr. EDWARDS. That is in the same county with Ocala?

Mr. CLARK. Yes; in the same county; Marion County. Here is Leesburg; the Oklawaha River comes right up this way [indicating on map].

Mr. HUMPHREY. Then it goes out the St. Johns River?

Mr. CLARK. When it gets here, it comes down here and down to there; it starts here and goes around [indicating].

Mr. HUMPHREY. Do you remember the distance?

Mr. CLARK. About 125 miles.

Mr. BOOHER. As I understand you, the principal part of the improvement is to be made between Silver Springs and Starkes Ferry?

Mr. CLARK. No; it is to be made here, from Leesburg up.

Mr. BOOHER. From Leesburg up?

Mr. CLARK. Yes; that is where the improvement is to be made. It would be about 60 miles across there in the pine country where there is not any transportation at all.

Mr. BOOHER. There is no railroad here at all?

Mr. CLARK. None at all.

Mr. BOOHER. What railroad is that [indicating on map]?

Mr. CLARK. That is the Coast Line?

Mr. BOOHER. And then between the Oklawaha River and the Coast Line there are places 60 to 70 miles across most of the way?

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

Mr. BOOHER. Then on the west side of the river the railroad comes in at Ocala?

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

Mr. BOOHER. And about how far from Ocala is that?

Mr. CLARK. From Ocala over to Silver Springs is about 5½ miles. That puts you at the head of Silver Springs Run and that lands you into the Oklawaha.

I do not know, gentlemen, that I care to take up any more time. I would like to file a statement with reference to the commerce at Ocala and the country tributary to it. I had that statement, but forgot to bring it along.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I wish you would do that, Mr. Clark.

Mr. CLARK. I would like to do that, because I contend when this improvement is made it is going to benefit all that whole section of the country.

A gentleman asked about the hammock land and the kind of growth. I would like to say you find live-oak trees 3, 5, or 6 feet in diameter, and you could put one of them out in the middle of the street here and it would touch the curb on each side—one of these wide streets.

The CHAIRMAN. That does not appeal much to Mr. KETTNER, however, out in California.

Mr. CLARK. No; but it takes good land to produce trees like that; you will agree to that?

Mr. KETTNER. Yes; indeed.

Mr. HULBERT. I would like to ask Mr. CLARK one question: What is the special urgency of the adoption of this Oklawaha project at this time, and to what extent would it suffer if it was passed over until the Sixty-fifth Congress?

Mr. CLARK. Well, Mr. HULBERT, the country is rapidly improving. Florida gained more, the census people say, in percentage of population in the last year, than any State in the Union. I get that from the Census Bureau.

Mr. HULBERT. Does that take it Palm Beach and Ormond Beach?

Mr. CLARK. It takes in actual all-the-year-around residents, and not tourists. And that is a fact; that is a statement we get from the Census Bureau—that we gained in percentage a greater population than any State in the Union. The country is building up very rapidly. These people are paying enormous freight rates, and it is absolutely impossible for them to keep it up. They have continued and they have lived, but they are not getting a fair show in the race of life as long as they have to pay those enormous rates of freight.

Mr. HULBERT. What I mean is, Is there any particular urgency for the adoption of it at this time?

Mr. CLARK. I do not know that there is any particular urgency for its adoption at this time, except that the sooner they get relief from the intolerable conditions under which they are laboring the better off they will be and the better for the country.

Mr. EDWARDS. And the saving of the freight rates in that one locality alone would almost pay for it?

Mr. CLARK. Yes. The freight savings in one year, as shown by this report, would be $600,000. If it would amount to four or five hundred thousand in the Ocala country alone, you would have millions saved in freight.

Mr. EDWARDS. And it would more than pay for it with the savings in one year?

Mr. CLARK. Yes. I understand that two years ago, in view of this proviso Mr. KETTNER referred to a while ago, the people in the community got ready for this work, and they have secured the right of way and have complied with that proviso; and they are ready at any time to close the matter up.

The CHAIRMAN. As I understand, the Government is not to purchase any right of way at all?

Mr. CLARK. None at all; no, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The Government is not to be at any expense for securing the right of way?

Mr. CLARK. Not a particle; and, of course, the committee understands, I suppose, that Leesburg has issued bonds for the purpose of connecting those two canals; that is shown in the report here—connecting those two lakes, I mean—Lake Harris and Lake Griffin.

Mr. DUPRÉ. That is in the committee's proviso?

Mr. CLARK. Yes. And a part of that work has already been done, and they are ready to go forward at any time they know this improvement is going ahead.

(The following is the statement filed by Mr. CLARK:)

Incoming and outgoing freight, Ocala, Fla., and tributary territory, compiled by Ocala Board of Trade—This freight would all be affected by Oklawaha River improvement.

HANDLED BY HOWARD BOAT LINE.

		To Palatka.	Local.
General merchandise	tons	345	4,680
Hay and grain	do	386	1,560
Fertilizer	do	18	960
Naval stores	do	1,883	4,239
Sirup	do	19	25
Oranges	boxes	2,186	957

Handled by "Sharpshooter," locally out.

Groceries	tons	88
Hay	do	81
Grain	do	2,800
Lumber	do	157
Miscellaneous	do	52
Vegetables	do	166
Fertilizer	do	196
Oranges	boxes	295
Sirup	tons	34
Iron	do	6
Rosin	do	829

Spirits	tons	206
Gasoline	gallons	18
Hardware	tons	17
Tonnage into Silver Springs, various		1,790

The new cotton mill has orders out for 10 cars of machinery. It will use 1,200 bales of short cotton, and will ship out 1,000 cases of cotton yarn. Plant cost, $100,000. This by negroes. Will have one equally as large in construction by whites. Every line of business will have 50 to 100 per cent increase coming year.

Business, incoming.			Freight charges.
Cotton	tons	260	$12,300
Dry goods	do	1,235	34,443
Fertilizer	do	975	8,430
Groceries (fancy)	do	1,237	45,475
Groceries (wholesale)	do	11,775	94,340
Gas and oil	do	7,370	15,320
Hardware	do	12,300	97,375
Hay	do	6,450	8,750
Lumber and timber	do	9,840	19,000
Meats, fresh and salt	do	1,500	3,500
Machinery	do	14,575	64,150
Miscellany	do	25,000	175,000
Wood	do	3,850	2,450
Live stock	do	350	2,600
Coke	do	460	3,900
Pig and scrap iron	do	4,000	3,500
Nails, wire, fencing	do	350	17,960
Building material	do	13,350	26,860
Total		114,877	635,068

Business, outgoing.			
Cattle	head	54,820	$65,000
Mules	do	3,807	7,000
Hogs	do	10,000	10,000
Cotton	bales	8,000	12,000
Corn	bushels	500,000	5,000
Peanuts	tons	500	Varies.
Watermelons	cars	1,200	18,000
Vegetables	do	2,500	43,750
Cantaloupes	do	750	11,250
Cotton seed	tons	180	3,420
Crate materials	do	4,320	5,440
Fertilizer	do	1,710	18,600
Groceries	do	732	6,900
Grapefruit	boxes	75,000	75,000
Lumber and timber	tons	5,022	71,200
Machinery	do	3,500	3,500
Miscellany	do	1,450	20,790
Naval stores, rosin	barrels	170,000	25,500
Naval stores, spirits	do	55,000	16,500
Oranges	boxes	530,000	530,000
Sand	tons	90,000	4,500
Lime products	do	15,000	15,000
Building rock	do	19,000	28,125
Total			996,475

To this add: Phosphate, 300,000,000 tons, now paying $1.35 per ton average freight charges to ports, while millions go to interior points to fertilizer factories; over 1,000,000,000 feet of lumber; now moving to Cuba from one mine as fertilizer, soft phosphate, 25,000 tons annually under contract. Freight, $6.21½ per ton.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Kissimmee River, Fla.: For maintenance, $4,000; completing improvement in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 137, Sixty-third Congress, first session, $47,000; in all, $51,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out lines 6, 7, 8, and 9 on page 19.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 19 strike out lines 6, 7, 8, and 9.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, this is the same motion I made when this item was up four years ago, and I have seen nothing to change my judgment in regard to it now. I will not discuss the Oklawaha River any further than to say that I have information of men who have run it, who have turned the pilot wheel on the river, men who stand high in the Northwest as any men, have told me that my judgment of the river is entirely right.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Will the gentleman tell us who these men are?

Mr. FREAR. One is a former governor of a State who has lived there and knows the conditions. There were three men, two of whom came to my office. Two are constituents of mine, one was Capt. Doughty, of my own district, living on the Mississippi river.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Does the gentleman think he ought to quote authority on the floor attacking a project——

Mr. FREAR. I am quoting Army engineers and the gentleman criticized me because I did not take advantage of the courtesy of these people and go down there when every Member of the House knows that I have been engaged on bills which have been before this House almost all the time.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. The gentleman did not get my question. I ask him if he thinks it is fair and right to attack a project upon this floor upon the authority of people whom he will not name?

Mr. FREAR. No; but on the authority of the Army engineers' report. I may say that the gentleman's invitation to me to go down and accept the courtesy of the people there, of course, was impracticable.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Does not the Army engineers recommend it?

Mr. FREAR. Yes; and I am reading from the report of the conditions there. The gentleman is championing his own projects and that is all right. He has the same privilege that I have to criticize this or others. Why, Mr. Chairman, in our State we have a commission that reduces freight rates. By looking at the map of the Oklawaha every point on it appears to be within 10 miles of a railroad. It seems to me that what the people want is to go to the railroad commission and have them fix rates, and not ask the Government of the United States to spend this large amount of money when there is such a small amount of commerce.

Coming now to the Kissimmee River——

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, just one moment while the gentleman is on the Oklawaha River. It is true the House has adopted that project in so far as it can adopt it, but I want to call attention to the fact that it is not adopted in its entirety. The full $733,000 is not to be expended in carrying out the part of the project we have adopted. It is some two or three hundred thousand dollars less than that amount. I do not recall the exact figures, but it is a good deal less, because we only adopted the locks with the 6-foot depth while providing for the construction of the channels outside of the locks to a depth of 4 feet, which reduces the cost very materially. Of course I shall be frank enough to say that I think that when that channel is completed, and the commercial development takes place which I believe is going to take place, Congress will also authorize the digging of the channel to a depth of 6 feet outside of the locks, but the project as we have adopted it here does not contemplate anything beyond 4 feet outside of the locks.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, accepting the statement of the chairman, which is always very fair in such cases, he says it will probably lead to a project of 6 feet, which, of course, will run fully as deep as the present project.

Referring to the Kissimmee River, we have spent only a small amount on that river. We have an old project on the river, but this is a new project, and on page 29 of House Document No. 137, Sixty-third Congress, first session, the report of the engineers, I find that one steamboat line uses this waterway and that this line operates two light-draft boats and a number of barges, which make one round trip every week throughout the year, except when it is rendered impassible by excessively low stages of water. Although the amount of commerce handled on this river is extremely small, the board is of opinion that the river is worthy of improvement.

Turning back to page 15, there is a statement which I read into the RECORD four years ago, and which, it seems to me, is entitled to appear again. It is from Clay Johnson, who furnishes the information to the Army engineers, showing that in 1902 there were six and a half months when the boats could not use the river on account of the drought; in 1903, none; 1904, four months; in 1905, one and a half months; in 1906, none; in 1907, eight months; and in 1908, five months. It could not be used during those periods in those years. The commerce upon this river, according to a statement from the State Bank of Kissimmee, signed by Clay Johnson, the same individual, as will be found on page 14 of the report, amounted to 20,000,000 pounds and over, or about 10,000 tons, and of that some 6,000 tons were logs. Again comes the Kissimmee State Bank's report subsequent to that, in 1907, showing again 10,000 tons of commerce, of which a large portion, I presume over half, apparently, was logs, and the next year a commerce about one-half of which is logs. So that the commerce is small. On page 15 of the document there is a letter written by G. F. Kribbs to the United States Engineer Office, and in that letter Mr. Kribbs states that there may be a real estate project there, so to speak. He says that the tract of land he mentioned is the Fort Gardner lands, comprising some 25,339 acres, and that it is owned by recent purchase by E. W. Bowen & Co., of Delphi, Ind. I suppose that is offered in evidence to enlarge the commerce and help conditions down there. The point I wish to make is that after the money we have put into this river, making it navigable enough to have two boats that travel once a week on a round trip, where there are but 10,000 tons of commerce a year, half of which is logs, which is extremely small, and where the river is dry or so nearly that they are unable to operate the boats for sometimes

as much as eight months in the year, it does not seem that it is now a wise policy for the Government, whether the river be in Wisconsin or Florida, to continue its improvements as is proposed here.

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

Mr. FREAR. Certainly.

Mr. HULBERT. I want to get cleared up in my mind the matter of the resolution which the gentleman stated he had introduced for an investigation in regard to the letting of contracts by the Army engineers. Was that in the Sixty-third Congress or the Sixty-fourth?

Mr. FREAR. The Sixty-third.

Mr. HULBERT. Has the gentleman reintroduced the resolution in this Congress?

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. HULBERT. When was it introduced?

Mr. FREAR. Yesterday.

Mr. HULBERT. So that the gentleman made no attempt to bring the matter to the attention of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors in the Sixty-fourth Congress at the first session of the Congress, nor in the second session until after the committee had reported its bill and the bill had been presented and was being considered under the five-minute rule?

Mr. FREAR. That is true. I will say to the gentleman this, that when the facts were called to my attention as they have been here, when I discovered by the reports that one company was controlling all of the contracts, then it occurred to me that it was time to make an investigation again.

The matter had passed from my mind during last session. It is for the committee to act and ask if a hearing was wanted. It is immaterial, I am only one individual Member of this Congress. I am not a prosecuting officer. If it was worthy of consideration the committee would have sent for me and I would have been very glad to have gone before them and furnished the evidence I had.

Mr. HULBERT. The bill was not before the committee until introduced yesterday.

Mr. FREAR. I am referring to the Sixty-third Congress.

Mr. HULBERT. And I am talking about the Sixty-fourth.

Mr. FREAR. It was not developed, I am trying to explain to the gentleman, until I discovered in the Army engineer's report the fact that all of the Baltimore district was controlled by this dredging company. That caused me to make the inquiry.

Mr. HULBERT. When did the gentleman first discover it?

Mr. FREAR. Several days ago, because I had been busy on other matters, let me assure the gentleman.

Mr. HULBERT. When did the gentleman introduce the resolution?

Mr. FREAR. I introduced it yesterday at the same time——

Mr. HULBERT. Why did not the gentleman introduce the resolution as soon as he found that condition of affairs existed and ask for a hearing before this bill was considered?

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, it strikes me I have made a fair explanation and it strikes me that that is not a fair criticism. The gentleman criticizes me for not having introduced the resolution——

Mr. HULBERT. Why did not the gentleman call for a hearing? He is on the committee.

Mr. FREAR. That is impossible; the gentleman is only one passenger on the committee.

Mr. HULBERT. I have been a very active passenger, and I can not say as much for the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. FREAR. I was referring to myself, and that may be true, but I want to say this, that the newspapers of New York, I understand, quoted the gentleman he would not vote for the bill unless the new projects were put in for New York Harbor. I do not know whether that is true or not.

Mr. HULBERT. There is not such a statement in any paper of New York City.

Mr. FREAR. I read something to that effect some days ago.

Mr. HULBERT. And I challenge the gentleman to produce any such paper.

[Mr. SEARS addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I will detain the House only a few moments on the motion made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR]. This is, in my judgment, one of the best river projects in the bill. There are only two or three which might be placed above it, if indeed there are any. Newtown Creek, N. Y., and probably Westchester Creek carry a larger tonnage in proportion to the amounts expended upon them, respectively, but the first named is almost in a class by itself. But I hold in my hand a list of projects now on the books, 118 in number, I think, not all of them appropriated for in this bill. In fact, most of them are not appropriated for in this bill, because they do not now need any appropriations. When, however, money is needed for the purpose of maintaining the channels already completed by the Government, such funds will be appropriated. I am going to print this list in the RECORD.

I risk nothing in saying that few, if any, of them make as good showing, when the commerce is compared with the cost of the project, as does the Kissimmee River.

The table is as follows:

List of waterways showing large expenditures when compared to commerce accommodated.

Locality.	Adopted in act of—	Total amount appropriated.	Amount in this bill.	Commerce (tons).
Harbor at Isle of Shoals, Me	1910	$86,453		2,225
Georges River, Me	1896	36,000		13,188
St. Albans Harbor, Vt	1910	5,000		444
Plymouth Harbor, Mass	1913	391,959		37,113
Hyannis Harbor, Mass	1902	221,267		3,891
Woods Hole Channel, Mass	1896	343,599		59,925
Merrimack River, Mass	1899	415,366		89,529
Great Salt Pond, Block Island, R. I	1902	238,033		9,680
Pawcatuck River, R. I	1896	198,500	$1,000	39,073
Milford Harbor, Conn	1902	79,100		13,312
Fivemile River Harbor, Conn	1888	49,140		2,498
Southport Harbor, Conn	1912	67,435		20
Westport Harbor and Saugatuck River, Conn	1893	35,465		6,033
Mattituck Harbor, N. Y	1896	124,750		1,312
Great South Bay, N. Y	1902	173,000		18,434
Sheepshead Bay, N. Y	1912	44,600		11,654
Dunkirk Harbor, N. Y	1910	1,089,112		1,414
Cape Vincent Harbor, N. Y	1899	220,000		4,338
Plattsburg Harbor, N. Y	1910	223,180		6,808
Browns Creek, N. Y	1890	50,000		8,998
Absecon Inlet, N. J	1912	300,000	45,000	5,237
Matawan Creek, N. J	1881	90,120		11,974
Woodbury Creek, N J	1913	46,500	2,000	11,270
Toms River, N. J	1910	14,050		4,997
Absecon Creek, N. J	1912	18,200		3,699
St. Jones River, Del	1910	113,756		7,063
Broadkill River, Del	1907	108,862	10,000	5,879
Inland waterway from Chincateague Bay to Delaware Bay	1910	197,250	1,000	10,601
Warwick River, Md	1892	49,081		8,541
Latrappe River, Md	1892	24,931		6,949
Tyaskin Creek, Md	1907	36,836	5,800	6,334
Tuckahoe River, Md	1912	15,600		2,208
Potomac River at Cedar Point, Md	1910	16,300		2,698
Milford Haven Harbor, Va	1908	31,275		7,933
Upper Machodoc Creek, Va	1910	26,400		11,528
Aquia Creek, Va	1912	56,536		11,424
Blackwater River, Va	1907	22,000		3,622
Scuppernong River, N. C	1902	34,900	3,500	9,448
Fishing Creek, N. C	1901	37,750		2,450
Contentnia Creek, N. C	1899	85,000	1,000	9,607
Smiths Creek, N. C	1910	17,650		5,896
Waterway between New River and Swansboro, N. C	1890	70,130		13,013
Shallotte River, N. C	1913	13,945		6,290
Waterway between Charleston and opposite McClellanville, S. C	1907	214,690		10,818
Little Pedee River, S. C	1888	45,200		1,442
Great Pedee River, S. C	1902	340,300	5,000	15,758
Congaree River, S. C	1910	668,298	80,000	4,324
Sapelo Harbor, Ga	1910	23,000		7,660
Savannah River above Augusta, Ga	1892	73,470		8,643
Cowhead River, Ga	1912	3,000		483
Fancy Bluff Creek, Ga	1913	10,000	1,000	2,513
Flint River, Ga	1880	481,500		23,603
Sarasota Bay, Fla	1907	132,500		8,554
St. Josephs Bay, Fla	1912	20,500		3,438
Orange River, Fla	1902	8,100		3,490
Crystal River, Fla	1902	34,000		2,141
Suwanee River, Fla	1890	85,812		7,685
Channel from Apalachicola River to St. Andrews Bay, Fla	1910	525,000	14,500	775
Tombigbee River from Demopolis, Ala., to Walkers Bridge, Miss	1911	400,350	10,000	34,233
Pearl River below Rockport, Miss	1907	346,411		30,650
Tchula Lake, Miss	1881	41,961		744
Steele and Washington Bayous and Lake Washington, Miss	1910	24,050		2,286
Bear Creek, Miss	1910	5,433		2,850
Waterway, Franklin to Mermentau, La	1907	316,792	5,000	5,630
Waterway, Mermentau to Sabine River, La	1910	405,000	2,000	14,308
Bayou Plaquemine Brule, La	1910	38,000	2,000	7,916
Bayou Que de Tortue, La	1912	29,000		5,759
Johnsons Bayou, La	1899	14,500		2,270
Red River below Fulton, Ark	1892	2,874,687	55,000	27,325
Bayou Bartholomew, La	1881	84,731		1,150
Boeuf River, La	1888	92,169		5,390
Tensas River and Bayou Macon, La	1884	78,500		2,802
Waterway, West Galveston Bay to Brazos River Canal, Tex	1907	373,400	15,000	
Waterway, Brazos River to Matagorda Bay, Tex	1910	383,000	30,000	9,061
Waterway, Aransas Pass to Pass Cavallo, Tex	1907	211,850	30,000	3,032
Channel from Aransas Pass to Corpus Christi, Tex	1910	334,610	15,000	26,803
Cypress Bayou and waterway between Jefferson, Tex., and Shreveport, La	1910	286,701	5,000	11,444

List of waterways showing large expenditures when compared to commerce accommodated—Continued.

Locality.	Adopted in act of—	Total amount appropriated.	Amount in this bill.	Commerce (tons).
Red River, between Fulton, Ark., and Washita River, Tex	1912	$569,000		2,076
Sulphur River, Tex. and Ark	1907	45,989		
Saline River, Ark	1910	33,191		2,550
Current River, Ark	1894	80,985		6,371
French Broad and Little Pigeon Rivers, Tenn	1880	240,000		8,866
Clinch River, Tenn	1880	61,251		5,291
Port Clinton Harbor, Ohio	1872	107,971	$500	9,009
Vermilion Harbor, Ohio	1905	175,122	500	982
Ontonagon Harbor, Mich	1910	476,675	9,000	4,697
South Haven Harbor, Mich	1905	582,000	3,600	27,435
Harbor at Saugatuck, Mich	1910	561,439		31,491
Holland Harbor, Mich	1905	779,366	10,000	30,426
White Lake Harbor, Mich	1907	380,701	5,500	10,071
Pentwater Harbor, Mich	1907	339,820		6,061
Arcadia Harbor, Mich	1905	63,000		10,983
Petoskey Harbor, Mich	1902	131,500		1,291
Mackinac Harbor, Mich	1910	79,000		17,217
Rogers City Harbor, Mich	1910	6,000		9,415
Monroe Harbor, Mich	1872	262,015		8,840
Clinton River, Mich	1886	101,564	1,500	14,352
Port Wing Harbor, Mich	1902	79,992	8,000	1,432
Oconto Harbor, Wis	1910	144,730		3,400
Algoma Harbor, Wis	1907	339,177		16,330
Two Rivers Harbor, Wis	1907	371,100	2,500	
Port Washington Harbor, Wis	1910	253,400		19,560
St. Croix River, Wis	1878	158,565		7,172
Zippel Bay, Minn	1911	31,781	1,000	775
Grand Marais Harbor, Minn	1879	180,350		4,298
Red River of the North, Minn	1876	378,623		125
Michigan City Harbor, Ind	1902	1,894,338		15,370
Illinois and Mississippi Canal	1890	7,657,803		32,276
Osage River, Mo	1890	1,072,500	10,000	22,083
Gasconade River, Mo	1880	222,000	10,000	22,037
Tillamook Bay and Bar, Oreg	1912	564,200	5,000	9,710
Nehalem Bay, Oreg	1912	326,175		23,643
Siuslaw River, Oreg	1910	540,162	5,000	6,757
Yaquina River, Oreg	1913	31,800	3,000	8,452
Columbia River, above Celilo Falls to mouth of Snake River	1907	550,000	20,000	8,394
Canal at Cascades, Columbia River, Oreg. and Wash	1896	3,914,000		42,477
Clatskanie River, Oreg	1910	21,200	5,620	9,490
Swinomish Slough, Wash	1892	224,602		32,925
Total		38,558,633	439,520	1,287,063

Now, just a word regarding the statement made that this river is dry eight months in the year. I do not know that such statement has been made this afternoon, but it was made before, and I think repeated several times. Now, according to a table which I find in the report, on page 15, there was one year out of seven when the river was too low for boats to run on it for a period of eight months, but the average was much below that. Two of those seven years the boats ran the year round, in one year six and one-half months, in another four months, in another one and one-half months, and in another five months, so that the average is a little more than three months during those seven years.

I want to say further that the navigation on that river has improved during the past few years, and since this report was made, because private individuals have, in a few instances, opened up the channels there so that more water is flowing in from the lakes above than was the case before. The lakes have been lowered, but the channel has been benefited.

It seems to please some critics of this stream to call it a "creek," the idea being, no doubt, to minimize its importance by thus designating it. But I wish to say that it is in no sense a creek, for if a stream from 50 to 100—yes; in some places 300 to 400—feet wide and 137 miles long does not rise to the dignity of a river, then I do not know what it would take to make a river. Furthermore, it runs through one of the richest sections in the world. There are contained in the valley of this stream at least 2,000 square miles, it is said, of the finest muck land to be found anywhere, only waiting to be reclaimed to be of service. I wish to add, however, that this improvement is not intended for reclamation purposes, and the work done in accordance with the project will not reclaim a foot of land.

Now, a word as to the commerce on this stream. It is true that in the report of 1913 the district engineer, quoting from a report made by an assistant dated some time in 1909 or 1910, fixed the commerce at 10,000 tons. But the report of the Chief of Engineers for 1916 gives the commerce at 71,000 tons, showing an increase in six years of 700 per cent. There are few projects, Mr. Chairman, in the country that can show such a healthy growth and such a steady and rapid increase.

Again, I wish to call attention to the fact that this river runs into Lake Okechobee, with a shore line of 90 or 100 miles; that, running out of this lake from the southwest side, is the Caloosahatchee River, which empties into the Gulf, and that this stream is of sufficient depth to accommodate light-draft vessels; indeed, it is now accommodating quite a commerce, as the Engineers' Report will show. In addition to this there are two or three canals cut through in the direction of Miami, on the Atlantic side, all of sufficient capacity to accommodate boats drawing 5 and 6 feet of water. So that this river, in connection with the Caloosahatchee River and the canals metioned, will give a waterway of more than 300 miles in extent.

Another matter mentioned by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SEARS] is that there is no railroad paralleling this river and that the only transportation that the people have, or will have for many years to come, is the river, and, in my judgment, it should be improved—at least to the extent recommended in the report—without further delay.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I suggest to the gentleman from Florida that he move that the committee rise.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. RAINEY, 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. 20079) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

CORRECTION.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the elimination of a paragraph in the RECORD that was placed there by my own mistake. It does not belong in the article at all, for it has nothing to do with the peace documents.

The SPEAKER. How will the Reporters know which paragraph the gentleman refers to?

Mr. FESS. I will point it out to them.

The SPEAKER. Was there any colloquy based upon it?

Mr. FESS. No; it was a mistake of my own.

The SPEAKER. The rule is that if there is any colloquy based on the paragraph it can not be cut out. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

DELAWARE RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 7748) authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Delaware River may be taken from the Speaker's table and laid before the House, a bill of similar tenor having been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill (S. 7748) to authorize the United New Jersey Railroad & Canal Co., and such other corporation or individuals as may be associated with it, to construct a bridge across the portion of the Delaware River between the mainland of the county of Camden and State of New Jersey and Petty Island, in said county and State.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I do not care at this juncture to make a point of no quorum, but I would like to inquire of the gentleman before the matter is brought up for consideration what part of the Delaware River the bridge is supposed to be built?

Mr. BROWNING. I will state that the William Cramp Sons' Shipbuilding Co. have bought Petty Island, which is about 2 miles long, in the Delaware River and near the Jersey shore. They are unable to go on with the building until the railroad connection is made on the island.

Mr. STAFFORD. And this only provides for a bridge from the mainland to the island?

Mr. BROWNING. That is all.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the United New Jersey Railroad & Canal Co., a corporation created and organized under the laws of the State of New Jersey, and such other corporation or individuals, if any, as shall be associated with said company for the purpose, their successors and assigns, be, and they are hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the intervening portion of the Delaware River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, from the mainland of Camden County, in the State of New Jersey, to Petty Island, in said county and State, in accordance with the provisions of "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, and that said bridge may be either for railroad purposes alone, or in part for railroad and in part for highway purposes, at the option of said United New Jersey Railroad & Canal Co.

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

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

On motion of Mr. BROWNING, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The bill (H. R. 19776) to authorize the United New Jersey Railroad & Canal Co., and such other corporation or individuals as may be associated with it, to construct a bridge across the portion of the Delaware River between the mainland of the county of Camden, State of New Jersey, and Petty Island, in said county and State, was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the proposed embargo on wheat.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the proposed embargo on wheat. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

BRIDGE ACROSS NANTICOKE RIVER, DEL.

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 7359) authorizing the Delaware Railroad Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Nanticoke River at Seaford, Sussex County, Del., a similar House bill being on the calendar, reported from the committee.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Delaware asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 7359, a similar House bill being on the calendar. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Delaware Railroad Co., a railroad corporation organized and existing under laws of the State of Delaware, be, and it is hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Nanticoke River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at Seaford, county of Sussex, and State of Delaware, 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. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

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

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

A similar House bill (H. R. 19000) was laid on the table.

DANISH WEST INDIAN ISLANDS (S. DOC. NO. 686).

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State, with accompanying papers, concerning the treaty signed August 4, 1916, between the United States and Denmark for the cession to the United States of the Danish West Indian Islands, and the obligations of the United States under the convention.

The attention of the Congress is especially invited to the necessity for action being taken by the Congress during its present session that will enable the Government of the United States to discharge its conventional obligation to pay to the Government of Denmark the sum of $25,000,000, which, by Article V of the convention, the United States agrees to pay in full consideration of the cession within 90 days from the date of the exchange of the ratifications of the convention. This exchange of ratifications was effected on January 17, 1917; so that the good faith of the United States requires the payment of the $25,000,000 not later than April 17, 1917, and to do this provision by the Congress during its present session for the payment is imperative.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 22, 1917.*

The SPEAKER. The message will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, should not that message be referred to the Committee on Appropriations? It embodies an appropriation which the Government is obliged to make.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it ought to go to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Of course, the Appropriation Committee will make the appropriation.

Mr. STAFFORD. The President calls attention to the exigency that arises, and it is virtually the occasion for a deficiency.

The SPEAKER. But it is something that originates in the diplomatic department of the Government, transmitting a report of the Secretary of State about the purchase of these islands. The Appropriation Committee will have no difficulty in bringing in an appropriation, if it desires to.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, may a Member of the House ask the Speaker a question for information?

The SPEAKER. If it is easy.

Mr. FESS. What would happen if the House should refuse to appropriate the necessary money to take care of the requirements of the treaty in this case?

The SPEAKER. It would simply be the end of the matter until another Congress did it. It would be violating one of the treaty stipulations of the country. If the House will bear with the Chair for a moment, the Chair remembers very distinctly the time the House had up for consideration an appropriation of $20,000,000 to pay for the Philippine Islands. Thirty-five Members fought it here to the jumping-off place, but the best lawyers in the House insisted that the treaty having been made, we were under a moral, if not a legal, obligation to pay the money. We had a very warm debate which lasted nearly a day.

Mr. EAGLE. Does the Chair suppose that we will get the same white elephant with these Danish West Indies that we got with the Philippines?

The SPEAKER. Well, it is not as big an elephant at any rate.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, January 24, 1917, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting lists of documents and files of papers which are not needed or useful in the transaction of the current business of the department and have no permanent value or historic interest (H. Doc. No. 1974); to the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 20353) concerning proof of widowhood in claims for pension, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1333), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

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. MILLER of Delaware, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 17411) for the relief of William H. Keys, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1334), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 17692) for the relief of Frank Pinkley, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1335), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CRAGO, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12317) for the relief of Stephen J. Haff, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1336), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DIES, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 20161) for the relief of William Blair, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1337), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. PETERS, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 17305) for the relief of William I. Wood, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1338), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 4416) to reim-

burse L. W. Dragoo, formerly postmaster at Smithfield, Wetzel County, W. Va., for money, money orders, and postage stamps stolen, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1339), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 15999) to correct the military record of Asbury Scrivener, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1340), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FIELDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 2880) for the relief of Martin V. Parmer, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1341), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 1553) for the relief of Peter Kenney, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1342), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 5203) for the relief of Gardiner L. Eastman, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1343), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 20410) to create a temporary building commission for the purpose of investigating all the public-building needs and methods of the United States in order to recommend a public-building policy; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GREEN of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 20411) to amend an act entitled "An act to increase the revenue, and for other purposes," approved September 8, 1916, so as to exempt legacies and devises for public benevolent and charitable uses or purposes from its provisions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 20412) to amend an act entitled "An act making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANDALL: A bill (H. R. 20413) to make an appropriation to compensate the Cherokee Indians for part of the lands conveyed to the Cherokee Tribe of Indians by the patent of December, 1838, afterwards patented to white persons who intermarried with Cherokee Indians prior to the 1st day of November, 1875; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 20414) for the establishment of a probation system in the United States courts, except in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 347) authorizing the removal of the statue of Admiral Dupont in Dupont Circle, in the city of Washington, D. C., and the erection of a memorial to Admiral Dupont in place thereof; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 69) authorizing joint committee of House and Senate to consider matters of legislation relating to the Alaska railroad, coal fields, fisheries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. SINNOTT: A memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, favoring the bill known as the "volunteer officers' retirement bill"; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a memorial favoring a constitutional amendment providing national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 20415) granting a pension to Edward Wilkinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. AUSTIN: A bill (H. R. 20416) granting an increase of pension to James C. Claxton; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BARNHART: A bill (H. R. 20417) granting an increase of pension to William J. Marsh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20418) granting a pension to Roman Ginther; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 20419) granting an increase of pension to John I. Smallwood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 20420) granting a pension to Admire M. Wood; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 20421) granting an increase of pension to John M. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DENT: A bill (H. R. 20422) for the relief of Eugene K. Stoudenmire; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: A bill (H. R. 20423) granting an increase of pension to Nicholas Reigenold; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20424) for the relief of William S. Colvin; to the Committee on Claims.

My Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 20425) granting an increase of pension to Edward H. Harpster; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HASTINGS: A bill (H. R. 20426) granting an increase of pension to Joseph B. Antoine; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20427) making an appropriation to compensate Samuel Grant for pay, bounty, and clothing pay while in the service of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HENSLEY: A bill (H. R. 20428) granting an increase of pension to Mary Reilley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: A bill (H. R. 20429) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Speer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JONES: A bill (H. R. 20430) for the relief of Hyter Myers; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KEARNS: A bill (H. R. 20431) granting an increase of pension to Timothy Hixson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20432) granting a pension to Lilly Howard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20433) for the relief of Jesse P. Brown; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEE: A bill (H. R. 20434) granting a pension to Carral A. Cantrell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LOBECK: A bill (H. R. 20435) granting an increase of pension to John Q. Goss; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MILLER of Minnesota (by request): A bill (H. R. 20436) for the relief of Alfred B. Andrews; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 20437) granting certain lands to Converse County, Wyo., for a public park; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. PARK: A bill (H. R. 20438) granting a pension to Eugene A. Hendricks; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. POWERS: A bill (H. R. 20439) granting an increase of pension to John C. Oliver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20440) granting an increase of pension to Jonas F. Fortney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAMSEYER: A bill (H. R. 20441) granting an increase of pension to John N. Dansdill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RANDALL: A bill (H. R. 20442) granting an increase of pension to John W. Robinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. A bill (H. R. 20443) granting a pension to Martha Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STOUT: A bill (H. R. 20444) granting an increase of pension to William G. Long; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WASON: A bill (H. R. 20445) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Foster; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 20446) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Stockon; 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 the SPEAKER (by request): Memorials of Ashley public school of Ashley; Methodist Episcopal Sunday School of Ashley; Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Ashley; Christian Women's Board of Missions, 74 people, of Fulton; and the Methodist Episcopal Church South Woman's Missionary Society of

Fulton, all in the State of Missouri, favoring national constitutional prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Humanitarian Cult, of New York, in favor of the Susan B. Anthony amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Bryn Mawr Woman's Club, of Chicago, Ill., for the Susan B. Anthony amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi: Memorials of First Presbyterian Church Society, 25 people, of Corinth; Daughters of the American Revolution, 32 people, of Corinth; As You Like It Club, 15 people, of Corinth; 34 people of Corinth; 20 people of Corinth; and Christian Ladies' Aid Society, of Corinth, Miss., for national constitutional prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREW: Memorial of New York State Fish, Game, and Forest League, of New York, indorsing Senate bill 7858 and House bill 20080; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Local No. 128, of Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against passage of House bill 19730; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, telegram from Michael Weiner, of Milwaukee, Wis., urging referendum for District prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, telegram from Edwin Weiner, of Milwaukee, Wis., urging a referendum for District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, telegram from Hugo Weiner, of Milwaukee, Wis., urging a referendum for District prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANFORTH: Petition of citizens residing in Rochester, N. Y., protesting against the passage of mail-exclusion bills, etc.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DARROW: Petition of 46 residents of Philadelphia, Pa., in behalf of Federal censorship of motion-picture films; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. EAGAN: Memorial of Nampa (Idaho) Chamber of Commerce, in re United States Reclamation Service; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, memorial of the Manufacturers and Dealers' Association of America, opposing prohibitory bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens, opposing prohibitory bills now before Congress; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of Orange Chapter, Daughters of American Revolution, in re immigration legislation; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FOCHT: Papers to accompany House bill 8118, for relief of Amos M. Stroh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Memorial of Woman's Auxiliary, Railway Mail Association, for increase in railway mail clerks' salaries; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HERNANDEZ: Papers to accompany House bill 20378, for the relief of Arthur H. Loomis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOPWOOD: Petitions of Farmers' Institute, 150 people, of Spraggs; 24 people of Buena Vista and Durham; Valley Chapel Sunday School, of 63 people, of Brock; Epworth League of Brock; Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 50 people, of Brock; Men's Bible Class of Methodist Episcopal Church Sunday School, of Connellsville, all in the State of Pennsylvania, for national constitutional prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOBECK: Memorial of 150 members of the Omaha Woman's Club, indorsing the resolution proposing equal suffrage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFADDEN: Letter from Dr. William Q. Granville, president Pennsylvania College, Gettysburg, Pa., in favor of increasing the appropriation for a monument to John Ericsson; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. McGILLICUDDY: Petitions of the Baptist Church of Norway, Me., the Congregational Church, the Epworth League, and the Christian Endeavor Society, all of South Paris, Me., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATTHEWS: Papers to accompany House bill 19391, granting an increase of pension to Frank B. Gorman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OAKEY: Petition of Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Engineers, Order of Railroad Conductors, and the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, of New Haven, Conn., opposing House bill 19730; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PATTEN: Petitions of sundry citizens of New York, opposing prohibitory bills; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. PETERS: Petition of rural carriers at Thorndike, Readfield, West Lubec, Bryant Pond, Skowhegan, Waterville, Stockton Springs, East Sullivan, Winthrop, Freedom, Pittsfield, Dexter, Perry, Harrington, and Ellsworth, all in the State of Maine, asking consideration of bill to fix compensation of carriers upon an equitable and specific basis; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. PHELAN: Petition of sundry citizens, opposing prohibitory bills; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. PRICE: Petition of 26 citizens of Hurlock, Md., for national constitutional prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of Epworth League, 96 people, of Hurlock; Modern Woodmen of America of Hurlock; Women's Club, 19 members, of Hurlock; Priscilla Club, of Hurlock; and sundry citizens of Rising Sun, Md., for national prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAKER: Petition of Hans Bros., of San Francisco, in favor of 1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of California State Church Federation, opposing universal compulsory military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Woman's World of Chicago, in re zone system for second-class postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of N. S. Young, of Roseville, Cal., in re compulsory arbitration act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Mrs. Florinde B. Huggus, of San Francisco, in re pneumatic-tube service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of Navy Yard Retirement Association, in re Government pensions; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of Waterfront Workers' Federation of Pacific Coast, in favor of a new marine-hospital building in San Francisco; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, memorial of Western Precipitation Co., of Los Angeles, Cal., in re development of national parks; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial of National Model License League, opposing prohibition for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, memorial of Citizens' Educational League of California, in re vocational-education bill; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens and organizations opposing sundry prohibitory bills now before Congress; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of Marlin Arms Co., of New Haven, Conn., in re preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Henry C. Merme, of Rochester, N. Y., in re Senate bill 4429 and House bill 18986; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. RANDALL: Petition of legal voters of the seventh congressional district of Kansas, favoring the Randall bill, excluding liquor advertisements from mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: Petition of citizens of Bexar County, Tex., against the passage of certain bills prohibiting liquor traffic between the States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STINESS: Petition of Mrs. Jessie L. Coggeshall and 11 others, female citizens of Providence, R. I., against the passage of House bill 14731 and Senate bill 6915; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, petition of Branch 25, United National Association of Post Office Clerks, of Providence, R. I., in favor of the Madden reclassification bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Cigarmakers' Union No. 94, of Providence, R. I., against the passage of bill providing for prohibition in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 20404, for relief of Thomas A. Owens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Providence Web Pressman's Union, No. 12, of Providence, R. I., against the passage of House bill 18986 and Senate bill 4429; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.