

REGISTERS OF THE LAND OFFICE.

Miles Wallace, of Fresno, Cal., to be register of the land office at Visalia, Cal., vice George W. Stewart, whose term will expire March 14, 1914.

Alex Nisbet, of Evanston, Wyo., to be register of the land office at Evanston, Wyo., vice Thomas V. Davis, whose term will expire January 24, 1914.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL.

Joseph P. Dillon, of Arizona, to be United States marshal, District of Arizona, vice Charles A. Overlock, removed.

PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY.

Second Lieut. Francis T. Evans to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 17th day of September, 1913.

The following-named citizens to be assistant dental surgeons in the Dental Reserve Corps of the Navy from the 29th day of December, 1913:

Meyer L. Rhein, a citizen of New York;
Clarence J. Grieves, a citizen of Maryland;
Charles W. Rodgers, a citizen of Massachusetts;
Clyde M. Gearhart, a citizen of Ohio;
John R. Barber, a citizen of Minnesota; and
David J. Alexander, a citizen of Virginia.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 14, 1914.

POTMASTERS.

NEW MEXICO.

M. McCreary, Magdalena.

OHIO.

Stephen D. Carroll, Painesville.
L. H. Chapin, Hudson.
David B. Dick, Harrison.
A. Ross Read, Akron.
George M. Sizelove, Camden.
A. N. Warren, Sylvania.
Royal M. Wheeler, Mantua.
George G. Wilkinson, East Palestine.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, *January 14, 1914.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Eternal God, our heavenly Father, inspire us by the stars that shine above us, by the hopes that fill our breast, by the voice that speaks within us, to larger faith and confidence in Thine infinite wisdom, power, and goodness; that doubts may disappear, fear vanish, and overwhelming love bring us to our knees and lift us again to our feet by the light of heaven, in the strength of infinite power; that we may be Thine to struggle, Thine to conquer. And blessing and honor and praise be Thine through Him who taught us the way and the truth and the life. Amen.

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

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bill of the following title:

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

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

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

H. R. 8142. An act to authorize the construction, maintenance, and operation of a bridge across the Bayou Bartholomew at or near Wilmot, Ark.

RAILROADS IN ALASKA.

The SPEAKER. This is Calendar Wednesday, and the House resolves itself automatically into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to consider the bill H. R. 1739, the Alaskan railroad bill, and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] will take the chair.

The House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union with Mr. HARRISON in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 1739, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 1739) to authorize the President of the United States to locate, construct, and operate railroads in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HOUSTON] is recognized.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman from Tennessee yield for a question before he yields time?

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I would like to ask the gentleman from Tennessee whether the entire day is going to be consumed in general debate?

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can the gentleman inform the committee whether or not members of the committee are going to speak, or who is going to speak on the bill, in advance, so that Members can be advised as to who will talk on the bill to-day?

Mr. HOUSTON. I can state to the gentleman that several members of the committee have expressed a desire to speak to-day, and perhaps the entire day may be taken up by members of the committee. It is quite probable.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is the gentleman certain that the entire day will be consumed in general debate?

Mr. HOUSTON. Oh, yes; it is the understanding that we will give the entire day to general debate. No limitation of time will be placed upon the debate to-day.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HOUSTON] is recognized.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, it was understood that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BRUMBAUGH] would speak first this morning, but I do not believe he is in the Chamber. The Delegate from Alaska [Mr. WICKERSHAM] will be next on the list.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alaska is recognized for one hour.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a moment before he begins?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alaska yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. HOUSTON. I desire to ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alaska be allowed time sufficient to conclude his remarks. I feel that one hour will not be sufficient for him to go through the details as he may perhaps want to do, and therefore I ask that he may have time to conclude his remarks.

Mr. DAVENPORT. Is it not understood that those who have prepared speeches may be given sufficient time to conclude their remarks as a general proposition, without limitation of time? I suggest that we have heretofore been operating under that rule.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I think there should be some limitation as to time. While I do not see fit to object to a liberal amount of time being given to members of the committee, still I think there should be some limitation.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, each request for unanimous consent has to stand by itself in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. HOUSTON. That was my idea and my understanding, that it would be necessary that the consent be given to each Member. I make that request now, Mr. Chairman, in behalf of the Delegate from Alaska.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HOUSTON] asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. WICKERSHAM] be allowed time to conclude his speech.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. There is no time fixed for closing debate, is there?

Mr. HOUSTON. No; no time has yet been fixed for closing debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HOUSTON] asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. WICKERSHAM] be permitted to continue his remarks until he concludes. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, would it not be better for the chairman of the committee to ask that the Delegate from Alaska have two or three hours? To grant unlimited time might incline a Member to occupy not only to-day but next Wednesday and the entire session, so far as Calendar Wednesday is concerned.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I will say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that the request is not unusual in cases like this.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Let the gentleman speak for an hour, and then we may agree on it.

Mr. HOUSTON. I think we might as well have the consent now, Mr. Chairman, if we can get it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. I object, for the present. I will say to the gentleman from Alaska that there will not be any objection later.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin objects.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, the bill before the House—H. R. 1739—was originally prepared by the Delegate from Alaska. Two opposing schools of thought have given much attention to the question of the development of Alaska. One insists upon the open door, upon allowing the widest latitude to individual effort in the Territory, and its most advanced members are those who think the way to develop Alaska is to turn its resources over to those who have the wealth to develop them. They insist that the Government shall do nothing more than to give ready assistance to every effort of individuals to secure title to all the bonanza resources of Alaska, with the privilege of immediately transferring them to monopoly. They insist that all that is necessary to do in Alaska is to raise the embargo and to permit the people of the United States to acquire title to the resources, leaving the laws of trade and commerce to deal with the question of transportation and the operation of production. That is radical reaction.

But there is a more progressive view held by many, and it is clearly stated in the following language:

Alaska, as a storehouse, should be unlocked. One key to it is a system of railways. These the Government should itself build and administer, and the ports and terminals it should itself control in the interest of all who wish to use them for the service and development of the country and its people. But the construction of railways is only the first step; it is only thrusting in the key to the storehouse and throwing back the lock and opening the door. * * * It is a part of our general problem of conservation. * * * We must use the resources of the country, not lock them up. * * * The resources in question must be used, but not destroyed or wasted; used, but not monopolize upon any narrow idea of individual rights as against the abiding interests of communities.

That is progressive democracy, and I shall give it my approval and support.

Pioneers go into a new country hoping to find some of its natural resources in such quantity and under such circumstances that they can be readily acquired and easily turned into wealth. The great West was developed upon that plan. The people were allowed to go upon the public domain, to locate mines and homesteads, and to acquire all of the resources of the public domain in small and individual lots for their own use. Certainly times have changed since those early days when the pioneers thus acquired their individual holdings in the Western States. The disturbing element is monopoly. Big business has learned that bigger business may be acquired by combinations. The great master of financial combinations taught the lesser masters how to acquire property through combination and monopoly. Even the great master himself, in conjunction with the Guggenheims, under the title of the Alaska Syndicate, became the master of monopoly in Alaska. When people inquire what is the matter with Alaska it may be answered: The Alaska Syndicate.

Mr. MADDEN. What does the Alaska Syndicate do, or what does it not do?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. If the gentleman will possess his soul in patience, I will tell him a great many things they do and a great many things they do not do.

Mr. MADDEN. I am asking for information.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The gentleman will get it if he will be patient.

Mr. MADDEN. I am patient. I supposed the gentleman wanted to tell the House.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I certainly do, and I shall be glad to have the opportunity.

The Alaska problem is easily presented for discussion, for it is a question of Government or Guggenheim—which? Shall the Territory be controlled by its constitutional trustee or the trusts? Shall it be owned by the people or by monopoly? Shall its resources be opened to acquisition and use by the pioneer prospector and homeseeker or unfairly monopolized by one great syndicate? Shall the Government or the Guggenheims control the destiny of Alaska and its people—which?

The bill under discussion is in the interest of the people and puts the issue of Government or Guggenheim control in Alaska squarely to the vote of this House. Which shall it be—Government or Guggenheim?

DRAFTING THE ALASKA RAILWAY BILL.

Everything we attempt in the way of development in the Territory is hindered by this overshadowing evil. If we begin the building of a railroad, the financial power of the Alaska Syndicate destroys its credit, prevents it from securing money, and renders the whole scheme abortive. If we apply to Congress for aid in building a national railroad in Alaska, it is at once whispered that our efforts will be of some advantage to the Alaska Syndicate—and none whisper this so incessantly as lobbyists for the Alaska Syndicate. They have walked the public corridors, visited the offices of Members, flooded the mails with letters and printed matter, and in every way sought to prejudice Members against the bill now before the House. This insidious warfare was expected, and in the preparation of the bill effort was made to put it upon so high a plane that their efforts would be minimized. For that reason the bill before the House was so drafted as to place the power of locating and constructing the railroad with the President. The bill was largely copied after the present law for the construction of the Panama Canal, which puts the whole power and responsibility upon the President. The bill provides generally that the President shall locate and designate the route or routes for the line of railroad in the Territory of Alaska to be so located as to connect one or more of the Pacific coast harbors with the navigable waterways of the interior and with a coal field or fields yielding coal sufficient in quality and quantity for naval use. If any attempt had been made by the bill to fix a specific route, then a clamor from every other locality would have been raised. Those supporting the bill would have been accused of having some interest in or along the line of location. If the bill had designated a commission to make the location and to build the road, equally vigorous accusations of attempting to secure unfair advantages would have been made. If the bill, like the Pacific Railway bills, had organized a specific corporation, designated its incorporators, and given them a land grant, the clamor would have been greater. If the bill had specifically prevented the President from making any location of the road in connection with any other road that would have brought criticism and increased lobbying. If the bill had limited the President to any particular route, it would have been open to grave criticism, upon the ground that Congress has no such information as would justify it in choosing any particular route or any particular region. The committee having charge of this bill had entire confidence in the President and believed the sanest method of securing the best results was to put the whole burden and responsibility upon his shoulders.

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

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. I am asking for information. Is it the proper interpretation of this bill that it shall connect the harbor with the interior waters or merely connect with some existing line which rests upon a harbor of the seaboard?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. That matter, of course, is left entirely with the President, who is given power in the bill to locate the route of the railroad.

Mr. SCOTT. But there is an appropriation of a specific sum here, which is probably based upon estimates. Do those estimates contemplate the construction from some inland point on interior waters or does this contemplate construction from the seaboard?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. There is nothing in the bill which limits the President in any way to any thought which any member of the committee may have had in his mind at the time the bill was prepared, and it is not known what the President will do if the bill passes. The bill provides that the line shall connect the southern coast harbors with the inland waterways of Alaska.

Mr. SCOTT. There is an appropriation of \$35,000,000 and a mileage of 733 miles.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. SCOTT. Is it not impossible with that sum of money to construct a line from the seaboard to the interior waters?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. It is not impossible; it is quite possible.

Mr. SCOTT. It is quite possible?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes; according to all the estimates.

Mr. SCOTT. And build the terminals?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. And build the terminals.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alaska yield to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. CALLAWAY. The President is not limited by this bill to any specific route or mileage or anything of that kind. He is just given the power to have \$35,000,000 worth of bonds to go into the railroad business within the Territory of Alaska, is he not?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. That is the gentleman's interpretation of the bill. The bill speaks for itself.

Mr. CALLAWAY. There is no place fixed for him to start and no place fixed for him to stop.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Oh, yes; there is.

Mr. CALLAWAY. No specific mileage laid out that he is to build.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The gentleman is mistaken about that. I said that the bill provided for a limitation upon the President to this extent only, that he connect the southern harbors in Alaska with the inland waterways and reach a coal field where he may obtain naval coal. Otherwise there is no limitation.

Mr. CALLAWAY. There is no particular harbor and no particular coal field designated, is there?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. No.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Any southern harbor and any coal field?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes; entirely in the discretion of the President.

Mr. CALLAWAY. And, further, is he not given the power either to build roads for the purpose of being operated by the Government or to buy roads?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. That is all covered by the bill, and the gentleman can read it and understand it just as well as I can, and I think it is better to continue my speech.

Mr. SIMS. Would not the gentleman prefer to make his regular address and answer questions afterwards?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I would.

Mr. SIMS. Inasmuch as the gentleman in his speech may answer many questions which otherwise would be asked.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I think I will answer all the questions before I conclude my speech.

Mr. SIMS. And the gentleman would like to proceed?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

There have been no surveys made over any of the routes to which Congress has access. If such surveys have been made with sufficient definiteness to justify the choice of a particular route, the Committee on Territories did not have such information. It was therefore determined by the committee, in view of all the circumstances, to report a bill to the House which should leave the entire responsibility for the choice of the route and the expenditure of the appropriation with the President. The bill before the House gives him ample authority to organize a force of railroad builders under some competent engineer, to be chosen by him, and to expend the money in the building of the road along the line determined by him, exclusive of any individual interest or influence. But, the opponents of the bill suggest, the President may build this road in such a way as to connect with the Guggenheim road, thereby giving them some advantage in transportation in Alaska which they do not now have. Certainly the bill is open to that objection. It was left open to that objection in the effort to give all authority to the President of the United States, in whom all have confidence. Under the bill the President has the widest latitude of power to locate the proposed railroad over the best route in Alaska, with the general limitation that it must connect one of the southern harbors with naval coal and the interior waterways. The President can build such a road over such a route without giving the Alaska syndicate railway any advantages in doing so. The committee believed that he would so locate and construct the road without seeking to betray the people of Alaska and of the United States in the expenditure of this appropriation.

If there are gentlemen in this House who think the President of the United States can not be trusted to do that, let them vote against the bill. The people of the United States had confidence enough in the President to elect him as their Chief Magistrate. The Committee on the Territories had confidence enough in him to believe that he will locate the railroad designated in this bill and expend the money appropriated in good faith and without misapplication. The committee believed there would be no scandal and no misapplication of the appropriation from the legitimate purpose of the act if the responsibility was left with the President, and so believing the bill was reported in its present form.

AN ADMINISTRATION MEASURE.

The plan proposed in the bill for the location and construction of a railroad in Alaska is a Democratic administration plan; it is strictly within the pledges of the Progressive plat-

form and has the support of that party and of Republican majorities.

In his message to this Congress the President declared that the long-locked resources of Alaska should be opened to use and development without monopolization, and he declared that one key to its storehouse of riches is a system of railroads. "These," he said, "the Government itself should build and administer, and the ports and terminals it should itself control in the interest of all who wish to use them for the service and development of the country and its people."

The announcement of this definite plan for development in Alaska removes the consideration of Alaska affairs from the domain of muckraking and scandal to that of fair discussion of ways and means. It is a proposition to do in Alaska what was done by the United States in every State and Territory in the South and West, for each State and Territory, except the original thirteen States and Alaska, was permitted to use part of its land resources in the building of turnpikes, canals, or railroads. The bill now before the House only proposes to do the usual thing in Alaska, but would do it more wisely, more economically, and with more particular regard to the rights of the people who own the public lands. Instead of conveying large areas of the public land to private corporations as a bonus to procure them to build the railroads, as was the earlier plan, it is now proposed that the United States instead of the corporation shall sell the lands to the people for homes and use the money received for the lands in building the railroad, whereby the people will have both the lands and the railroad. Such is the transaction on its face.

THE STATUS OF ALASKA.

Before entering upon a consideration of the particular merits of the bill before the House, it seems necessary to consider the political status of Alaska and its relationship to other members of the United States of America. If it is truly a member of that national family, though in Territorial infancy, it is justly entitled to the same treatment as its elder brothers and sisters received in their youthful struggles for a start in life. If it shall appear that it has been incorporated into and is a part of the body of the Nation, in the same sense that other Territories were within the present limits of the United States, then it follows that it will be entitled to the same advantages in development as those Territories had. What is the political status of Alaska?

Alaska was purchased from Russia in 1867, and the purchase price of \$7,200,000 paid out of the Public Treasury. The Louisiana territory was likewise purchased from France in 1803, and the purchase price of \$12,000,000 was paid out of the Public Treasury. In exactly the same businesslike way the United States, in 1848, purchased California, New Mexico, and Arizona, and paid the purchase price of \$15,000,000 out of the Public Treasury. The Louisiana, Mexican, and Alaskan treaties each contained substantially the same obligation on the part of the United States to admit the inhabitants of the acquired territory "to the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages, and immunities of citizens of the United States." Alaska thus stands exactly equal with the Louisiana Purchase and all the States carved therefrom, exactly equal with California, Arizona, and New Mexico, in respect to its entrance by purchase into the body of the Nation, and the United States is bound by exactly the same promise of incorporation and statehood to Alaska that it made in the Louisiana and Mexican treaties.

The American statesmen who conducted and concluded the negotiations for the purchase of Alaska from Russia purposely employed the form used in the acquisition of the Louisiana territory, of California, Arizona, and New Mexico. They fully appreciated its effect and officially declared their purpose in so doing. In his fourth annual message to Congress President Johnson expressed his purpose in procuring the cession of Alaska in this significant language:

The acquisition of Alaska was made with a view of extending national jurisdiction and republican principles in the American hemisphere.

And in his great speech in support of the ratification of the treaty of purchase Senator Sumner was even more specific in dedicating Alaska to future statehood in the Union. He said in part:

But your best work and most important endowment will be the republican government which, looking to a long future, you will organize, with schools free to all and with equal laws, before which every citizen will stand erect in the consciousness of manhood. Here will be a motive power without which coal itself will be insufficient. Here will be a source of wealth more inexhaustible than any fisheries. Bestow such a government, and you will bestow what is better than all you can receive, whether quintals of fish, sands of gold, choicest fur, or most beautiful ivory.

The political structure of the present Territory and future State of Alaska is based upon the solid foundation of the national pledge contained in article 3 of the treaty of cession, which reads as follows:

ART. 3. The inhabitants of the ceded territory, according to their choice, reserving their natural allegiance, may return to Russia within three years; but if they should prefer to remain in the ceded territory, they, with the exception of uncivilized native tribes, shall be admitted to the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages, and immunities of citizens of the United States, and shall be maintained and protected in the free enjoyment of their liberty, property, and religion.

We are not left in doubt as to the effectiveness of this effort to make Alaska part of the body of the Nation, for while its material development has long been neglected by Congress, the Supreme Court of the United States, in a series of well-considered cases coming from Alaska, has declared and firmly established its right to membership in the national family.

In 1896 that court, in the *Coquitlam* case (163 U. S., 346-352) declared that "Alaska is one of the Territories of the United States," in the political sense. That decision was affirmed in *Binns v. United States* (194 U. S., 486-491), where the court added: "Nor can it be doubted that it is an organized Territory." In the case of *Rasmussen v. United States* (197 U. S., 516), the question whether Alaska was incorporated into the body of the Nation was squarely presented, fully argued, and finally determined. The court said (p. 522):

This brings us to consider the treaty by which Alaska was acquired and the action of Congress concerning that acquisition, for the purpose of ascertaining whether within the criteria referred to in *Downes* against *Bidwell*, and adopted and applied in *Dorr* against *United States*, Alaska was incorporated into the United States. The treaty concerning Alaska, instead of exhibiting, as did the treaty respecting the Philippine Islands, the determination to reserve the question of the status of the acquired territory for ulterior action by Congress, manifested a contrary intention, since it is therein expressly declared in article 3 that:

"The inhabitants of the ceded territory shall be admitted to the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages, and immunities of citizens of the United States, and shall be maintained and protected in the free enjoyment of their liberty, property, and religion."

"This declaration, although somewhat changed in phraseology, is the equivalent, as pointed out in *Downes* against *Bidwell*, of the formula employed from the beginning to express the purpose to incorporate acquired territory into the United States, especially in the absence of other provisions showing an intention to the contrary. And it was doubtless this fact conjoined with the subsequent legislation of Congress which led to the following statement concerning Alaska made in the opinion of three, if not four, of the judges who concurred in the judgment of affirmance in *Downes v. Bidwell* (p. 335):

"Without referring in detail to the acquisition from Russia of Alaska, it suffices to say that that treaty also contained provisions for incorporation and was acted upon exactly in accord with the practical construction applied in the case of the acquisition from Mexico, as just stated. * * * Indeed, both before and since the decision in *Downes* against *Bidwell*, the status of Alaska as an incorporated Territory was and has been recognized by the actions and decisions of this court."

Alaska was a territory in 1878, when the following section of the United States Revised Statutes extended the Constitution over it:

Sec. 1891. The Constitution and all laws of the United States which are not locally inapplicable shall have the same force and effect within all the organized Territories, and in every Territory hereafter organized as elsewhere within the United States.

And in the *Rasmussen* case the Supreme Court declared:

Under the treaty with Russia ceding Alaska and the subsequent legislation of Congress, Alaska has been incorporated into the United States and the Constitution is applicable to that Territory.

It is not necessary to cite other authorities or argument to demonstrate that Alaska is one of the Territories of the United States; it is an organized Territory; the Constitution of the United States extends over it; it is incorporated into the United States; it occupies the identical plane of relationship to the United States and to the several States that other Territories did in their day; the treaty of cession pledged the United States that the inhabitants thereof "shall be admitted to the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages, and immunities of citizens of the United States," and therefore, in the natural course of events, when its territory shall be settled and organized and when its growth and permanent development shall make it desirable, one or more sovereign States will be organized out of the Territory of Alaska and admitted into the Union.

Assuming, then, that Alaska Territory—the embryo State of Alaska—is equal in right before the Constitution and the law of the land with every other Territory or State, we may also assume that it is entitled to an equal share of internal improvement with every other Territory or State—especially out of its own public lands.

POWER OF THE UNITED STATES TO CONSTRUCT AND OPERATE RAILROADS.

Another preliminary question arises touching the power of the United States to locate, build, and operate a railroad in Alaska, even though it be done out of the income from the sale of its public lands.

Careful attention has been given to a consideration of the power of Congress to enact the legislation offered in the bill as reported. Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution provides that—

The Congress shall have power * * * to provide for the common defense and general welfare * * * ; to borrow money on the credit of the United States * * * ; to regulate commerce among the several States * * * ; to establish post offices and post roads * * * ; to raise and support armies * * * ; to provide and maintain a Navy * * * ; to exercise authority over all places purchased * * * ; for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dockyards, and other needful buildings * * * ; to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, etc.

Section 3, Article IV, also provides that—

The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.

Each of the foregoing clauses of the Constitution gives warrant to some feature of the bill and affords authority for the legislation proposed.

The objects of this bill are the development of the agricultural and mineral resources of Alaska, the settlement of the public lands in Alaska, to provide transportation for coal for the use of the Army and Navy, to establish post roads, and transport the mails in Alaska.

Certainly it is late to raise the constitutional question, for more than a century ago the United States built the Cumberland Road, from the Potomac to the Ohio, and paid the cost, \$8,000,000, out of the Public Treasury. Every Congress passes a river and harbors bill appropriating millions of dollars out of the General Treasury for the improvement of rivers for the transportation of freight—there is no difference in principle between these river and harbor appropriations and the one now suggested for building a railroad in Alaska, except that it is proposed to pay for the road in Alaska out of its public lands—just as was done in the building of the land-grant roads in the Southern and Western States and Territories. The Supreme Court of the United States had before it the question arising out of the objection to the constitutional power of the United States to build the Panama Canal, in the case of *Wilson v. Shaw* (204 U. S., 24-33), where the court said:

Again, plaintiff contends that the Government has no power to engage anywhere in the work of constructing a railroad or canal. The decisions of this court are adverse to this contention. In *California v. Pacific Railroad Co.* (127 U. S., 1, 39) it was said:

"It can not at the present day be doubted that Congress, under the power to regulate commerce among the several States, as well as to provide for postal accommodations and military exigencies, had authority to pass these laws. The power to construct, or to authorize individuals or corporations to construct, national highways and bridges from State to State is essential to the complete control and regulation of interstate commerce. Without authority in Congress to establish and maintain such highways and bridges it would be without authority to regulate one of the most important adjuncts of commerce. This power in former times was exerted to a very limited extent, the Cumberland or National Road being the most notable instance. Its exertion was but little called for, as commerce was then mostly conducted by water, and many of our statesmen entertained doubts as to the existence of the power to establish ways of communication by land. But since, in consequence of the expansion of the country, the multiplication of its products, and the invention of railroads and locomotion by steam, land transportation has so vastly increased, a sounder consideration of the subject has prevailed and led to the conclusion that Congress has plenary power over the whole subject. Of course, the authority of Congress over the Territories of the United States and its power to grant franchises exercisable therein are, and ever have been, undoubted; but the wider power was very freely exercised, and much to the general satisfaction, in the creation of the vast system of railroads connecting the East with the Pacific, traversing States as well as Territories, and employing the agency of State as well as Federal corporations. (See *Pacific Railroad removal cases*, 115 U. S., 1, 14, 18.)"

In *Luxton v. North River Bridge Co.* (153 U. S., 525, 529), Mr. Justice Gray, speaking for the court, said:

"Congress, therefore, may create corporations as appropriate means of executing the powers of government, as, for instance, a bank for the purpose of carrying on the fiscal operations of the United States or a railroad corporation for the purpose of promoting commerce among the States. *McCulloch v. Maryland* (4 Wheat., 316, 411, 422); *Osborn v. Bank of United States* (9 Wheat., 738, 861, 873); *Pacific Railroad removal cases* (115 U. S., 1, 18); *California v. Pacific Railroad* (127 U. S., 1, 39). Congress has likewise the power, exercised early in this century by successive acts in the Cumberland or National Road, from the Potomac across the Alleghenies to the Ohio, to authorize the construction of a public highway connecting several States. See *Indiana v. United States* (148 U. S., 148)."

See also *Monongahela Navigation Co. v. United States* (148 U. S., 312).

These authorities recognize the power of Congress to construct interstate highways. A fortiori, Congress would have like power within the Territories and outside of State lines, for there the legislative power of Congress is limited only by the provisions of the Constitution and can not conflict with the reserved power of the States. Plaintiff, recognizing the force of these decisions, seeks to obviate it by saying that the expressions were obiter dicta, but plainly they were not. They announce distinctly the opinion of this court on the questions

presented and would have to be overruled if a different doctrine were now announced. Congress has acted in reliance upon these decisions in many ways, and any change would disturb a vast volume of rights supposed to be fixed; but we see no reason to doubt the conclusions expressed in those opinions, and adhere to them. The court of appeals was right, and its decision is affirmed.

There is, then, no doubt about the equal right of Alaska before the Constitution and the law to the railway aid asked for in this bill, and no doubt about the power of Congress to grant it.

AREA OF ALASKA, 590,884 SQUARE MILES.

Alaska is national in area, in the magnitude and variety of its resources, and in its capacity to support population. It is almost 200,000 square miles greater in area than the original 13 States when they adopted the Constitution and became one of the nations of the world. The following table will give a comparative view of the area of the 13 States and other specified States carved out of their public lands having a smaller combined area than Alaska:

	Square miles.
Delaware.....	2,050
Pennsylvania.....	45,215
New Jersey.....	7,215
Georgia.....	59,475
Connecticut.....	4,990
Massachusetts.....	8,315
Maryland.....	12,210
South Carolina.....	30,570
New Hampshire.....	9,305
Virginia (including West Virginia).....	67,230
New York.....	49,170
North Carolina.....	52,250
Rhode Island.....	1,250
Area 13 original States.....	349,845
Vermont.....	9,565
Kentucky.....	40,400
Tennessee.....	42,050
Ohio.....	41,060
Indiana.....	36,350
Illinois.....	56,650
Total area of 20 States.....	575,920
Total area of Alaska.....	590,884

Alaska is 472 times as large as the smallest State (Rhode Island) and more than 2½ times as large as the largest State (Texas), which once assumed independence and nationality as a Republic. It is more than 12 times as large as New York, more than 14 times as large as Ohio, and more than 8 times as large as Oklahoma; it is equal in area to 10 average States of the American Union.

Compare it with the following European countries:

	Square miles.
Norway.....	124,445
Sweden.....	172,867
Finland.....	144,255
Denmark.....	15,888
England and Wales.....	58,575
Scotland.....	30,443
Ireland.....	32,373
Total.....	578,346
Alaska.....	590,884

France and Germany, in Europe, have only 415,884 square miles, while Spain and Portugal together are not one-half as large as Alaska. Norway, Sweden, and Finland, on the same northern latitude as Alaska, with a combined area of only 441,567 square miles, support a population of 10,884,839 almost exclusively from their agricultural products, for they have no gold, nor coal, nor copper, and their fisheries do not compare in magnitude of value with those of Alaska.

COAST LINE—ISLANDS.

Alaska's coast line is more than 35,000 miles in length, while that of the United States on its Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific coasts does not exceed 22,000 miles. More than 20,000 miles of the Alaska coast line are washed by the surging tides and the warm waters of the Kuro-shiwo, the Japanese "black stream," ever carrying eastward its tropic waters along the south shores of the Aleutians into the innumerable straits and passages between the thousand islands, great and small, along the continental shores of southern Alaska. The Aleutians, like a rope of pearls, stretch from Unimak to Atka, a distance of more than 500 miles east and west. The islands in the Aleutian group are in a temperate climate and are fit for the habitation of man. Those in southern Alaska, from Kodiak to the Prince of Wales, are well forested, highly mineralized, and offer tempting inducements to hardy settlers. Their waters teem with salmon, halibut, and cod; their shores are covered with shellfish and other sea foods; when the tide is out the table is set. Gold, copper, marble, gypsum, and other minerals are found in quantity and richness in their hills, while the valleys and level areas are fit for agriculture. The climate from Kodiak to Ketchikan is mild and humid; it corresponds, winter and summer, to that of Wash-

ington, D. C., or Richmond, Va. These innumerable Alaskan islands offer homes, happiness, plenty, and prosperity to people who care to accept these blessings. It will not, however, be a "prairie schooner" move nor a "cowboy" existence, but one braver, hardier, and with a more certain future. Here will gather that hardy population of "fisher folk" so familiar in the history of Maine and Massachusetts, supplemented by the marble quarrymen of Vermont and the miners of gold and copper.

MOUNTAIN RANGES, GLACIERS, AND VOLCANOES.

The Cordilleran Mountain Range rises out of the Antarctic seas at Cape Horn, stretches northward along the western coast line of South and North America to Alaska, and thence out upon the Alaska Peninsula. There it dips into the sea again, only the peaks of the Aleutian Islands, stretching away toward the volcanoes of Japan and the Malay Peninsula, to mark the course of the old equatorial earth crack which produced them all. From Ketchikan to Seward, from Cook Inlet to the end of the Alaska Peninsula, it forms a barrier to the inland progress of the rain clouds which rise off the warm waters of the Japan current and float landward to drop their moisture on its seaward slopes. As the clouds ascend the mountain heights the decreasing temperature wrings them dry. The cloud disappears, the snowfall is added to the glaciers' bulk, and the air current, freed of its burden, drops to the interior region minus its moisture, and dry. And thus are glaciers formed and maintained on the seaward side of the slope, and thus the interior is supplied with dry air and little moisture.

There are no glaciers in Alaska behind the Coast Range except on Mount McKinley, Mount Hayes, and the Mount Wrangell group. No glaciers are found north of the Kuskokwim or the Tanana. None are to be found in the great interior valleys, nor from there northward to the Arctic Ocean. Some people imagine Alaska to be widely glaciated, but less than 1 per cent of its area is covered. Then, too, glaciers have a high economic value. They are generally located in high mountain canyons, unfit for agriculture or other use. When the long, hot days of summer come the streams of the lowlands are parched. The Tanana, the Ohio River of the North, would then disappear but for the glacial waters which pour down from the southern summits. The horde of salmon, the food supply of our Indians, ascending to spawn and renew the race, come on this rise. A Nile-like flood of turbid glacial waters brings richness of silt and top soil, the spawning fish, and the steamboats to a land that would suffer without it. On the coast, from California to Alaska, the high mountain glaciers afford a never-failing source of water power during the season of drought. Alaskan glaciers have a greater potential and economic value for the production of heat, light, and power—for the generation of electricity—than Alaskan forests, and Alaska has forestry reservations larger than the State of Ohio.

Thousands of Americans annually visit the Old World to enjoy its scenery, to view the fiords of Norway, the mountains and glaciers of Switzerland, and the fires of Vesuvius, not knowing that these are dwarfed by the greater fiords, mountains, glaciers, and volcanoes of Alaska. The highest mountain in the United States is Mount Whitney, in California, whose summit rises 14,500 feet above the sea. Alaska has a dozen peaks which overtop this California giant, the highest, Mount McKinley, rising more than a mile in height above it.

Height in feet of mountains in California and Alaska.

	Feet.
Mount Whitney, Cal.....	14,500
Mount Blackburn, Alaska.....	16,140
Mount Sanford, Alaska.....	16,200
Mount Crillon, Alaska.....	15,900
Mount Fairweather, Alaska.....	15,360
Mount Hayes, Alaska.....	14,500
Mount Hubbard, Alaska.....	16,400
Mount McKinley, Alaska.....	20,464
Mount Foraker, Alaska.....	17,100
Mount St. Elias, Alaska.....	18,024
Mount Vancouver, Alaska.....	15,715
Mount Wrangell, Alaska.....	14,000

Europe is proud of her single volcano, Vesuvius, on the shores of the Bay of Naples, but the Italy of America, the peninsula of Alaska, has 10 great volcanoes. The Bogoslovs, near Unalaska, are submarine; to-day with loud noises and ascending volumes of smoke and steam, they throw up a red-hot island; to-morrow it sinks into the depths. Makushin, Pogromni, and Shishaldin light the mariner through Aleutian passes, while Weniaminoff, Popof, and Katmai, at long intervals, explode with detonations louder than the heaviest cannonading and cast their volcanic ash a thousand miles away. Iliamna and Redoubt, on the western shore of Cook Inlet, and Wrangell overtopping the interior range, seem to be old and decadent, though the smoke from their internal fires yet floats lazily away to sea. St. Augustine, rising out of the waters of Cook Inlet, and Edgecumbe, guarding the entrance to the beautiful Bay of Sitka,

are extinct, but justly famed for their symmetry and graceful lines. A hundred extinct cones, as far north as St. Michael, prove that in ages gone by the forces of internal heat were, as now, engaged in fashioning the shores of Alaska, and extending her islands and continental land mass toward Asia.

RAIN AND SNOW FALL.

The coastal mountain range divides Alaska into two distinct climatic regions. The coast side of the range is rainy and has a high and equable temperature. The snowfall is excessive. Behind the mountain range, in the interior of the country, it is dry and cold in the winter and hot in the summer.

RAINFALL.

Locality.	Years' observation.	January.	February.	March.	April.	May.	June.	July.	August.	September.	October.	November.	December.	Inches.
Valdez, Alaska.....	11	7.65	5.02	5.74	3.92	3.52	2.74	5.13	8.14	8.82	9.47	5.60	8.10	73.94
Sitka, Alaska.....	29	7.61	6.56	6.08	5.91	4.01	3.27	3.99	6.49	10.15	11.58	9.47	8.76	83.88
Loring, Alaska.....	8	10.93	11.73	10.09	13.42	8.50	6.57	7.38	8.54	16.81	21.12	20.58	15.89	152.16
Fairbanks, Alaska.....	7	1.16	0.23	0.57	0.35	0.59	1.43	1.43	1.78	1.52	0.71	1.07	0.84	11.73

SNOWFALL.

Valdez, Alaska.....	11	83.4	53.5	67.1	33.3	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.6	11.4	41.6	72.1	364.7
Juneau, Alaska.....	15	36.3	23.1	12.0	7.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	6.0	20.9	106.4
Fairbanks, Alaska.....	5	11.0	3.0	5.0	2.6	T.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7	5.4	5.2	9.9	42.8

The Weather Bureau reports show a remarkable difference between the fall of rain and snow on the coast and in the interior. While Valdez had an annual average rainfall of 73.94 inches, or more than 6 feet; Sitka, an annual average of 83.88 inches, or more than 7 feet; and Loring an annual average of 152.16 inches, or more than 12½ feet, Fairbanks, in the Tanana interior, has an annual average of but 11.73 inches, or less than 1 foot. The proportions may be stated graphically by these figures: Fairbanks, 1; Valdez, 6; Sitka, 7; and Loring, 12. The Tanana Valley has about the same average rainfall as Arizona.

The snowfall in the Tanana Valley, in the interior of Alaska, is proportionally light. While Valdez had 364.7 inches per annum, for a period of observation of 11 years; Juneau, 106.4 inches per annum for 15 years, Fairbanks had but 42.8 inches per annum for a period of observation of 5 years. The proportions may be stated graphically by these figures: Fairbanks, 3.6 feet; Juneau, 8.9 feet; and Valdez, 30.8 feet. The snow in the Tanana Valley and the whole interior of Alaska is light and dry, because of the dry, cold winter climate. There can be no glaciers without an excessive fall of rain and snow, and there being but a light fall of both behind the coast range barrier there are no glaciers there. A road or trail once used for travel over these light interior snows becomes a boulevard for the winter; the snow falls in October and does not melt until April.

Since this bill was introduced I am often asked how many months in the year a railroad can be operated in Alaska. The answer is: Every month in the year and every day in the month as certainly as the Canadian Pacific or the Grand Trunk Pacific, building far north of the Canadian Pacific, can be operated. The light fall of snow in the interior does not even prevent the automobiles from running every day in the winter from Fairbanks to the mines. There will be less annoyance and expense in keeping the Alaska railway open on either of the routes recommended by the Alaska Railway Commission than there is in operating the Northern Pacific, Great Northern, the Chicago, Milwaukee & Puget Sound, or the Canadian Pacific across the Cascade Mountains in Washington and British Columbia. The light, dry snow in the interior is no obstacle at all, the wet and heavier snow through the coast range is largely avoided on the Seward line, and is much less of a burden on the Valdez Line than it now is on the railroads across the coast range in Washington, Oregon, and California.

HARBORS AND RIVERS.

The triangular Gulf of Alaska thrusts its northern apex far into the southern coast of Alaska. Prince William Sound, Alaska's greatest harbor, is as large as Chesapeake Bay, and as easily protected from assault by an enemy as San Francisco Bay. Its front is protected by Montague and other large islands, while wide entrances between the islands and the mainland afford easy access from the ocean without rock or sand bar to threaten wreck. Fortifications on the headlands commanding these entrances will render it well-nigh impregnable—as safe and easily defended as Seattle or San Francisco.

Numerous interior harbors, unrivaled in position, safety, and comfort, for shipping and naval use branch inland from this greater outer harbor like fingers from the human hand. Cordova, Valdez, Portage Bay, Seward, and many others, are deep, well sheltered, and easily fortified from outer attack, even from Prince William Sound itself. These splendid harbors, nestling behind bristling mountain walls, are each at least 10 miles long, 3 miles wide, have unobstructed approach and deep water, and are sufficiently commodious to hold the

Pacific Fleet at maneuvers. They are ever flooded with the warm tides of the Japanese current and ice never forms in either of them. More ice forms in Boston, New York, or Washington Harbors than in either of these south Alaskan bays. From a strategic and climatic point of view, because they are free from rock, sand bar, or ice, and because they are so naturally defended by the great outer harbor of Prince William Sound and natural mountain sites for fortifications these harbors offer the best natural naval base in the Pacific. With proper fortifications and railroads back to the naval coal fields immediately behind them, they can be turned into impregnable harbors of refuge for our Navy, one-half the distance toward the Orient from our States.

Railroads from the interior must come to these harbors, and the winter trade to the interior now passes through them. Large, safe, commodious, deep, free from ice, ever open and waiting for the coming of commerce, southern Alaska has the finest natural harbors in the world.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will it inconvenience the gentleman from Alaska, while he is describing the advantages and beauties of this country, to stop and point out the different localities on the map?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Not at all.

Mr. MURDOCK. I wish the gentleman would take his statements seriatim and show us the course of the Japanese gulf stream.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. This is known as the North Pacific current. It rises in tropical waters north of the Equator, in the latitude of the Hawaiian Islands, then flows from the coast of California westward across the entire width of the Pacific Ocean, gathering heat as it goes until it strikes the Philippine Islands. There it is deflected to the shore of Japan and is deflected again eastward along the shores of the Aleutian Islands until it strikes southeastern Alaska, and then it flows south along the coast of British Columbia, Oregon, Washington, and California, and strikes on across the Pacific again.

Mr. MURDOCK. That answers my question and I am obliged to the gentleman. At no point does it penetrate the Aleutian chain.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. It does; one branch goes into the Bering Sea, goes through Bering Straits on the American side, and moderates all the climate along the coast.

Mr. MURDOCK. Then it is not a matter that affects the settlement in southern Alaska alone?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Not at all. I will come to that before I complete my remarks.

So many people going along the Alaska coast see glaciers and mountains above them that they imagine that that condition exists in an increasingly greater degree in the interior, when as a matter of fact the opposite is true. There are no glaciers in the interior of Alaska. They are all on the southern coast and are produced from the excessive moisture coming from the Pacific and falling on the seaward slopes of the mountain side.

We have 20 automobiles at Fairbanks running every day in the winter in opposition to the railroad out to the mines, and they never stop on account of the snow. For nine years in succession the winter stages between Valdez and Fairbanks never missed a scheduled trip.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. How far is it to the mines out of Fairbanks?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The mines are within 40 miles of Fairbanks.

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

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended one hour.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask to amend that by asking unanimous consent that he have time in which to conclude his remarks. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks to amend the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin by giving the gentleman from Alaska time to conclude his remarks.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have no objection to that if the time is limited to to-day.

The CHAIRMAN. Providing it does not extend beyond to-day. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I want to ask the gentleman from Tennessee if it is the purpose through this debate to give each Member all the time he wishes? I make the inquiry because there are many of us who want to be heard at some time during the debate, and of course I take it that the pressure of business behind the bill might crowd out some who want to be heard.

Mr. HOUSTON. My request only refers to the speech made by the gentleman from Alaska because of the fact that he is the Delegate from the Territory, and I think it but just and proper that he should have a full amount of time. So far as the time is given to any other Member, it does not depend upon this. I am willing to give all the latitude that is desirable, but we will have to put some limitation on it.

Mr. MURDOCK. I would like to ask the gentleman if he intends to run until 6 o'clock to-night?

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes; we expect to run until 6 o'clock to-night.

Mr. DAVENPORT. I desire to state to the chairman of the committee and to my colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] that I do not think there will be any trouble about the time, because I think this is a question that all the Members are anxious to have fully discussed before casting a vote upon it. We are not going to conclude the general discussion of it to-day, and it is possible that we will run over without fixing any definite time as to when general debate will close.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I further reserve the right to object for the purpose of saying to the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. WICKERSHAM] that I have no idea of curtailing his speech, because I am enjoying it as well as those who favor the legislation; but at the same time the House will observe that no time has been fixed, and there has been no division of time made. The matter has simply gone along, but if there should come a time when there is to be a division of time I hope the chairman will be liberal in dividing it.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, I have no disposition in the world to cut off the time. In fact, I favor the freest discussion that we can have.

Mr. FERRIS. I so understood the chairman, but I wanted to have that placed in the Record, so that there would be no misunderstanding.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hears no objection, and the gentleman from Alaska has permission to conclude his remarks.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The navigable rivers in the interior discharge their waters westward into Bering Sea. The Yukon is one of the greatest rivers of the world and ranks with the Mississippi. It discharges one-third more water per annum than the Mississippi and is constantly navigated in season from its mouth, at St. Michael, to Whitehorse, in the Yukon Territory, Canada, a distance of 2,164 miles. It is only 1,830 miles from St. Paul to New Orleans and 1,930 miles from Pittsburgh to New Orleans. Alaska has more than 6,000 miles of inland navigable rivers which may be connected with the south coast harbors by the railroad provided for in the bill before the House.

	Miles.
Yukon River, navigable for.....	2,164
Tanana River, navigable for.....	275
Kantishna River, navigable for.....	200
Innoko River, navigable for.....	370
Iditarod River, navigable for.....	320
Koyukuk River, navigable for.....	620
Kuskokwim River, navigable for.....	530
	4,479

This interior system of waterways is now and since 1900 has been navigated by a fleet of large, well-built, flat-bottomed Mississippi River packet steamers, many of which push from two to four barges loaded with machinery, merchandise, provisions, and passengers far up the interior rivers. The system, however, is meager and unsatisfactory. The first drawback to its efficiency is that the Yukon discharges its waters into Bering Sea at St. Michael, and the heavy drift ice in that sea

does not permit the ocean steamers from San Francisco and Seattle to reach the transfer point at St. Michael till June. The Yukon and Tanana are open for navigation by May 10, but it is a month later before the ocean freight can be put into St. Michael, and a fortnight later before it gets into the Yukon for distribution. Here, then, is more than a month at the beginning of a very short summer season lost to transportation. Then freight dare not enter the rivers unless it can get to the distributing point, a distance of 1,175 miles to Fairbanks, before the freeze-up in the fall, and two weeks or more are lost then. The open season for the distribution of freight on these rivers would be extended at least six weeks if the distribution could be made downstream from a central point, like Fairbanks, beginning immediately on the opening of the rivers about May 10. Such a method of distribution from such a central point would extend the efficient period of river transportation at least one-fourth longer per annum than is enjoyed under the present method.

Alaska has spacious and ice-free harbors on the south coast and 400 miles in the interior a great river system now capable of distributing freight for four months only, but no transportation line connecting them. Let that link be supplied and at once it increases the efficiency of the river system one-fourth and adds to the railroad mileage quite 6,000 miles of river transportation.

FORESTS.

There are two forest reserves—the Tongass and Chugach—in Alaska, which practically cover the coastal front from Ketchikan to Cook Inlet. These two reservations contain 41,815 square miles—a greater area than that of the State of Indiana, or Kentucky, or Ohio, or any of the lesser States. They are reported by the Forest Service to contain over \$5,000,000,000 feet of timber, valued at \$148,750,000. It is estimated that even a greater amount and of a greater value exists in the Sushina, the Tanana, the Yukon, and other interior valleys. The Territory thus has a timber covering of a greater value than \$300,000,000. Much of it is saw timber, more of it is pulpwood, and all of it is valuable for fuel, house building, and mining.

ANIMALS—WILD AND DOMESTICATED.

Alaska is the best big-game country left in the two Americas. The Alaska moose, of which thousands roam the higher valleys, is the most kingly of the deer family, extinct or alive. Herds of caribou roam over the barren highlands like the herds of buffalo on the Western plains a century ago. White mountain sheep in large bands live on the interior mountains, where the snowfall is light, while mountain goats frequent the wind-swept peaks of the coast range. Polar bear, walrus, and innumerable seal and other animal life live along the Arctic coasts, while black, brown, grizzly, and Kodiak bear inhabit the southern mountains and fish along the salmon streams. The great Kodiak bear in the Washington Zoological Garden typifies the superior size and wealth of Alaskan land and sea mammals.

During the bright dry winter in the interior of Alaska our hunters find plenty of prairie chicken, one of the five varieties of grouse which are abundant there; flocks of ptarmigan are found everywhere from mountain peak to the lower valleys. The raven, owl, hawk, Canada jay, and other winter birds keep us company in the interior, while along the coast the list is greater. But when spring arrives and the snow melts—when the lakes and rivers are opened—then the migratory bird life arrives from the Southland in numbers not to be computed. Swan, geese, brant, ducks of every variety, robins, swallows, martins, and humming birds fill the forests with song and spring cheer. It is estimated that 200 species of birds then inhabit Alaska, and it is truly a birds' paradise.

In the caribou and reindeer herds which now roam over the highlands of Alaska there is an economic promise of the first magnitude. The wild Alaska caribou and the domesticated Lapland reindeer belong to the same species. In 1891 the United States Bureau of Education, under Dr. Sheldon Jackson, imported a few reindeer from Siberia, and later a few more, and some skilled herders from Lapland. Altogether about 1,280 reindeer were landed on Alaskan ranges, where the herds now aggregate 38,000. The imported reindeer, like the native caribou, live exclusively on the mosses and lichens gathered on the high mountain sides above agricultural possibilities or the grazing lands of cattle. They do not require feeding at any period of the year, increase rapidly, and make fine meat for the market. Their skins are valuable, and the herds solve the problem of meat transportation in the winter season, for they can be driven over the highest and coldest mountain ranges to market without other food than what they readily pick up along the mountain trails. The first ex-

portation of reindeer meat from Alaska was made to Seattle in 1911, and consisted of 185 carcasses, weighing 18,750 pounds, which sold readily for a good price in the market. It is estimated that herds of 2,000,000 of these fine food animals can be permanently maintained in Alaska and that they will support a stock-herding population of 100,000 people and afford a meat supply for a million more.

CLIMATE.

The most serious objection made to the passage of the bill before the House has the least basis of fact to support it. That objection is that the climate of Alaska is so harsh and rigorous that people can not live there in comfort, can not raise gardens or agricultural products sufficient to subsist on, and that a railroad could not be operated in the winter even if constructed with Government aid. The data with respect to the climate of Alaska is so abundant, so exact, and so at variance with the general opinion, that it is offered to the House in the hope that this objection can be effectually and finally disposed of.

North of the Equator, and, of course, in the United States and in Alaska, the date of the winter solstice, December 21, is the shortest day of the year. The sun on that date has reached its farthest point south and begins its return journey toward the north. On the date of the vernal equinox, March 21, it has reached the mid-point of its northern journey, and on the date of the summer solstice, June 21, it reaches its most northern point, stops, and begins its retreat. On September 22 it crosses the Equator on the autumnal journey south, and continues its retreat to the winter solstice on December 22. Those movements of the sun's light and shade produce the four seasons—spring, summer, fall, and winter—and determine the periods in which vegetation may grow for beautifying the earth and providing food for men and animals. We are so familiar with these movements of the sun, with the resulting day and night and the seasons of the year, that few people give consideration to them beyond their effect in the production of their crops. Twice each year, when the sun crosses the Equator, the length of the day and night is everywhere equal, but when the sun is north or south of the Equator days and nights are never equal, though at the end of the solar year the total amount of day and night is everywhere the same. In short, every spot on the earth's surface, in the course of the solar year has the same amount of day and night. Your attention is now directed to a graphic chart representing the years division of sunshine and shadow at Fairbanks, in the Tanana Valley, the central distributing point in the interior of Alaska. Fairbanks is on latitude 65° north, and on December 22, the date of the winter solstice, the low southern sun skirts the horizon for only two hours and sinks out of sight. It is in the date of the northern midnight.

Immediately after December 22 the sun begins to rise, and from day to day its course across the southern heavens is higher, until on March 21 the day and night at Fairbanks are exactly equal in length. But we are now to have compensation for its long absence during the winter, and it continues to rise until on June 21 its highest culmination is reached and the Tanana Valley is ablaze with 22 hours of sunshine and heat. Not only does nature thus compensate us for the hours of sunshine lost in the winter, but she puts vigor and activity into plant life in an equal measure. Our crops have the same number of sunlit hours for growth that similar crops have in more southern climes, though in a less number of days. In 100 days, between May 20 and September 1, the growing season in the Tanana Valley, the sun shines 1,800 hours, while during the same 100-day period in Oklahoma it shines but 1,500 hours, or one-fifth less time than in the Tanana. For every five days' sunshine and heat in Oklahoma during that 100 days the Tanana Valley has six. Our crops grow in equal proportion—where Oklahoma crops grow five units ours grow six in the same period of time.

During May, June, July, and August, the summer season of the Tanana, the whole earth is ablaze with the glory of the solstitial sun. During that period the Tanana Valley has more hours of sunshine than sunny California, and more hours of summer than Ohio or any other State in the Union. The gardeners and farmers are at work early and late, crops grow vigorously in the long hours of sunshine and heat, and the valleys, the birch-clad hills, and the mountains of the northland respond to the magic touch of the life-giving sunlight.

The summer—no sweeter was ever;
The sunshiny woods all athrill;
The grayling aleap in the river;
The bighorn asleep on the hill;
The strong life that never knows harness;
The wilds where the caribou call;
The freshness, the freedom, the farness;
'Tis I who do long for it all.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. Mr. Chairman, may I interrupt the gentleman right there to ask him a question about the tempera-

ture in the valley during the crop-growing season? How does it compare with the temperature in the State of Oklahoma?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I will come to that in a few moments. But during that period, from the 21st day of March to the 22d day of September—six months—we have the summer, and during that period of time on the latitude of Fairbanks, Alaska, we have 70 per cent of total sunshine out of the total time. There is only 30 per cent of night during those six months and 70 per cent of sunshine, and the sun shines just as hot there as it does anywhere, and when the mosquitoes get at you in the brush and the sun pours down upon you you often wish you were back in Oklahoma where it is cool.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. I understand that the same percentage of sunshine obtains in latitudes farther north from Fairbanks, but the question of temperature is just as vital to the crop-growing development as the duration of the sunshine.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Fairbanks and the Tanana Valley are on the same northern latitude exactly as Norway, Sweden, and Finland, and the northern Provinces of Russia, where such vast quantities of wheat are produced. In Norway, Sweden, and Finland more than 10,000,000 people are supported, mostly by agriculture. The climate is similar, and I have the statistics here, and will produce them for the gentleman's edification in a very short time.

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

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Certainly.

Mr. ESCH. The gentleman's argument about sunshine is very convincing, but does not the production of crops in the Tanana Valley depend upon its elevation above sea level?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Somewhat, perhaps. The town of Fairbanks in the center of the Tanana Valley is 1,100 miles from the sea down that river, and the town is 512 feet above sea level. It is a very low, wide valley.

Between the 21st day of March and the 22d day of September—the summer six months—the sun shines exactly 70 per cent of the total time, including both day and night. Out of 4,392 hours of time, day and night, the sun shines 3,074 hours. No valley in the United States has that many hours' sunshine in the growing season, and these long hours of sunlight, heat, and growing force give the Tanana its wonderful climate and great agricultural productivity.

THE NORTHERN PACIFIC OCEAN CURRENT.

The Gulf stream of the Atlantic carries the tropical waters flowing from the Caribbean Sea into the Gulf across the Atlantic upon the coasts of the British Isles and thence to the western and northern shores of Norway and Sweden. Greenland lies on the same northern latitude as Norway and Sweden, and its continental ice cap graphically demonstrates the condition which would exist in Norway and Sweden if the warming influence of the Gulf stream was withdrawn. The British Isles lie as far north as Labrador—the difference between the genial climate of England and the Arctic climate of Labrador is the result of the influence of the warm ocean current on the English climate.

The equatorial waters of the North Pacific Ocean current, the Kuro-siwo, or "Black Stream," of the Japanese, does for Alaska exactly what the Gulf Stream does for Norway and Sweden. The North Pacific current takes its rise in the tropical waters north of the Equator. It follows the course of the sun westward until the coasts of Japan deflect it north and eastward. One branch enters Bering Sea and passes thence into the Arctic, but the great body flows eastward, along the southern shores of the Aleutian Islands, until it strikes the continental shores of southern Alaska. Thence it is deflected southward, past the fir-clad hills of British Columbia, Washington, and Oregon, to turn westward again off southern California, and gather new heat from the Tropics as it flows again westward on its great circuit. This wheel current of the North Pacific is greater in volume than the Gulf Stream of the Atlantic, and its powerful influence, added to that of the long summer days and the heat of the solstitial sun pouring into the valleys of Alaska, is responsible for the genial summer climate of that region. On the same latitude in Norway and Sweden, for exactly the same reasons, there is the same summer climate. The mean annual temperature of the old and the new capitals of Alaska compares favorably with that of the capitals of Norway, Sweden, and Russia.

Mean annual temperature at different capitals.

	Degrees.
Sitka, Alaska.....	43.4
Juneau, Alaska.....	42.3
Christiania, Norway.....	41.5
Stockholm, Sweden.....	42.3
St. Petersburg, Russia.....	39.6

The mean annual temperature of Juneau and Stockholm is exactly the same, while Sitka's mean annual is nearly 1 degree

I now show the House an official Weather Bureau map of Alaska, and on it are shown the lines of the average temperature for the three winter months. Some gentleman wanted to know about the temperature of the winter months. January, February, and March are the cold months in Alaska, and here is a map showing the average temperatures of these three winter months. The average temperature of the region of which Fairbanks is the center during those three winter months is 10 degrees below zero, while above it you find a line of 15 degrees below, so that the average annual temperature of those three winter months ranges between 10 and 15 degrees below zero.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. What are the extremes?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I will show you that in a few moments. I am showing you this map for a moment for the purpose of showing you the effect of the Japanese Current on temperatures in that country. I call attention to the fact that a branch of that current enters Bering Sea and warms that interior coast and flows toward the north, and it will be noticed that the isothermal lines are tilted upward. The highest line runs most northwest and southeast, and although Fairbanks is north of Dawson, the lower temperature of 15 degrees runs through Dawson. Dawson is about fifteen or sixteen hundred feet above sea level.

It is a thousand feet above the level of Fairbanks and the Tanana Valley and it is behind a second range of mountains. It is in the cold region.

Mr. FESS. Is that due to elevation or latitude?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. It is due to both.

Mr. STAFFORD. I notice some minor red lines. Are those higher temperatures to the southward?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman mention what those temperatures are?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The lower one is 30° above zero; the next is 20, the next 10, and the next is the zero line. Then comes 10 below, and 15 below. Now I call attention to the three summer months in Alaska on this upper map. The annual average temperature in the interior of Alaska is 55° above zero. That is the annual average temperature given by the Weather Bureau in the summer months.

Mr. FESS. What are those months?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. June, July, and August. Now I want to call attention—

Mr. FERRIS. Will it interrupt the gentleman if I should ask a question there?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. No.

Mr. FERRIS. I want to ask the gentleman if it was or was not true that in each and every month in Alaska they have frost, and sometimes even a hard, killing frost?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. No; that is not true.

Mr. FERRIS. Do you know Prof. Chubbuck and Prof. Piper?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I do.

Mr. FERRIS. They are in charge of the four Alaskan stations.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. No, sir; Prof. Georgeson is in charge.

Mr. FERRIS. Do you know him?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I do, very well, indeed.

Mr. FERRIS. If Prof. Georgeson, Prof. Chubbuck, and Prof. Piper in a report stated that there was a killing frost on July 31, August 8, August 15, and August 25, and on September 8, would that be true?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I think it would be true.

Mr. FERRIS. At Fairbanks?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. No; not at Fairbanks; it would not be true.

Mr. FERRIS. Well, at Copper Center?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Copper Center is, of course, very much higher than Fairbanks.

Mr. FERRIS. Is it true of Kodiak?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. No; it is not.

Mr. FERRIS. I will say to the gentleman frankly there is a report that states that.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I would like to see it.

Mr. FERRIS. I will present it.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I now show the lowest temperatures ever recorded in Alaska, and a map showing the lowest temperatures ever recorded in the United States, and I will call attention to that in a moment.

Mr. BROCKSON. In the summer months?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. No; in the winter months.

Mr. FESS. The gentleman's remarks are luminous and we enjoy them very much, and the gentleman will understand that some questions are asked for information.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I appreciate that.

Mr. FESS. What are the growing months?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The gentleman asks what the growing months are?

Mr. FESS. For agriculture?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The farmers begin to put in their crops the latter part of May, and the growing months are the latter part of May, June, July, August, and September.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Will the gentleman tell us what they raise?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. We raise the finest potatoes in the world. We raise barley and oats which can not be beaten in any climate.

Mr. FERRIS. The gentleman has given investigation to this matter—

A MEMBER. Let the gentleman get through with his statement.

Mr. FERRIS. If the gentleman declines to yield, all right.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I do not decline to yield.

Mr. FERRIS. The gentleman said a moment ago that they raise the best potatoes in the world.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes, sir.

Mr. FERRIS. I would like to ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that the agricultural report from the men in charge of the stations does not show that it is almost impossible to sell those kinds of potatoes at all on the market in Fairbanks because they are in such a watery condition, and that the price of potatoes from the States are not even double or treble the price?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. No; that is not true.

Mr. FERRIS. Does the gentleman deny the statements made in the reports from Alaska?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I have not seen such reports.

Mr. FERRIS. I will show them to the gentleman.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. When they are presented they will probably be found to be correct.

Mr. FERRIS. The gentleman knows the facts, no doubt.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I am not raising potatoes.

Mr. FERRIS. Does not the gentleman say that the potatoes raised in Alaska are not watery and inferior in value to potatoes brought in from the outside?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The gentleman says nothing of the kind. The gentleman says that when the land is first prepared for crops, and when the potatoes are first put in the potatoes are not so good as they are later, when the ground has been tamed, just as it was in the case of Illinois and Indiana and Ohio, where the potatoes were not good until the ground was first tamed.

Mr. FERRIS. Then the gentleman insists that the potatoes raised in Alaska are as good now as those brought in from the outside?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. No; but they are just as good as those that were raised in Indiana, Illinois, and Ohio, for the same identical reason. Those raised on ground which has been cultivated two or three years are just as good and even better than any shipped from the outside, and sell for better prices.

Mr. FERRIS. Is not the price of potatoes from the States higher than that of potatoes raised in Alaska?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I will state that the price of potatoes from the States was higher for a few years.

Mr. FERRIS. How is it now?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The prices of outside potatoes and potatoes raised in Alaska are about the same, as our land is becoming more tame and susceptible of better cultivation.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Did the gentleman finish the statement as to what is raised there?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. No; not at all.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Do they raise flax there?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I do not think anybody ever tried to raise flax, but we raise oats, and barley, and rye, and wheat, and potatoes, and the finest celery in the world. We can beat Kalamazoo for celery, and we also raise garden vegetables of all kinds.

Now, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] will undoubtedly find in some report a statement that we can not raise tomatoes. I have seen that report, but when Mr. Chubbuck comes up there and stays around for a little while and goes out without full information he may say we could not raise tomatoes. But we do raise tomatoes and we raise them to perfection, although it was thought at first we could not do so in

that country, and the earliest reports from the experiment stations will show that. Now, of course, some of those reports from the experiment stations state one thing and some state another, unless you confine your research to recent dates. But if the gentleman from Oklahoma will take the last report of our experiment station at Fairbanks and those at other places I will stand by them.

Mr. LINDBERGH. How about fruits?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Good. Wild berries grow in great variety. Alaska is the natural home of the cranberry. We have great cranberry bogs all through that Tanana country. Of course they do not grow very high. They are low-bush cranberries generally. We have a great many other berries and small fruits, including strawberries, currants, and berries of that kind. Then, of course, in our gardens a great many more varieties of berries are raised.

Mr. WILLIS. I just wanted to suggest, in answer to the inquiry of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LINDBERGH] and the inquiry of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH], that if they will get the annual report of the Alaska Experiment Station for the year 1910—a document which is available—they will find very complete information on the question of growing potatoes and other products, and also on the growing of fruits, bearing out completely what Judge WICKERSHAM has stated.

Mr. LINDBERGH. I did not ask the question to object at all, but simply for information.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes; I understand. And if those gentlemen anxious for the truth in this matter will go to room 115 in the Senate Office Building and see the fine exhibit there of grain and vegetables from the Tanana Valley and other parts of Alaska, they will be amazed at it. Also of fruits. It is very instructive and convincing, and you should all see it.

Mr. SLOAN and Mr. THACHER rose.

The CHAIRMAN. To whom does the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I will yield to either one.

Mr. THACHER. The gentleman refers to the growth of cranberries in Alaska. Are they wild or cultivated?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. They are wild.

Mr. THACHER. Does not the frost interfere with them?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. No, sir. They spring up abundantly, and they grow wild everywhere.

Mr. THACHER. I come from a cranberry country, and I am interested in the subject.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Our cranberries are excellent, and we have a great field for them in the Tanana country.

Mr. SLOAN. On the same topic, as to the growth of cranberries being favored, is it also true as to the growth of wild turkeys?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Well, we have ravens up there. Maybe that would satisfy the gentleman. [Laughter.]

Mr. LOBECK. There seem to be some ravens here. [Renewed laughter.]

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Notice that not in all the years in which the Weather Bureau has maintained stations in the interior of Alaska has the thermometer been officially caught "falling as low as 79° or 80° below zero" for six months or any other period. The lowest it has ever gone in the Tanana Valley, at Fairbanks, in a period of seven years' observation was when it once went down to 65° below zero. Your attention is called to the official Weather Bureau chart, giving the "lowest temperatures ever recorded at points in Alaska." You will notice that 65° below is the coldest ever recorded in the Tanana Valley.

I do this for the purpose of showing that there is no spot in all Alaska where the temperature for six months, or one month, or one minute, ever reaches 79° or 80° below zero. It is amazing that the trustees of this great trust in Alaska should make such statements upon the floor of this House, or anywhere else, when they could get accurate information from the Weather Bureau to show what the truth is.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I think the gentleman was about to tell the House the extreme ranges of temperature, as shown by the Weather Bureau observations.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I am going to do it right now.

Mr. BATHRICK. Even if the temperature was as low as 79° or 80° below zero, would it represent any more serious obstacle to agriculture than is produced by 40° to 50° below zero in the northern part of continental United States?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I do not think so. There are no crops in the ground at that season of the year, and it makes no difference to the next year's crop what the temperature is then.

But that statement as to the temperature being 79° or 80° below zero does not happen to be true. I now call the attention of the House to this official Weather Bureau map, showing the lowest temperatures ever observed in the Territory of Alaska. They are not average temperatures, they are not temperatures which happen every day in the winter or every day in some months in the winter, or any day regularly in Alaska, but they are the exceptionally low temperatures which have been noted by the weather observers in the Territory of Alaska in all the years they have had weather observations there.

I call your attention to the fact that at Fairbanks, Alaska, in the Tanana Valley, the lowest temperature ever recorded was 65° below zero. In all the years that they have kept the Weather Bureau reports there 65° below zero is the lowest that was ever recorded in the Tanana Valley.

Your attention is now called to the Weather Bureau chart showing "the lowest temperatures ever observed" in the United States, and especially to the fact that a large area in Montana is shown to have recorded 60° below zero, or within 5° of the coldest day ever observed in the Tanana Valley. Fifty degrees below zero was observed over the northern part of Montana, North Dakota, Minnesota, and Wisconsin, while 40° below spreads over a greater territory, reaching as far south as Colorado and covering the northern parts of New York, New Hampshire, and Maine. Why the minority report added 14 or 15 degrees to the single lowest temperature ever recorded in the Tanana Valley, and then by innuendo extended the 79° or 80° below zero thus falsely compounded over a winter period of six months in every year, is for the minority report to explain. The statement has no support in fact or in any official data reported by the Weather Bureau.

Mr. EVANS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. EVANS. I should like to ask, Is it not a fact that that territory which you have pointed out, where the thermometer sometimes reaches 50° to 60° below zero, is to-day the best wheat-growing country in America?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. It is; and the Government is spending immense sums of money in that very region in the Reclamation Service, extending the growth of wheat and oats and other cereals throughout those parts of Montana and other northern parts of the United States.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Is it not a fact that the moisture is held in the ground by deep freezing?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Undoubtedly.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. And that the colder the weather the more certain the ground is to contain a sufficient amount of moisture to grow crops in the following summer?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Undoubtedly.

Mr. BRYAN. Is it not a fact that the Government donated a larger price for the building of a railroad through that territory you are now discussing than you are now asking for a railroad in Alaska?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Very many times more.

Mr. BRYAN. And then did not own the railroad?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. And then did not own the railroad. Now, you will see from this Weather Bureau chart that it sometimes gets below zero even in the State where my friend [Mr. DAVENPORT] who signed the minority report has his home. I find that it gets 20° below zero in Oklahoma. [Laughter.] That does not prevent the people of the State of Oklahoma from raising good crops the next year, any more than 65° below zero, as an exceptionally low temperature, prevents the people of the Tanana Valley from raising crops.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. What is the record on the lack of rainfall and drought as compared to Oklahoma?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I guess the gentleman knows as much about that as I do, and maybe more. We never have a drought in our country, never; and we do not have any chinch bugs nor grasshoppers. [Laughter.] And we never have the fever nor the ague, nor a hundred other luxuries which my friend down in Oklahoma has.

Mr. DAVENPORT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. With pleasure.

Mr. DAVENPORT. I should like to ask the gentleman if the reason why they never have any chinch bugs or grasshoppers is not because during the greater portion of the year they can not thrive there?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I have no doubt the gentleman can say that.

Mr. DAVENPORT. Because they would have no grass to live on there, even if they wanted to.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I have no doubt the gentleman can say that.

Mr. DAVENPORT. Is not that the fact, that that is true?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Why, certainly not.

Mr. DAVENPORT. What is the fact, then? How many months in the year can a grasshopper or any other living being procure anything to live upon in the Territory of Alaska, take it in its entirety?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Just about as many months as he could in the gentleman's district.

Mr. DAVENPORT. I should like to ask the gentleman if he expects to pass his bill upon the theory that my colleague and I have signed minority views against his bill? Does he expect that argument will take him through?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Not at all, Mr. Chairman, but I do feel that I am under some obligations to people in my Territory to answer the unkind and unfair statements in the minority views. Somebody might believe them if I did not. [Laughter.]

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Chairman, I accept the criticism, but I would like to ask the gentleman if he thinks the criticism of my colleague and myself will pass his bill.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Oh, the gentleman does not want information.

Mr. DAVENPORT. I want information and am trying to get the gentleman to give it to the House, but he is indulging in criticism of those who signed the minority report.

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

Mr. DAVENPORT. I ask the gentleman if he expects to pass his bill by a criticism of my colleague and myself?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Perhaps it might be of some assistance. [Laughter.]

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Certainly.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DAVENPORT] just made the observation that it was so cold in Alaska that grasshoppers could not live so as to produce anything for the people to live on. I would like to know what the grasshoppers produce in Oklahoma that people live on. It might have some bearing on the high cost of living. [Laughter.]

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Chairman, I did not say anything of the kind, and I do not think the reporter's notes will so show. But if that will have anything to do with taking \$35,000,000 out of the Treasury to construct a railroad in Alaska, I will bear it with greatest cheerfulness.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Minority views seemed to forget that no country in the world raises or attempts to raise crops when the temperature is "79° or 80° below zero," or 25° below, or even 1° below. But Saskatchewan, Alberta, Manitoba, Montana and other parts of the United States, and Norway, Sweden, Finland, and the northern Provinces of Russia raise crops during the sunlit solstitial summer, though in the winter it sometimes happens the temperature descends to 60° or 65° below zero. What difference does it make to the summer crops how cold it was last winter, or whether it was 65° or 80° below zero?

Railroads in Canada, in a climate substantially the same as that in the Tanana Valley, are operated every day in the year. The Tanana Mines Railway, 45 miles in length, from Fairbanks to the mines, has been operated every day in the year for 10 years, and Fairbanks automobiles run daily during both winter and summer from Fairbanks to the mines in opposition to it. The White Pass & Yukon Railway runs from Skagway across the Coast Range to Whitehorse; and the Dawson Railway, out to its mines, never misses a trip, under identically the same conditions that would confront the operation of a trunk railroad from the coast to the Tanana Valley. There is no climatic or any other reason why a railroad can not be operated from the seacoast to Fairbanks both in the winter and in the summer.

AGRICULTURE.

But "Minority views" declares that even if a railroad can be operated to the interior of Alaska, no agricultural products can be grown there with which to support population. Assuming that the interior terminal of any road built under this bill will be at Fairbanks, in the Tanana Valley, what is the fact about the agricultural capacity and value of that valley?

When farmers think of Alaska it is with a view of its capacity for agriculture; a banker only thinks of its ability to support his business; the manufacturer inquires what it will take in manufactured products; and the merchants judge it by its statistics of trade and commerce. There are those who now object to building a railroad into Alaska because it will not raise corn or watermelons. If their idea of the value of agriculture had been followed there would be no farmers in Norway, Sweden, or Finland, in Manitoba, Alberta, or Saskatchewan, and would never be any in Alaska. Primarily

Alaska is not an agricultural country. It has other more showy attractions, and farmers have been slow to realize the solid returns which agriculture affords in this fertile northern valley. The Tanana Valley is a good agricultural region, compared with the Provinces of Canada, and Norway, Sweden, and Finland, but, unlike them, it is also rich in minerals, which always offer a hope of a speedier return to labor than farming on the frontier.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Certainly.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman allow me to put, in brief, what I apprehend to be the situation? As I understand it, the railroad difficulty in going to Fairbanks is simply to get through the ridge of mountains close to it. If that is tunneled through so that you can pass through it the railroad is without difficulty.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Without difficulty, because the snowfall is only about 3 feet and very light. When you put your foot down you go to the bottom of it; there is no substance to it.

Mr. HARDY. The mountain ridge next to the seacoast is only 28 or 30 miles inland.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. It is 20 miles from Skagway to the top of the mountain, and in 110 miles you are at White Horse, on a navigable river, by that route. The distance from the coast to the mountain range varies along the coast.

Mr. HARDY. How far is it from the seacoast to the top of the ridge?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. About 20 miles at Skagway.

Mr. HARDY. How far is it from Cordova?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The railroad follows the coast line around to the mouth of the Copper River and then up the Copper River.

Mr. HARDY. How far is the mountain ridge back of the seacoast?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. It is right at the seacoast; the big mountains are not 20 miles back.

Mr. HARDY. How far is it from Seward?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. There is substantially no mountain range back of Seward; the grade does not exceed 1,800 feet at the highest place, and the railway goes through that region at an elevation of about a thousand feet—1,000 or 1,100 feet.

Mr. HARDY. At Cordova there was talk of tunneling through that mountain range, was there not?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. At Valdez.

Mr. HARDY. How long a tunnel would that be?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I do not know the length, but probably a mile. There was another tunnel proposition suggested from Portage Bay to strike the present line running north from Seward, and that would be 2 miles long, I am told.

Mr. HARDY. There is a road owned by private owners from Cordova and one from Seward, but none from Valdez.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. None from Valdez.

Mr. HARDY. Which is the central point.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman compares the possibilities of agriculture in Alaska, in the Tanana Valley, with Norway and Sweden and Saskatchewan. Will he tell me whether the ground is frozen in other countries as deep as it is in Alaska?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I do not think the ground is frozen as deep in those other countries as in some parts of Alaska.

Mr. WHITE. Is it not a fact that the ground freezes in Alaska to the depth of 50 or 60 feet?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. In some parts of Alaska; yes.

Really the only solid argument against the passage of the bill before the House comes from those who base it upon the lack of agricultural value in Alaska. They forget that railroads are often built for other reasons than hauling corn. For instance, Arizona may not raise as much oats, corn, and wheat as one county in Kansas, but her mineral production in 1909 was \$34,217,651. So it is with Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, and Nevada. The mining States make little attempt to raise agricultural products, except for local market—they add to the wealth of the country by mining. Alaska is typically a mining country—the richest in the world—but it has agricultural capacity sufficient to feed a population equal to that of Norway and Sweden.

Your attention is now directed to a large 6-foot photograph of the town of Fairbanks, situated on the banks of the Tanana River on the north side of the Tanana Valley. This picture gives a correct view of the Tanana Valley, and looking into the center of the picture you are looking due south. The valley here is 50 miles wide; it is well watered, well timbered, wide,

flat, and fertile. The soil is a silt brought down in ages past from underneath the great glaciers which ground the mountains far to the south and which the ancient glacial floods deposited over this wide and now fertile valley. As the glaciers ground the mountains down both gradually disappeared, but the beautiful valley remained well fitted for the habitation of the tribes of men who are now settling there. The Mississippi and Ohio Valleys were filled by a great northeastern glacier, which leveled Illinois and filled these valleys with rich soil. In exactly the same way, by exactly the same force, the Tanana Valley was filled with exactly the same rich soil as the Mississippi. It is wide and fertile, with a soil of silt and loam, productive and capable of supporting a large farming and stock-raising population.

In the presentation of his objections to Alaska as a land of homes and farms the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DAVENPORT] quoted from the statement of Prof. Piper made before the Senate Committee on Territories to show that the agricultural capacity of the great interior valley was low. The professor's statements were not enthusiastic, but on turning to his evidence, on page 551, we learn the reason for his conservatism, for on inquiry he testified:

Senator WALSH. What is the character of your information from the farmers in the Fairbanks neighborhood?

Prof. PIPER. Only what has been published in the reports.

Senator WALSH. Generally speaking, what is that?

Prof. PIPER. Generally favorable; that is, vegetables do exceedingly well. Potatoes yield up to the neighborhood of 300 bushels per acre. The quality, where they are properly grown, is said to be very good.

And on page 549, Senate hearings, he is quoted as follows:

There can be no question from these results that there is a possibility of the production of grains in the agricultural lands of Alaska. Just here I may say that the amount of tillable land in the interior of Alaska has been estimated by most of the men who have attempted to make an estimate at about 30,000 square miles. The total area of agricultural lands in Alaska has been estimated at 100,000 square miles, of which it is assumed that at least one-third is tillable, and that of the tillable lands probably more than two-thirds is in the interior. So there is a very large area of land which is capable of raising profitable crops of grain and would furnish a large amount of freight.

And on page 547 the professor admits:

I know nothing of the interior except from the agricultural reports which have been published and some miscellaneous information that has come to me from time to time.

He then pessimizes professorially, because it cost the experiment station \$200 an acre to clear a birch forest off a south sloping hill at the experiment station at Fairbanks. Well, that is some timber, anyway.

If we have timber enough of that kind in Alaska, we ought to be thankful. I called attention some time ago to the fact that the Forest Bureau figured that we have nearly \$150,000,000 worth of timber in Alaska forest reserves, and that we have \$150,000,000 more in the interior, but it does not cost \$200 an acre to clear it. Everybody knows that when the Government starts in to clear land it hires the highest-priced men at the time of year when they are receiving the highest wages for work in the mines, but an old farmer would clear that by burning it off and knocking the stumps over next year for about \$10 an acre.

Now let us hear the evidence of men who are competent to speak of the area and capacity of the agricultural land in Alaska from actual observation and experience. Prof. C. C. Georgeson is now, and for more than 10 years last past has been, the special agent of the Department of Agriculture in charge of Alaska experiment stations. He resides in Alaska, and has given this subject his constant attention. In a special address before the National Geographic Society in Washington, found in its July, 1909, magazine, at page 676, he makes these declarations about the area and capacity of agriculture in Alaska:

AREA OF AGRICULTURAL LANDS.

Alaska has not been surveyed. We have therefore no definite data as to the actual area which can be utilized for agricultural purposes, but I believe that the following estimated figures are approximately correct: The Yukon Valley and the valleys tributary thereto, except the Tanana, 30,000 square miles; the Tanana Valley and its tributaries, 15,000 square miles; the Copper River Valley and its tributaries, 15,000 square miles; the Susitna and the Matanuska Valleys, 15,000 square miles; the valleys of the Kuskokwim and the Nushagak Rivers, 15,000 square miles; and the coast region, 10,000 square miles; total, 100,000 square miles, or in round numbers about one-sixth of the area of the entire Territory. I do not mean to say all of this is good plow land, but I mean that there is at least 100,000 square miles in Alaska which can be utilized for culture and for pasture, and, as a matter of fact, the area is probably very much larger since a considerable of the mountain territory will afford pasture. Perhaps these data can be realized more fully if we compare them with similar data of better-known areas. The States of New York and Pennsylvania have together an aggregate area of 94,000 square miles, which is less than the agricultural area in Alaska. The combined areas of Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New Jersey, Delaware, Connecticut, and Maryland do not equal the agricultural area of Alaska.

WHAT POPULATION CAN THE TERRITORY SUPPORT?

In the face of these facts it is fair to infer that Alaska can support a permanent population. It would, of course, be too much to assume that Alaska can support a population equal to that of the States mentioned. In 1900, for instance, Massachusetts had a population of 348 persons to the square mile, New Jersey had 252 persons per square mile, New York had 152 per square mile, and Pennsylvania had 140 per square mile. It must not be forgotten, however, that these two large States have extensive mountain and lake areas which are not populated at all, but which are nevertheless counted in these density figures. But is it too much to say that the agricultural area of Alaska can support and will eventually support a population of 30 persons per square mile? This is but little more than the average density of the population of the United States, exclusive of Alaska and Hawaii, in 1900, but including our mountains, deserts, and forest areas, which are now uninhabited. The country which affords the best parallel to Alaska in point of latitude and climate is Finland. It is bounded on the south by latitude 60° and on the north by latitude 70°. The main body of Alaska lies within these latitudes, though the two long arms of southeastern and southwestern Alaska extend some 8° farther south. Now, Finland has a total area of 148,000 square miles, or, in round numbers, one-fourth the area of Alaska. But one-third of Finland consists of marsh land and inland lakes and another one-third is forest land. The agricultural area therefore, including the area covered by streams, fawns, etc., does not exceed 50,000 square miles. But Finland supports a population of 3,000,000 people, or 60 persons per square mile of area utilized for agricultural purposes. Would it be unreasonable to suppose that the agricultural area of Alaska can, and eventually will, support an equal population of 60 persons to the square mile? If it is not, then Alaska can support a population of 6,000,000 people. But 3,000,000 may be deemed a conservative estimate.

We have reasons for believing that Alaska may equal Finland in agricultural production. Temperature is the chief controlling factor in the production of agricultural crops, and the temperatures, both in the coast region and in the interior of Alaska during the growing season, compare favorably with the recorded temperatures of Finland. The available data of the two countries are, however, not comparable, owing to the difference in method of recording the data. In Alaska we base the average temperature on the recorded daily maximum and minimum temperatures; that is, an average temperature which is the mean of these two, while the recorded temperatures of Finland are based on three observations taken at 7 in the morning, at 2 in the afternoon, and at 9 in the evening. While these data include the maximum temperature of the day, which usually occurs about 2 o'clock, they do not include the minimum temperature, which occurs usually some time after midnight, and the mean, based on the three recorded figures, is higher than it would be if the minimum temperature was taken into account. Owing to this difference we can not draw any accurate comparison, but the facts are we grow vegetables and grains with about the same success that these are grown in Finland. Finland is a noted dairy country. The agricultural exports consist chiefly of butter, cheese, and beef from slaughtered dairy animals. In Alaska cattle feed can be grown in any quantity and it can therefore also become a great dairy country.

DRAWBACKS TO SETTLEMENT.

As yet there are but few farmers in Alaska, and these are chiefly disappointed prospectors who have found that they can make more money raising products to supply the local market than they can mining. Nor is there any immediate prospect that the country will be settled with a farming population. Congress has generously enlarged the homestead in Alaska to 320 acres, but even this does not attract prospective farmers except to a very limited extent. The reason is that it is too expensive for a farmer in the States to move his family and equipment to the northland and there begin as a pioneer. Lack of transportation facilities is a barrier at once both to the influx of people and to the export of such produce as they might raise. Until the transportation problem is solved, Alaska will have but few immigrants aside from those who come for the purposes of trade and mining; but these conditions will be remedied as the resources of the country are developed. The rich deposits of gold, copper, and coal are bound to be developed, and with this development there will be a general advance, not only in transportation conditions, but there will be a corresponding growth in the number who take advantage of the agricultural possibilities of the country.

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

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. HARDWICK. Before I ask a question I desire to state to the gentleman very frankly that the question bears upon an entirely different subject from that which he is now discussing, but it does relate to the bill. Will it bother the gentleman at all if I ask him the question now?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Not at all.

Mr. HARDWICK. Did this Alaska commission ever survey any of these projected routes?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. No.

Mr. HARDWICK. There has been no survey of any of them?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Not by the Government for Government railway purposes. Of course, there are the topographical surveys by the United States Geological Survey, and a lot of private surveys whose maps are usually on file in the General Land Office.

Mr. HARDWICK. No accurate detailed estimate of what it will cost to build them?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Accurate and detailed in this: They went over those routes, and assuming that a railroad could be built substantially on the level country which they covered, they made very careful and full estimates, and in the worst parts of those routes other railroads had made estimates and surveys, and they secured the benefit of those exact estimates and surveys and based their estimates and report upon that.

Mr. HARDWICK. After all, that is more or less of a guess?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Not at all.

Mr. HARDWICK. How much of those 752 miles of projected railroads carried in this bill have ever been surveyed either by this commission or anyone else?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. All of it.

Mr. HARDWICK. Will the gentleman tell me where I can get the information that shows that?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes; the gentleman can get the information if he will go to the Alaska Syndicate headquarters for the survey of the Alaska Syndicate route up to Chitna and their survey across to Fairbanks, and if the gentleman will go to the Alaska Northern Railroad headquarters they will give him a survey of that route, and he will find all of the facts with respect to that stated in the hearings. They testified they had made accurate surveys over those routes.

Mr. HARDWICK. Does that include them all?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. That includes only those two.

Mr. HARDWICK. But about the balance of it, which is the greater part; has that ever been surveyed?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. That has been surveyed by the Alaska Road Commission in the location of a road along that route.

Mr. HARDWICK. But not by a railroad?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. No.

Mr. HARDWICK. It has not been surveyed at all for a railroad?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Not by the Government.

Mr. HARDWICK. That is true of a large bulk of this?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. No; very largely the surveys have been made, as I have told the gentleman.

Mr. HARDWICK. These private corporations have done that?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. HARDWICK. The commission itself did not survey it?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. They did not.

Mr. HARDWICK. It had no civil engineer's report or anything else on which to base what they claim in their report?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The commission was composed of the best civil engineers in the United States.

Mr. HARDWICK. They had one?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. They had more than one; they had three, at least.

Mr. HARDWICK. They did not do civil-engineering work?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Oh, no.

Mr. HARDWICK. Such as a private corporation would require it to be done before it constructed railroads?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Not at all.

Mr. HARDWICK. That claim is not made?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. No.

Mr. HARDWICK. I just wanted to be sure if I were right in my own mind. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WINGO. Is there any difference between the effect the freezing has on the soil there, and the resultant thaw, from what it is in this country?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. In what respect does the gentleman mean—in the cultivation of crops?

Mr. WINGO. No; I am talking about the physical effect on the roads.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I do not think so.

Mr. WINGO. The gentleman thinks they are practically the same?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I do not know of any difference.

Mr. WINGO. What kind of ballast have they used on the railroads constructed there?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The railroad that is constructed out of Fairbanks, 45 miles, is a dirt ballast.

Mr. WINGO. What does the gentleman mean by dirt ballast?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Just the dirt thrown from the sides of the road. Of course, there are some places on the mountain top—one or two places, perhaps—where they may use gravel, but 90 per cent of it is dirt ballast.

Mr. WINGO. What effect does the freezing and the resultant thaw have on the dirt ballast?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. None.

Mr. WINGO. None whatever?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. No.

Mr. WINGO. There is a difference. Why is it that they can run a railroad in Alaska on dirt ballast with such a low temperature at certain times during the year and you can not run one in the States?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. When the temperature is low the ground is frozen as hard as a board and you could run the railroad on the ground.

Mr. WINGO. Now, when the thaw comes in the summer time, how deep does it thaw in this dirt ballast?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. That would depend upon the condition. There are many places where it is not frozen at all, other places where it is frozen for several feet, and other places it will thaw deeper, but it always thaws the depth of the grade.

Mr. WINGO. It always thaws the depth of the grade. What effect does that have on the dirt ballast?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Nothing serious. There is no more trouble than on the Canadian Pacific or on the Grand Trunk Pacific, and all those roads at Manitoba and in Canada.

Mr. WINGO. I assume the gentleman understands they are not altogether dirt ballast?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The new ones are.

Mr. WINGO. They have not used chert or other ballast?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Very little; they have used dirt ballast.

Mr. WINGO. How often do they have to reballast those roads already in Alaska?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I have no definite information about that.

Mr. WINGO. The gentleman says all these proposed routes have been surveyed?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I did not say so; I pointed out those that had been surveyed.

Mr. WINGO. What kind of a survey did they make?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I do not know.

Mr. WINGO. When the gentleman speaks of "surveyed," what does he understand the word "survey" to mean?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I understand it to mean at least a temporary survey that gives the contour of the country over which the route passes.

Mr. WINGO. That is the gentleman's understanding of a railroad survey?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. It is not my understanding of a railroad survey at all, but it is my understanding of what these people generally did on these temporary surveys through that country.

Mr. GORDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. What would be the gentleman's objection to assessing the cost of the construction of these roads upon the adjacent land, on the same principle of ditch and road assessments that are assessed throughout the United States?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The Government owns this land, and if you pay the assessment I will agree to it. [Applause.] I do not object.

Mr. GORDON. I understand that, sir.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. They are Government lands.

Mr. GORDON. Certainly they are.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Well, I have no objection.

Mr. GORDON. The gentleman has not proposed that in his bill, has he?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. No; but we propose to put a mortgage upon all the lands in Alaska.

Mr. GORDON. Half?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. No; 75 per cent of all the sales of public land is proposed.

Mr. GORDON. The copy of the bill I have only provided 50 per cent.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Maybe it is the Senate bill that has the 75 per cent.

Mr. GORDON. Does the gentleman see any injustice in that simple assessment upon those lands adjoining this railroad for the cost of construction upon the theory of the great benefit growing from the construction and operation of this railroad accruing to the lands, as there are no people up there?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Well, the gentleman is mistaken in all of his premises. The whole benefit does not accrue to the adjacent lands, and there are a lot of people up there.

Mr. GORDON. How many people are there up there?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. There are 35,000 of the best people in the world.

Mr. GORDON. Undoubtedly they are the best people in the world, but 35,000 are not many people for a Territory of that size. That is just about as many as live in one ward in my city.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes; and I am sorry for them. If they will come to Alaska, we will give them homes and something to live on.

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

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Certainly.

Mr. PAYNE. How many of these 35,000 people earn their livelihood by tilling the soil?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Very few of them.

Mr. PAYNE. How large is Fairbanks?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. It has about 4,000 population.

Mr. PAYNE. What proportion of them depend upon the soil for their support?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Last year about 90 per cent of the potatoes consumed was raised at home.

Mr. PAYNE. Can you give any information in regard to the raising of cereals?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. We raise all the garden vegetables that are used in the country.

Mr. PAYNE. You have no cereals and no flour mills?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. No; we have no flour mills. This year we began to take in harvesters and reapers, and other machines for cutting grain, for the first time.

I will say that I went to Fairbanks in 1903, and at that time there were but three houses there. It was in the midst of a dense wilderness, at that time 500 miles from civilization. In 10 years those people have made the most wonderful progress in that country. They have taken \$74,000,000 in gold out of the creeks at Fairbanks in those 10 years, and we have in those creeks now a great area of low-grade placer ground; and if we had the railroad there, so that we could get cheap freight rates, we could take out 10 times the amount we have taken out before our placers are exhausted, and then our quartz mines could be worked.

Mr. PAYNE. It would seem that those people who are taking this gold out might themselves build this railroad and own it.

Mr. OGLESBY. But the trouble is they have to have a railroad to take it out.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. What proportion of the people of Alaska would be served by the construction of these 400 miles of railroad?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. If the railroad were built to Fairbanks it would serve all the interior of Alaska and all the waterways of the interior.

Mr. MADDEN. What percentage of the population would be served?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. One-half of the population, of course, does not live in the interior.

Mr. MADDEN. Would the construction of this system of railroads serve one-half of the present population?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Oh, yes; it would, because this country right through here, in the south, has more than one-half of the population, and it would be served by the building of the railroad.

Now, gentlemen want to know what is raised in this country. If you will let me, I will read from a letter of a farmer who resides in Fairbanks; and out here, hanging in one of these windows, where you can see it, is a picture of this particular farmer cutting his grain on his own farm in Fairbanks. I have visited him many times. I will be glad to show you this letter to demonstrate what he raises and what he gets for it. He says:

FAIRBANKS, ALASKA, November 8, 1909.

HON. JAMES WICKERSHAM,
Delegate to Congress, Fairbanks, Alaska.

MY DEAR JUDGE: In answer to your suggestion that I write you a letter about my farming operations, I take pleasure in doing so. When you and Mr. Joslin were at my place last fall I had not begun to take in my crops, but since then I have done so. I had 3 acres of potatoes and they yielded me 18 tons, and the market price was \$120 per ton, for which I sold most of them. I had 1 acre of beets upon which I had a crop of 8 tons; 2 acres of carrots which yielded me 7½ tons, with a market price of \$140 per ton. One acre of turnips from which I gathered 200 sacks of 80 pounds to the sack, or 8 tons, at \$80 per ton. I had 2½ tons of rutabagas upon one-fourth of an acre of ground, for which the market price was \$100 per ton; I had 1 ton of red beets on one-quarter of an acre of ground, at \$140 per ton; I had 15 acres of barley which I cut and sold for hay. I had 3½ tons which I sold for \$75 per ton, and still have enough left to fill my barn chuck full for my own use for the winter. I raised 2 tons of cabbage which I put away for the winter, besides which I sold between 3½ and 4 tons during the summer at an average selling price of \$140 per ton.

I raised 29 suckling pigs, also 13 pigs which weighed about 100 pounds each, and 23 big hogs. I sold 5 of my hogs to the butcher for \$60 each.

This fall I put in 6 acres of winter wheat—Bluestem—which I sowed the second week in August, and before the snow came in October the wheat was up 2 or 3 inches high, and I never saw a better stand of wheat anywhere. I have raised good winter wheat, barley, and oats, and all kinds of garden vegetables, and in my judgment as a farmer of more than 30 years' experience the Tanana Valley is a first-class agricultural country.

My farm is near the river and is perfectly level. The soil is a sandy loam and is very rich, and is made up of sediment and silt and sand brought down by the river in ages gone by. The Tanana Valley opposite my farm is 60 miles wide, and there are probably 5,000,000 acres

of as good ground as mine in this vicinity. I know from six years' experience on this farm that farming can be made entirely successful and that this valley can be made to produce everything which can be raised in Minnesota and the Dakotas, and there is no valley in the North so wide and rich and variable for agricultural purposes as the Tanana Valley.

I have several neighbors immediately around the town of Fairbanks who are engaged in successful farming, and we have in the last year raised almost enough to supply the local market, and there is no question hereafter that the whole local market in the Tanana mines can be supplied from our farms and gardens.

Respectfully,

WM. YOUNG.

As you will observe, he goes on to tell what he is putting in for the fall. I call your attention to this letter, which I intend to put in the RECORD complete, for two purposes—first, to show what the writer actually raises there and what enterprise he has and what can be raised there, and, second, to show you what he charged the poor fellows around there for it.

The charge is very high. It is so high that if men did not get \$5 a day working in the mines they could not afford to buy what this farmer raises; and he is enabled to charge these high prices because of the lack of transportation. We can not get food into that country without paying \$125 a ton freight.

Dr. Walter H. Evans, chief of the division of insular stations in the Office of Experiment Stations in the Department of Agriculture, prepared the following careful study of the conditions in Alaska in comparison with those countries in Europe lying under the same latitude and climatic conditions:

As a result of the investigations at Sitka, Rampart, and Fairbanks, supplemented by hundreds of letters from settlers, it can be safely asserted that in almost any part of Alaska south of the Arctic Circle hardy vegetables of good quality can be produced, so far as the climate is concerned. A list of these vegetables would embrace radishes, turnips, kale, mustard, lettuce, carrots, parsnips, parsley, peas, cress, cabbage, cauliflower, Brussels sprouts, kohlrabi, onions, spinach, endive, leeks, beets, potatoes, and rhubarb, and, among the herbs, caraway, catnip, mint, and thyme. In specially favored localities and in favorable seasons, asparagus, beans, celery, cucumbers, squash, and salsify have been grown by taking advantage of warm sheltered spots with exposures toward the sun. Under ordinary conditions, corn, melons, tomatoes, eggplant, and pumpkins have proved failures.

In the interior valleys grain can be successfully grown, and there has not been a year since 1900 when the majority of the varieties of oats, barley, and rye have not ripened at the Rampart Station (lat. 65° 30' N.). Wheat, both fall and spring sown, has ripened some years. Similar results have been secured at Fairbanks in the Tanana Valley, but the work has not been in progress for as many years. In 1909, out of 60 varieties of grain of all kinds, 55 ripened their entire crop, as follows: Spring wheat 1, winter wheat 1, winter rye 7, spring rye 1, spring emmer 1, spring barley 29, and spring oats 15.

AGRICULTURE IN NORTHERN EUROPE.

In order to further establish the possibility of agriculture in Alaska a comparison has been made of the countries of Norway, Sweden, Finland, and the Russian Provinces of Archangel, Vologda, and Olonetz. All the countries lie between latitudes 58° and 70° north, and for the most part they are north of 60°, the approximate latitude of the northern reach of the Gulf of Alaska. In Europe, within the above limits, are embraced over 985,000 square miles, or about 599,450,000 acres. Alaska, with its 570,390 square miles or 365,049,000 acres, extends from latitude 54° 30' in southeastern Alaska to more than 71° at Point Barrow. A study of the topography, climate, native plants, etc., shows that the conditions are not very dissimilar in the two regions, whatever advantages there is in climate being probably slightly in favor of the European countries. In these countries of Europe more than 11,000,000 people are living, while the census of 1910 reports 64,356 as the population of Alaska. Recent statistics show in the three countries and three Provinces in Europe which lie mostly north of 60° that 8,373,000 acres of land were producing cereals of all kinds, the total yield being: Wheat, 6,683,840 bushels; rye, 30,509,640 bushels; barley, 26,963,545 bushels; oats, 109,036,780 bushels. In addition, potatoes to the amount of 100,321,100 bushels and 7,871,119 tons of hay were reported. Live stock are returned for these countries as follows: Horses, 1,516,251; cattle, 6,110,476; sheep, 4,033,578; hogs, 1,484,124; goats, 368,021; and reindeer, 564,732.

The area reported under cultivation varies from less than 0.01 per cent in Archangel and 0.5 per cent in Norway to 4.1 per cent in Sweden. In Finland, Vologda, and Olonetz only about 1 per cent of the total area is in cultivation, as the term is commonly used. In nearly every country there are natural meadows of large extent used as pasture and for haymaking, so that the total under agricultural use is probably about double the figures quoted above. On a basis of 1 per cent of the total area available for crops and 2 per cent for crops, pasture, and hay, there should be over 3,650,000 acres capable of cultivation, or 7,300,000 acres available for possible agricultural development in Alaska. In 1894 the Director of the United States Geological Survey, in a letter to the House Committee on Agriculture, estimated the area of tillable land in southeastern Alaska, in the Cook Inlet country, the Alaskan Peninsula, and adjacent islands at from 3,000 to 5,000 square miles, or 2,000,000 to 3,000,000 acres. In 1900, after traveling repeatedly throughout Alaska and comparing estimates from various sources, Prof. C. C. Geogerson estimated the tillable and pasture land of Alaska at 100,000 square miles, or 64,000,000 acres. In 1910 Mr. J. W. Neal, who is in charge of the agricultural experiment station near Fairbanks, made a reconnaissance survey of the Tanana Valley, and he estimated the agricultural and grazing lands of that valley and the small valleys leading from it at about 15,000 square miles, or 9,700,000 acres, or more than the total area reported under crops in the specified countries of Europe.

With the same development of agriculture in Alaska as in Europe, to supplement its mining, fisheries, and other industries, Alaska should support a population almost equal to that of Europe north of 60° latitude and a commerce of equal or of greater importance.

Comparative area of some European countries.

	Latitude north.	Popula- tion.	Total area.	Area cultivated to cereals.	
				Acres.	Per cent.
Norway.....	58 30 to 70 30	2,000,917	76,226,000	402,000	0.5
Sweden.....	56 30 to 68 0	4,919,260	101,563,000	4,113,900	4.1
Finland.....	60 0 to 70 0	2,335,916	82,025,000	1,578,300	1.9
Russian Provinces:					
Archangel.....	62 0 to 70 0	413,500	208,680,320	162,200	.075
Vologda.....	58 0 to 65 0	1,565,800	99,369,600	1,656,930	1.7
Olonez.....	60 0 to 64 33	422,200	31,587,200	359,770	1.1

Crop production in some European countries.

	Wheat.	Rye.	Barley.
	Bushels.	Bushels.	Bushels.
Norway (1905).....	318,380	951,360	3,357,120
Sweden (1905).....	5,769,520	16,929,120	13,134,000
Finland (1907).....	147,000	11,661,000	5,415,000
Russian Provinces:			
Archangel (1909).....	5,700	451,940	1,395,250
Vologda (1909).....	431,640	5,037,700	3,053,400
Olonez (1909).....	11,100	1,478,520	608,775

	Oats.	Potatoes.	Hay.
	Bushels.	Bushels.	Tons.
Norway (1905).....	9,562,880	25,033,400	2,572,920
Sweden (1905).....	65,646,860	50,654,730	3,361,390
Finland (1907).....	21,822,000	19,836,000	
Russian Provinces:			
Archangel (1909).....	226,200	752,880	295,153
Vologda (1909).....	9,567,110	2,923,140	1,216,482
Olonez (1909).....	2,211,730	1,121,040	425,174

Live stock in certain European countries.

	Horses.	Cattle.	Sheep.	Hogs.	Goats.	Reindeer.
Norway (1906).....	172,468	1,094,101	1,393,488	318,556	296,442	142,623
Sweden (1906).....	566,227	2,628,982	1,021,727	878,828	65,300	288,360
Finland (1906).....	327,817	1,491,264	904,447	221,072	6,279	133,749
Russian Provinces:						
Archangel (1908).....	62,050	118,675	133,096	253		
Vologda (1908).....	313,872	622,619	464,138	60,957		
Olonez (1908).....	73,817	154,835	116,682	4,458		

And, finally, the attention of the House is directed to the annual report of Alaska agricultural experiment stations for 1912, and particularly to pages 46-57, relating to Fairbanks, and pages 57-67, relating to the work at Rampart, Alaska, a hundred miles farther north.

The attention of the House is also directed to the official report of the governor of the Territory of Alaska to the Secretary of the Interior, since it calls attention to the agricultural value of Alaska and to many other elements of value that are noticed in these remarks.

The call of Alaska to the immigrant spirit has been rendered into beautiful verse by the Alaska pioneer Presbyterian preacher, Dr. S. Hall Young:

Ho! Viking brood, ho! Norsemen, all;
 The sturdy Swede, the hardy Gael;
 Ye Finns, ye Celts, to you I call;
 Ye Germans, Danes, I bid ye hail!
 Who'er has breathed the Ice King's breath,
 Has braved his wrath, nor feared his death;
 My gold, deep locked with icy bands;
 Come, rive it, mine it, fling it free!
 Come, dig my coal and plow my lands;
 Snatch finny hordes from streams and sea;
 My copper rend from mountain walls;
 My marble blast for stately halls.
 Here life is freedom, blessed health;
 I break all chains, I fashion men;
 Ye scale my hills of boundless wealth,
 And win—ye win yourselves again.
 I smite to bliss, I bind to free;
 Lag not in cities; haste to me.

Now, gentlemen, I want to call your attention to the rate side of this question and to the present railroad conditions in that country. I want to show you why this farmer could charge \$125 to \$140 per ton for the produce which he raised on his farm and get the money out of the miners. Of course at that time the miners were taking out enormous sums of money. Up to date we have taken out \$75,000,000 from the streams immediately around Fairbanks.

THE GUGGENHEIM COPPER TRUST.

The greatest obstacle to the development of Alaska by Alaskans for Alaskans and the people of the United States is the Alaska Syndicate. This syndicate is a New York trust, composed of the Morgans, the Guggenheims, and the Close Bros., of London, together with their immediate lieutenants and confidential employees.

Those members of this House who have examined the charts prepared by the committee which investigated the Money Trust must have been impressed with the demonstration that interlocking directorates in banking and industrial corporations virtually made one man the financial king of the world. A similar chart showing the widespread ramifications and powerful financial alliances of the Copper Trust, all centering in the Alaska Syndicate, would prove equally striking. Whoever wishes to know what is the matter in Alaska must understand what the Alaska Syndicate is, for it is what is the matter in Alaska.

The real power in the Alaska Syndicate, so far as Alaska and the western mining is concerned, is with the Guggenheims, whose head is Daniel. Here is a partial list of the activities of the Guggenheims, and one who wishes more details will find them in Poor's Manual of Industrials, 1913, at pages 1641-1644; in the Copper Handbook, 1910-11, at pages 311-316; in Poor's Manual of Railroads, 1913, at page 1212; and in the hearings before the Senate and House Committees on Territories on the Alaska railroad bill. Briefly, these evidences show that the Alaska Syndicate is financially connected as follows:

Alaska Syndicate partners: J. P. Morgan & Co., New York; Guggenheim Bros., New York; Close Bros., London.
 Some of the Alaska Syndicate's Alaska enterprises are: Copper River & Northwestern Railway Co., Alaska Northern Railway Co., Alaska Steamship Co., Kennecott Copper Mines Co., Beatson Copper Mines Co., Ellemar Copper Mines Co., Northwestern Commercial Co., Northwestern Development Co., Yukon Gold Co.

The Copper River & Northwestern Railroad is the road going up the Copper River to the Chitna, and thence branching out to other copper mines. The Alaska Northern Railroad is this 71 miles of road running north from Seward.

Mr. STAFFORD. I understood that that was the road that broke the Sovereign Bank of Canada.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.
 Mr. STAFFORD. Have the Guggenheims got control of the bonds of that road since then?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Not the Guggenheims, but the Morgans. They had them all the time.

Mr. STAFFORD. Have the Morgan interests got control of those bonds?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I believe so.
 Mr. STAFFORD. I am acquainted with one gentleman in Milwaukee who has some of those bonds which are not covered by the mortgage.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Certainly not. He is in the minority. That is another bad feature of it. If you are in the minority, you do not count.

Mr. OGLESBY. The hearings showed that the syndicate had 26 to 28 per cent of the bonds.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I call your attention to the fact that the Tacoma Smelting Co., at Tacoma, Wash.; the Everett smelter at Everett, and the Selby smelter at San Francisco are the only smelters on the Pacific coast of the United States, and all three of them belong to the Guggenheims. The richest copper deposits in the world are in Alaska. If you do not believe it, I have a specimen here for you to look at. There is a piece of Guggenheim copper from the Kennicott mines, near Cordova, Alaska. That is 75 per cent pure copper, and there is enough gold in it to pay for working it. They have \$25,000,000 worth of that rock at the top of the ground, ready to ship out.

Mr. MADDEN. There is nothing to prevent anybody else organizing smelters, is there?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.
 Mr. MADDEN. What is it?
 Mr. WICKERSHAM. Money.

Mr. MADDEN. If you had had the money, you could go and organize one?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. No; I could not; and I could not build a railroad in Alaska.

Mr. MADDEN. Why not?
 Mr. WICKERSHAM. Because the great overwhelming Alaska syndicate, the Morgans and Guggenheims, would not permit it.

Mr. MADDEN. Do you mean to say that if you had the money to put into a railroad, they would not permit you to build it?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.
 Mr. MADDEN. How could they prevent it?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. They would break down my credit.
Mr. MADDEN. You would not need any credit if you had the money.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. They would hire away my men. They would kill you if necessary, as they have on these roads in Alaska. If the gentleman will be patient I will present the evidence to him.

Mr. MADDEN. I shall be glad to have it.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I will do it with pleasure.

The following are among the great enterprises in the United States which, with interlocking alliances and the vast capital invested, give this Guggenheim Copper Trust such a commanding position in the financial world, and especially in the West. Their corporations and principal mines controlled are as follows:

Balakhala Consolidated Copper Co., Coram, Cal.
Dairy Farm Mining Co., Van Trent, Cal.
Sibby Smelting & Lead Co., Leadville, Colo.
Silver Lake Mines, Silverton, Colo.
Federal Mining & Smelting Co., Wallace, Idaho.
Federal Lead Co., Federal, Ill.
Central Lead Co., Flat River, Mo.
Federal Lead Co., Flat River, Mo.
Puget Sound Reduction Works, Everett, Wash.
Tacoma Smelting Co., Tacoma, Wash.
Monte Cristo Mining Co., Monte Cristo, Wash.
Bonanza Mines and others in Mexico.
Baltimore Copper Smelting & Rolling Co., Baltimore, Md.

The following is a list of metallurgical plants owned by them:

Perth Amboy plant, Maurer, N. J.
National plant, South Chicago, Ill.
Omaha plant, Omaha, Nebr.
Globe plant, Denver, Colo.
Pueblo plant, Pueblo, Colo.
Ebers plant, Pueblo, Colo.
Durango plant, Durango, Colo.
Arkansas Valley plant, Leadville, Colo.
Murray plant, Murray, Utah.
Everett plant, Everett, Wash.
Helena plant, East Helena, Mont.
El Paso plant, El Paso, Tex.
Baltimore plant, Baltimore, Md.

Through their ownership of innumerable companies purchased, the monopolization of copper and lead properties, and the acquisition of numerous smelting and metallurgical plants throughout the United States and Mexico, and through their manipulation of the copper markets, the Guggenheims have acquired vast wealth and great financial and political power. All these have taught them the line of least resistance to follow in securing the complete monopolization of the copper, the gold, and the steamship and railroad transportation in Alaska. They long ago discovered they had a free hand in securing title to unlimited quantities of Alaska's undeveloped wealth at Government rates. If the policeman will only continue to sleep, they will continue to help themselves. Will the policeman wake?

RAILWAY CONDITIONS IN ALASKA.

Any effort to secure Government aid for the building of a trunk line of railway in Alaska meets with the prompt objection that there are private interests which will build this road if the Government will keep its hands off. This objection to Government aid and to Government control is of such serious moment that it must be fully and fairly answered before Members of the House will be satisfied to vote for the bill under consideration. If it is true that private interests will build railroads into the interior under such circumstances as to freely and fairly open the country for development and give such transportation facilities as will enable the citizens of the United States to go there and acquire property and enter into business, develop mines, settle the land, and generally open up the country, then there will be little need for Government aid.

I beg the attention of the House while I sketch for you a few graphic pictures of railway conditions in Alaska, and show you how impossible it is for there to be any such development in the way of transportation by private interests as you would wish to see there. These few pictures will show you that Alaska is substantially in the hands of the Alaska Syndicate and that all of its transportation lines are under the control of that one powerful influence. My effort will be to show you that their monopoly of transportation is used by them, not for the purpose of settling the country or to open up its mines, but for the purpose of excluding every effort at independent development which will in anywise interfere with the monopoly which they are building there. They have been in control of the transportation lines in Alaska for a decade, and during that 10 years they have unfairly crushed every attempt to create independent transportation down to the date of this bill. If this bill is defeated the grip of the old Southern Pacific on California will be gentle to the hold which this national devilfish will have on Alaska.

WHO COMPOSE THE ALASKA SYNDICATE.

On February 18, 1910, before the Senate Committee on Territories appeared Mr. Stephen Birch and Mr. John N. Steele, representatives and members of the Alaska Syndicate, who, being examined, testified as follows, at page 73 of the hearings:

Mr. STEELE. Who compose what is known as the Alaska Syndicate?
Mr. BIRCH. The Messrs. Guggenheim and J. P. Morgan & Co.
Mr. STEELE. When you say "the Messrs. Guggenheim" do you mean M. Guggenheim Sons?

Mr. BIRCH. M. Guggenheim Sons.
Mr. STEELE. Who have charge of the affairs of that syndicate in New York?

Mr. BIRCH. Mr. S. W. Eccles, Mr. John N. Steele, and myself.

Mr. STEELE. About when was this Alaska Syndicate formed? In the spring of 1906, was it not?

Mr. BIRCH. In the spring of 1906.

Mr. STEELE. In what enterprises in Alaska is that syndicate interested?

Mr. BIRCH. They are interested in the Northwestern Commercial Co., the Alaska Steamship Co., the Northwest Fisheries, the Kennecott Mines Co., the Copper River & Northwestern Railway, and the Katalla Co.

Mr. STEELE. We will take up first the Northwestern Commercial Co.

On page 88 of those hearings these gentlemen were interrogated with respect to the community of interest of the White Pass owners in the Alaska Syndicate, and they testified as follows:

Mr. STEELE. Who at that time owned the Copper River Railway?

Mr. BIRCH. At that time—

Mr. STEELE. I mean at that time.

Mr. BIRCH. The Alaska Syndicate owned it.

Mr. STEELE. At the time the Copper River & Northwestern Railway was first acquired by the Alaska Syndicate who owned the Copper River Railway?

Mr. BIRCH. M. J. Heney, Mr. Graves, and Close Bros., of London.

Mr. STEELE. Did the Alaska Syndicate acquire the entire interests of those gentlemen in the Copper River Railway?

Mr. BIRCH. Yes, sir; by permitting them to participate in the Alaska Syndicate up to the amount they had expended.

Mr. STEELE. In other words, they gave them a participation in the syndicate up to the cash amount they had expended in the construction of the Copper River Railway to that time?

Mr. BIRCH. Yes, sir. Mr. Chairman, I have a map showing this railroad, if you desire it.

SLUGGING THE CLOSE BROS.

The immediate facts relating to the partnership between the Alaska Syndicate and the White Pass & Yukon is stated by Mr. O. L. Dickeson, the president of the White Pass & Yukon, in his testimony before the Senate Committee on Territories of May 8, 1913, and will be found in full on page 153 of those hearings, where he testified as follows:

Senator McLEAN. Have you any interest in common with the Guggenheims?

Mr. DICKESON. Yes, sir; we have. Frankly, I might say here that, in this talk that I have made against the extension of that line, I am talking against a part of our interests. The interest comes about in this way: The firm of Close Bros. & Co. and a man by the name of M. J. Heney, who built the White Pass & Yukon Road, entered into the original scheme of building the Copper River & Northwestern Railroad. We went down in our pockets and each of us put up 50 per cent of the money to start that project. We got to the 20-mile point and we found that some one was building over the Valdez route—I think it is the Valdez route—and we found that this man was one John Rosene, who is now projecting the Haines route, and we also found that this man was backed by the Morgan-Guggenheim syndicate, and that being true, and our making efforts to raise money in New York to complete the extension of this plan, we did not feel that we were likely to be very successful, and we therefore thought that the only other thing to do was to go to England to get the money.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Why could you not raise the money in New York in opposition to them?

Mr. DICKESON. I was not with the road then, Mr. WICKERSHAM. We thought the only thing to do—

Senator JONES. If you had been do you think you could?

Mr. DICKESON. No, sir; I do not believe I could. We thought the only other thing to do was to go to England, and, in going to England, the English people, who had or could have raised the money to put up for a railroad project, said the White Pass & Yukon route had not paid anything, and they said, "Why ask us for money to build another railroad?" So, we could not raise the money there. We had considerable difficulty, so we dropped the whole scheme and sold out to the Morgan-Guggenheim syndicate, which is known as the Alaska Syndicate, and accepted paper for our interests. We sold for the paper.

These admissions show how intimate the association is between those who own the Skagway gateway into Alaska and those who own the Copper River gateway; they also show that these two gateways are controlled by the Alaska Syndicate, and that the Close Bros. could not get financial aid to finish their Copper River Railroad, but were forced to sell to the Alaska Syndicate. It was another instance where the Alaska Syndicate choked an independent railroad to death and bought its trust estate for participation in its general scheme of monopoly.

HOW THEY GOT THE ALASKA NORTHERN.

The Alaska Northern Railway is constructed from Seward, on Resurrection Bay, 71 miles north to Kern Creek, at the head of Turnagain Arm. The first few miles were built before the firm of Frost & Osborne took them over and completed the construction to Kern Creek. The testimony with respect to the real

ownership of this road is quite fully stated in the testimony of Mr. F. J. Jemmett, who is now the trustee in charge of the Sovereign Bank of Canada, and also the treasurer of the Alaska Northern Railroad, which connects these two defunct institutions directly. Beginning at page 386 in the Senate hearings before the Committee on Territories, Mr. Jemmett is interrogated quite fully in respect to advances of money made by the Sovereign Bank, of Toronto, Canada, for the building of the Alaska Northern Railway. It appears that the Sovereign Bank, through its officers, entered into some combination with contractors for building this road and furnished large sums of money, some portions of which went into the building of the road and some portions into other enterprises. How much money went into the Alaska Northern road does not appear from Mr. Jemmett's statement, but it does clearly appear that the Sovereign Bank, of Toronto, Canada, acquired the title to the Alaska Northern through advancing money to build the road. It became the owner of all the bonds, foreclosed its mortgage, bought it in, and is therefore the present owner.

THE SOVEREIGN BANK OF CANADA A MORGAN BANK.

Now, who is the Sovereign Bank, of Toronto, Canada? An examination of the bankers' directory of that date shows that its New York correspondent was J. P. Morgan & Co., and it is conceded to have been known as the Morgan bank in Canada. Some effort was made to show the exact amount which the Morgans owned in the Sovereign Bank, and on page 399 of the Senate hearings Mr. Jemmett testified:

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I will pursue that further. Mr. Jemmett, the Sovereign Bank of Canada—was that the correct name of the bank?

Mr. JEMMETT. Yes.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Was it not known as the Morgan bank?

Mr. JEMMETT. I did not know it, Judge, but I will take your word for it.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. You did not know of that before?

Mr. JEMMETT. I never heard of it before.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Did you ever hear at this time that J. P. Morgan & Co. were New York representatives of the bank?

Mr. JEMMETT. There is no question about the fact that J. P. Morgan & Co. were stockholders, and were the New York representatives. I never heard it called the Morgan bank.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Did they represent any other bank in Toronto, or Canada, in the same respect as they did this one?

Mr. JEMMETT. I would say no. I do not know of my own knowledge.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. To that extent, then, this was the Morgan bank in Canada?

Mr. JEMMETT. To that extent; yes.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. How much stock did J. P. Morgan & Co. own in the Sovereign Bank of Canada?

Mr. JEMMETT. They owned about one-sixth.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Who owned that one-sixth—J. P. Morgan?

Mr. JEMMETT. J. P. Morgan & Co.'s nominees held it for them.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. J. P. Morgan & Co. owned it, and it was held by an agent for them?

Mr. JEMMETT. It was recognized that it was their stock.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Were there other allied or interlocking interests in the United States with the Morgans who held an interest in the bank?

Mr. JEMMETT. Not to my knowledge. I think that one-sixth represents the whole thing.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Did they advance moneys after they found these matters out to help tide the situation over? If so, how much?

Mr. JEMMETT. After I took charge?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. JEMMETT. Yes; they lent us some money. That was part of the conditions on which I arranged to go in, that the Morgan shareholders should give us some support. I do not know the exact amount.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Did they give you any support except in proportion to the interest they held in the bank?

Mr. JEMMETT. Oh, yes. The scattered shareholders all over the country could not be got at as a practical matter.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. To what extent did J. P. Morgan & Co. give you support in the way of cash loans?

Mr. JEMMETT. I should think that it ran up a couple of million dollars, but I may be absolutely wrong on that. I think it was about a couple of million dollars.

There are some differences in the testimony as to whether the Morgans owned a one-sixth or a one-third interest in the Sovereign Bank of Canada, the evidence being strongly, in my mind, that they owned a one-third interest. It was the Morgan bank in Canada, it was controlled by the Morgans, and its investment in the Alaska Northern Railway Co. was a Morgan investment. When the Alaska Northern Railway was taken over by the Sovereign Bank of Canada it became either a one-third or a one-sixth Morgan railroad. It is that now, and is wholly a Morgan road in its control.

When George W. Perkins went to Seward in 1909 with the purpose of resuscitating this road and extending it to the interior of Alaska in connection with Ballaine's efforts, it was stated that it was for the purpose of saving their investment in the road and for the purpose of securing a further investment of money in their favorite work in the exploitation of railroads. However, in 1906, the Morgans had entered into the Alaska Syndicate with the Guggenheims, and according to that agreement they could not go into Alaskan enterprises without the consent of the Guggenheims. The Guggenheims refused to give their consent to Perkins resuscitating the Alaska Northern

Railway to save the Morgan investment in it, and it was not done. That refusal was based upon their claim that the road in which they were interested, the Copper River road, had the first right to the ownership of the Tanana Valley, a right which the Morgans conceded, and thereupon they gave up the rejuvenation of the Seward road.

I have gone into this matter thus carefully to show you that the Alaska Syndicate not only owns the Copper River & Northwestern Railroad gateway into the interior of Alaska, and that it is a partner with the owners of the White Pass & Yukon gateway, but that it is the owner of the Alaska Northern Railway and in control of that gateway. In short, we find the Alaska Syndicate in control of three of the principal gateways to the interior of Alaska.

Who are these Colossi who stand astride not one but three of the harbor gateways to the territory of Alaska? Is the Alaska Syndicate a law-abiding, liberty-loving, and developing power, to whom we may look for justice and fairness if we shall abandon Alaska to its control? May Congress abdicate its power and duty over the trust estate in Alaska and leave the performance of that duty to this great syndicate with the certainty that the rights of the people in that trust estate will be well cared for? Permit me to offer some concrete facts in answer to these inquiries.

Mr. MADDEN. As I understand, they claim that this railroad cost \$80,000 a mile?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes; but we know that it did not cost one-third of that.

Mr. MADDEN. I was wondering if that road cost \$80,000 a mile, how we were going to build this road for \$40,000 a mile.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The 71 miles are built over what is doubtless the most expensive portion, from the coast over a little range of mountains, but we are sure it did not cost that amount of money.

Mr. OGLESBY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Certainly.

Mr. OGLESBY. Is it not a fact that the first 20 miles of that road cost less than \$20,000 a mile?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. That is in the evidence given upon the committee hearings.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Certainly.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I have a letter from a contractor who built the first 20 miles of the road, and that letter shows that the road was built and equipped, the first 20 miles of it, for less than \$20,000 a mile.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes; everybody knows that.

Mr. MANAHAN. Will the gentleman state how many gateways there are?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. There is a side gateway from Valdez, which cuts into the Copper gateway, and there is said to be a side gateway that opens into the Seward route. It would not be much of a trial to condemn the Seward road and take it over by paying its value. It is a bankrupt concern, closed down, and has not been in operation for three or four years. At any of these places we can get an independent route. But let me say that this is true. Take the Seward route, and it is wide and can be paralleled for 71 miles. It is a wide route, and we could build parallel to it if the Government had to do so.

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

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I desire first to yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I was just going to ask the gentleman to tell us how the Government was going to get in through either one of those three gateways. They are the only gateways. I would ask whether the Government is going to get in by condemning the properties already there or by paralleling them?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. That can be done either way.

Mr. MADDEN. Is it the intention of those who are promoting the passage of this bill to take over the railroads that are already there?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I have no such intention.

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

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Is it not a fact that there is a way to get into Prince William Sound so as to avoid the grade of the present road? I will show first on the map. I want to know whether or not it is true that a road could be built from, say, this point across here to Prince William Sound?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. By avoiding the taking over of this road?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Not only that, but according to the reports I have seen you would avoid this grade of some 1,700 feet and 50 miles distant get into Prince William Sound here at a very good harbor, perhaps better than the one at Seward.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Possibly, but that would require a tunnel 2 miles long.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I do not know whether that is true or not, but I have heard that statement made.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. It is stated that those surveys have been made.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. That would give at least one way and avoid taking over that route?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Oh, yes; and the Valdez is the second, and both are fine routes.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, that is the matter that I was going to ask about. I will ask if it is not true that the Geological Survey have finished their survey and have reported that by a 12-mile route, at about the sixty-third mile north from Seward, you can go into Portage Bay and secure there a line that will be almost without a grade, and about as good a harbor as perhaps Resurrection Bay.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. That is stated.

Mr. TOWNER. So that the entire route shall be brought into the Susitna Valley, and will be shortened as much as 63 miles, and be made very much better than it would be if the Government took over or purchased or in any other way acquired the present line north from Seward.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Substantially that is true, I think. I do not know what the surveyors would say about it, but I have seen the survey recently made by one of the bureaus, which substantially shows that to be correct.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman inform the House what negotiations were carried on by the last administration and the recommendations made by Secretary Fisher concerning the taking over by the Government of this Alaska Northern Railroad?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I can; and I will do so a little bit later.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Right there, if I may be permitted to interrupt the gentleman again, if that condition of which we were speaking is correct, might not that then furnish some clue as to why certain parties refused to negotiate for buying that road? I saw a lot in the hearings about where Mr. Perkins was asked to buy that road and there were a lot of negotiations carried on, and it occurred to me afterwards that perhaps Mr. Perkins would not want to buy a road that would be of no use.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I do not think the testimony shows that. I think the testimony shows that Mr. Perkins already owned the road himself.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. No; there is some testimony that I recall which I read somewhere where one of the parties was negotiating with Mr. Perkins about the purchase of the road.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Now, I have called attention to the fact there are but three gateways in Alaska and those are occupied by the Alaskan Syndicate. Now gentlemen asked me if it is possible, that being true, to build a railroad into the interior of Alaska. I say, yes, we can build through either one of those gateways if it is done by the Government of the United States, but there is no other power that has the financial ability and the willingness to do that but the Government of the United States, to go into one of those passes and build a railroad through into the interior of Alaska and invade the territory belonging to the Guggenheims. The Alaska Syndicate will not let you get any money on the market. They will treat you as I will show in a moment how they have treated every other attempt to build an independent railroad.

Mr. PAYNE. When the gentleman speaks of the character of this syndicate does he mean land owned and occupied by them, or territory from which they draw freight?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I mean they claim the Tanana Valley is a part of their territory because they now furnish a good deal of transportation, and they do not want anybody else to build another railroad there.

Mr. MADDEN. Are these railroads being operated at a profit now?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The Guggenheim railroad is being operated at a great profit.

Mr. MADDEN. How many miles is that?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. It is 196 miles long.

Mr. MADDEN. What does it haul?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. It hauls copper.

Mr. MADDEN. From what?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. From the Guggenheim copper mines.

Mr. MADDEN. And that is the only freight it has?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes. Of course, they have the winter stage route from Chitina to Fairbanks, and haul considerable freight during the winter, and handle the large passenger traffic and winter mails to Fairbanks and the interior.

Mr. MADDEN. What about the other roads?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Substantially doing nothing except the White Pass & Yukon, which is supplying the Yukon interior.

Mr. MADDEN. How long has it been in existence?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Fifteen years.

Mr. MADDEN. Is there any increase in population in the territory embraced around the railroad?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Very little.

Mr. MADDEN. Why?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Because it is a mining country.

Mr. MADDEN. Is there anything in the laws of the United States that prevents an increase in population?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Not at all; but there is something in the law which enables the Alaska Syndicate to prevent it, and if the gentleman will possess his soul in patience I will get to that in a few moments.

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SHERLEY. Is it the gentleman's contention that these railroads can not be controlled in the interest of the public, but we must ignore them and build? Do not we have sufficient power in the United States to control them?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Railroads; yes.

Mr. SHERLEY. These railroads?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes; these railroads.

Mr. SHERLEY. What is the gentleman's statement predicated upon of this syndicate bottling up the country and then saying the only way to unbotle it is by building another railroad?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Because there are only 196 miles of railroad in Alaska controlled by the Alaska Syndicate. All the rest of the transportation in Alaska is water transportation, and the Interstate Commerce Commission has no jurisdiction over that.

Mr. SHERLEY. That is a matter that can be easily remedied.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. But it has not been remedied.

Mr. SHERLEY. I know; but I am asking the gentleman why it is necessary to build a railroad in order to control the transportation facilities.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I think so.

Mr. SHERLEY. Does not the gentleman think it possible to do it by regulation?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Possibly on the railroad.

Mr. LENROOT. I would like to suggest to the gentleman we can not compel them to build railroads by law.

Mr. SHERLEY. I understand; but I am not expressing the opinion. The gentleman has given the opinion that we have railroads sufficient; but being a monopoly, we must build another in order to control the situation.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. If I have given the gentleman any idea that there are sufficient railroads there, I have quite failed to give the impression which I wished.

Mr. TOWNER. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. TOWNER. Has there ever been any real attempt to build any railway in Alaska that did not deal either with a syndicate or by a syndicate or for a syndicate?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. None whatever, except those they throttled and killed.

Mr. TOWNER. Has there ever been an attempt to build a railway in Alaska for the purpose of developing the interior of the country?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. None whatever.

Mr. TOWNER. Or for developing any agricultural interests?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. No.

Mr. TOWNER. Or anything excepting mines or private interests?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. No.

Mr. SWITZER rose.

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

Mr. WICKERSHAM. In a moment.

Mr. SWITZER. Can the gentleman state how many people are employed by the Guggenheim syndicate and operate the copper mines and the railroad running to them?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. In Alaska?

Mr. SWITZER. Yes; in Alaska.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Oh, I should judge two or three or four hundred.

Mr. SWITZER. Are they developing the copper industry there?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes. They took out \$3,000,000 last year and something like \$4,000,000 the year before.

Mr. SWITZER. They are taking it out fast enough for the people of Alaska, are they?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. They are taking it out too fast, under all the circumstances.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. I was called out and could not hear all that the gentleman said in reference to these various gateways into Alaska. I wanted to inquire whether the Alaska Northern has passed into the control of the so-called syndicate?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. How did that happen?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. That happened in a technical and legal sense when their mortgage was foreclosed about 1909, and they bought it in at the sale.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. They had reached mile 71 in their construction?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes; they have.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Is it proposed in this plan of railroads that has been submitted by the commission to connect with the northern end of this Alaska Northern road?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The commission recommended that, but the President is not bound by anything that the commission recommended.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. However, if it could be bought at a reasonable price it would be advisable, I suppose?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. I believe it has been stated in the testimony that that road has cost about eighteen thousand and some odd dollars a mile for construction?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes; the first 20 miles or so, anyway.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. And that the actual cost is known?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT. Now, Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] asked the gentleman whether private capital had ever been secured to build a railroad into the interior of Alaska. I understood the gentleman to say that it had not been secured.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I did not say that, and yet that is substantially true. The Alaska Northern was built substantially with the money of the Morgans. They loaned money to the builders, and they afterwards foreclosed the mortgage held for the security of the loan and now own the road.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. And was started from Fairbanks?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes; from Seward for Fairbanks.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. And it was intended to tap the interior of Alaska?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT. I thought it was sold by Frost & Osborne to the Alaska Syndicate.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I do not know as to that; but they certainly owned it at the end.

Mr. TOWNER. Is it not now generally thought by the people of Alaska that there never was an intention of extending that road to Fairbanks, and that it was only intended to go as far as the Matanuska coal field?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. It was thought at first, when Mr. Ballaine and his people undertook to build that road, that it would go into the interior, but after his successors took over another situation began to develop. Then creditors or representatives of the Sovereign Bank of Canada came in and bought it, and it was announced that it would go only to the coal fields; and it certainly did not go farther than mile 71.

Mr. TOWNER. Was it the Sovereign Bank of Canada?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. I thought they came in later.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. WILLIS. Possibly the gentleman has already covered this in his statement, but I have not heard all of his interesting and instructive explanation. Is it not a fact that this bill con-

templates that all the Copper River Railroad could be taken over by the Government?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. No; not at all.

Mr. WILLIS. What is the fact as to that? I am asking entirely for information on that point.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. There is nothing in the bill that refers to that in any way, shape, or manner. It is left entirely to the President to build the road or roads on such route or routes as he shall deem best.

Mr. WILLIS. Then let me put the inquiry in another way: Does the recommendation of the commission contemplate the taking over of that road?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. No. The commission did not recommend it. The commission recommended the building of an additional line from Chitina to Fairbanks, which would be a substantial extension of the Copper River road to Fairbanks, but did not recommend the purchase of the Copper River road.

Mr. WILLIS. The point I want to bring out is this: There is a portion of the Copper River Railroad that runs over to the Kennicott copper mines.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. WILLIS. Is it contemplated by the commission that that shall be taken over, or simply this necessary part of the line up to Fairbanks?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The commission did not recommend taking any of it over. They recommended the building of a railroad on the Copper River route to Fairbanks, but a road can be built from Valdez, which gives the Government an independent outlet. If you build from Fairbanks to Chitina, you have got to go over the Alaska Syndicate road.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Does the gentleman consider that the bill authorizes either the purchase or condemnation of any of these railroads that have already been built?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I do not think it does. That is a question. The Senate bill certainly did not.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The Senate bill did?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The Senate bill as reported does not.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Suppose the plan should contemplate the construction of a road from Chitina to Fairbanks, could not the Government control the traffic over the Copper River & Northwestern road through the Interstate Commerce Commission?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. It could.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. And would not that be a good route from Chitina across to Fairbanks?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. It is one route, and one of the routes recommended by the commission, but the bill does not confine the President to this route or to any routes.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. I have read the bill carefully. The impression I obtained was that the President has the discretionary power to determine as to whether any other road shall be taken over, or any part of any other road shall be taken over.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. That may be. I heard the argument on the Senate bill yesterday, and I may have got that mixed.

Now, I want to say to the House that not only has the Alaska Syndicate gone into these gateways and got possession of the roads through them substantially, but that it exercises every power which it possesses, and it has greater power than the Government of the United States in that regard, to prevent the building of any other road through these passes, because such a road would go into its territory. I want to call the attention of the House to that, and I want to show you the means by which this great Alaska Syndicate moves to accomplish its purposes.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. One more question.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. I know that no one knows Alaska better than the gentleman who is addressing the House.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Thank you.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. I wish to ask whether it would be possible to construct a railroad from Valdez across to Fairbanks over what is substantially now the wagon road?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Would not that be a good route to open up Alaska?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. It would.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. The gentleman likes that better than the proposal to construct a road from Chitina across to Fairbanks?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Oh, certainly. I would oppose that kind of an extension.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. One reason why the road across from Valdez would be a good route, I take it, is because

it would open up agricultural possibilities sooner than any other route, except the route from Seward northward.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Northward through the Susitna Valley.

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman allow a question?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. SHERLEY. Why does the gentleman oppose the extension of what he calls the syndicate railroad?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I oppose it for several reasons. The first reason is that that route goes up the Copper River canyon, which is a very narrow canyon. It is in the region of greatest snowfall in Alaska. The snowfall there is something like 30 feet per annum. The glaciers on both sides of it come down almost to the railroad. It is a narrow gorge—

Mr. SHERLEY. Then the gentleman thinks the syndicate did not use very good judgment in locating their road. Is that it?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Oh, they were building to their rich copper mine, a mine they own themselves.

Mr. SHERLEY. The thing that strikes a man who knows nothing about it is that the syndicate should be so all powerful and also should be so all ignorant.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The gentleman is mistaken if he thinks that they are ignorant.

Mr. SHERLEY. I am only drawing conclusions from the gentleman's statements that the road has been unwisely built.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Oh, they constructed it so as to get into the copper field.

Mr. SHERLEY. Is not that a proper reason for building the road?

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Certainly.

Mr. HOUSTON. The object of building this road up the Copper River Valley was solely to exploit the copper mines owned by the syndicate.

Mr. SHERLEY. But there is plenty of copper there besides what the syndicate owns, is there not?

Mr. HOUSTON. No; I take issue with the gentleman on that.

Mr. SHERLEY. I can conceive of no better reason for building a road than to get at the mineral wealth.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. That is right.

Mr. HOUSTON. The main reason was to get at the copper mines.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Now, you can build a railroad from Valdez across to the same copper region over a very much better route, I think, than their route. In 1908, when the Close Bros. were building, the Guggenheims came down on them one day and shut off their wind, except upon some sort of participation from which they have not been able to receive anything.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman speaks of the syndicate being able to shut off their wind and close them out; was there not some occasion when there was actual killing of men there, or the commission of murder?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. To prevent the building of a road by other people?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. WILLIS. Will the gentleman from Alaska yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I will.

Mr. WILLIS. I understood the gentleman to say a few moments ago that in his judgment this bill did not contemplate the condemnation or taking over of any other line of road.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I may be mistaken about that. I have not read the bill since I heard the argument in the Senate, and I may have got the two mixed up.

Mr. WILLIS. I want the gentleman's interpretation of this language. On page 9 of the bill this language occurs:

To purchase or otherwise acquire all real and personal property necessary to carry out the purposes of this act; to exercise the power of eminent domain in acquiring property for such use, which use is hereby declared to be a public use, by condemnation in the courts of Alaska in accordance with the laws now or hereafter in force there; to acquire rights of way, terminal grounds, and all other rights.

And then, in connection with that, I invite the gentleman's attention to the language on the following page:

To lease, purchase, condemn, or otherwise acquire any other line or lines of railroad in Alaska which may be necessary to complete the construction of the line or lines of railroad designated or located by him in the first instance, upon such terms as he may deem proper.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. That would cover it.

Mr. WILLIS. That gives the President full power.

Mr. SHERLEY. Does not the gentleman think that the President should have that power?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I should be willing to give him all that power if I had the money.

Mr. SHERLEY. I think it would be foolish for us to undertake to restrict his power to buy, if it was wise to buy, instead of paralleling.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I agree with the gentleman. I am willing to trust the President with the power. I think it is right. I do not want any limitation placed on him.

Now, with respect to the railway conditions in Alaska—why they are as they are. The gentleman intimates that I think the Guggenheims are not wise railroad builders and did not build to the right place to accomplish the right result. No man in this House has a higher regard for the eminent ability of the Guggenheim family than I have. I think they are the wisest monopolists that ever hit the turf in America. I think the situation in Alaska shows it, and their monopolistic efforts have gone largely to transportation in that region where it is possible to develop copper and gold. They have not hesitated at any sort of crime to accomplish their purpose. Wherever another railroad is started, wherever a steamship line has gone in opposition to them, which goes into their territory, they have gone after that with hammer and tongs and always destroyed it.

Mr. MANAHAN. Can the gentleman give us the details of that?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I can.

THE ALASKA SYNDICATE A CRIMINAL ORGANIZATION.

The community of interest between the Alaska Syndicate and its partners, the Close Bros., the owners of the White Pass & Yukon Railway, extending through the first gateway to the headwaters of the great Yukon, which supplies the interior from that source, is shown in the case of the United States v. Pacific & Arctic Railway & Navigation Co., the Alaska Steamship Co. et al., decided by the Supreme Court of the United States April 7, 1913 (228 U. S., p. 87). The facts in that case are that the Alaska Steamship Co., in connection with the Pacific Coast Steamship Co. and the White Pass Railway Co., entered into a combination in violation of the Sherman antitrust law to exclude all other transportation companies from any participation in the carrying trade over the White Pass Railway to the interior of Alaska. Their insolence became so notorious and their efforts so detrimental to the development of Alaska that they were indicted by the United States grand jury at Juneau, Alaska, and the case was on appeal from the district court of Alaska upon that indictment. The following statement is copied from the opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States (228 U. S., 87):

The indictment contains six counts. The first and second counts charge violations of the antitrust law. The first, by the defendants engaging in a combination and conspiracy in restraint of trade and commerce with one another to eliminate and destroy competition in the business of transportation in freight and passengers between various ports in the United States and British Columbia in the south and the various cities in the valley of the Yukon River and its tributaries, both in British and American territory, in the north upon a line of traffic described for the purpose and with the intention of monopolizing such trade and commerce. The second count charges the monopolization of trade and commerce in the same business and between the same ports. The manner of executing the alleged criminal purpose is charged to be the same in both counts.

The places of the incorporation of the corporate defendants are alleged, and the following facts: The Pacific Coast Steamship Co. and the Alaska Steamship Co. operate, respectively, lines of steamships as common carriers of freight and passengers running in regular route between Seattle, State of Washington, and Skagway, Alaska.

Without going into details of the case the facts are that the Alaska Syndicate, through its Alaska Steamship Co., in combination with the White Pass Railway and the Pacific Coast Co., had monopolized the carrying trade through this gateway for many years and thereby maintained excessive rates to the great harm and injury of American citizens in the interior of Alaska.

Not only was this gateway thus monopolized by this unlawful monopoly, but the White Pass partner of the Alaska Syndicate for many years maintained a contract with the Northern Navigation Co. and its twin, the Northern Commercial Co., at Dawson, whereby the White Pass carried this monopoly freight down to Dawson, and there turned it over to the Northern Navigation Co. for transportation into the Yukon Alaska. The Northern Navigation Co. agreed not to carry freight above Dawson and the White Pass Co. agreed not to carry freight below, and in this way the community of interest between the Alaska Syndicate, the White Pass, and the Northern Navigation Co. extended down the full length of the Yukon River, in violation of the Sherman antitrust law. For 15 years the people of the interior have been paying enormously excessive freight rates on account of this unlawful contract. Instead of "leaving the laws of trade and commerce to deal with questions of transportation and operation of production," as the minority report somewhat vaguely recommends, the Alaska Syndicate, with insolent disregard to those or any other laws, with a strong arm and the might of its financial influence, has forced all competitors into their combination or destroyed them.

I now call the attention of the House to this map and the colors upon it. The orange color here represents the route of the Alaska Steamship Co. to the end of their railroad, and then it represents their railroad out to their mines. Here it represents the Alaska Steamship Co. in its approach to Skagway, and it is at this place that they held such a combination that they were indicted, and the indictments are now pending against them, for violation of the Sherman law. The facts are that the combination of the Alaska Syndicate Co. and the White Pass Co. shut out all other boats from that port by excessive rates, by every form of opposition, which excluded them from equal facilities for doing business over that road.

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

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. FORDNEY. I would judge from reading the records and the question put by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] about the commission of crime up there, and the statement of the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. WICKERSHAM] so far, that the Guggenheims are guilty of murder there. What evidence has the gentleman to that effect?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The evidence was in court, and the evidence was that their high officials gave instructions to shoot, and a fellow did the shooting and killed a man, and he was sent to the penitentiary for it, and the other man who was shot alongside him brought suit against the Alaska Syndicate corporation for shooting him, and the court and the jury sustained him and gave judgment against them.

Mr. FORDNEY. I think a copy of that evidence should go into the Record, because it will go out to the world that the Guggenheims are murderers, and there should be some evidence of that with such a statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I am not defending the Guggenheims, but that is what the Record will show.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan is unduly sensitive on behalf of the Guggenheims. I did not mention the Guggenheims, and nobody knows it better than the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORDNEY. I know the gentleman did not.

Mr. COOPER. Then the gentleman should not have assumed what he did.

Mr. FORDNEY. Oh, yes; I should; but I will not interrupt the gentleman now.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I did not charge anybody by name as being a murderer, but I said this syndicate, the personnel of which I do not know, was instrumental, so it had been reported in the press, and the gentleman from Michigan knows—and that is all I said—in preventing the building up there, keeping these other people out of there, as the gentleman from Alaska said, and murder had been committed, crime had been committed. The gentleman said yes. I do not suppose that any one of the Guggenheims personally committed murder, or that they authorized it. What I said was that the newspapers had reported it. It seems that in preventing other people from going in there murder was committed; that the murderer was convicted and sent to the penitentiary; and to that extent merely the rumor cited was correct.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I did not say that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] had said that the Guggenheims had committed murder. I say the question asked by the gentleman from Wisconsin of the gentleman from Alaska would carry the inference that the Guggenheims were responsible for the crime, and that it would go out to the country that the Guggenheims are murderers. I do not know the Guggenheims, and I do not care anything about them. I am not defending them here, but it is a pretty broad statement to go out to the world from the House of Representatives that the Guggenheims are murderers without some evidence along with that statement to go into the Record to that effect.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Certainly.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. So that the gentleman may state the facts and so that the facts may go into his interesting address, let me put a question: Did not this controversy in which one man was killed and other men were injured arise over a conflict of surveys? I am not quite clear in my own mind in relation to it, but I have the impression that the syndicate had a survey and that another road had a survey also, and that those surveys intersected and that at the point of intersection they got into a row, and somebody on one side or the other constructed a sort of go-devil, and that go-devil was a dangerous thing. Somebody sought to get possession of the go-devil and they had a fight there. How near right am I?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The gentleman is about 200 miles from the fact. [Laughter.]

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. All right. This is merely from recollection—

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The incident the gentleman has reference to occurred at Katalla, and the incident referred to by the other gentleman occurred over at Valdez, about 200 miles away. Both of them were incidents where this great overwhelming monopoly in Alaska tried to take other men's property away from them by force.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Was it true there was a conflict between right of way in each instance?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. No; it was not a conflict over right of way.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Let us get at the facts—

Mr. WICKERSHAM. One was a conflict over right of way at Katalla—

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. So I was not 200 miles away? Mr. WICKERSHAM. The case the gentleman was taking about occurred at Valdez.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. I was not talking about the same thing that they were talking about. I was talking about a conflict over right of way.

Mr. COOPER. If the gentleman will permit, the gentleman from Michigan referred to what I have been talking about and the gentleman does not know the facts at all.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. He does not dispute the facts. Mr. COOPER. He does dispute the facts. The gentleman from Michigan when he rose referred specifically to what I have been talking about.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Precisely; I do now.

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman said he wanted to get the facts and that he understood them to be so-and-so—

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. And the gentleman from Alaska confirmed it.

Mr. COOPER. No; the gentleman from Alaska said the gentleman from Michigan was referring to another incident entirely.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. He was mistaken about that.

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

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. DAVENPORT. I would like to ask the gentleman from Alaska who was the other syndicate that was responsible or was at least present when this fight came up where these parties were killed, where the Guggenheim interest was involved to which he referred awhile ago? What is the name of the syndicate, in order that we may have in the Record, where the Guggenheims were on one side at Cordova or Valdez and another syndicate on the other side when this shooting took place? I remember distinctly the first Cordova affair. The gentleman from Michigan was chairman of the Committee on Territories at the time and the gentleman from Alaska made reference awhile ago to another syndicate. Which was the other syndicate on the other side where the shooting took place?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The other syndicate was the Home Railway of Valdez, composed of residents of that community who formed themselves together to get an independent outlet from that community to the interior.

Mr. DAVENPORT. Who financed it?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The Home Railway Co.

Mr. DAVENPORT. Who were the financiers?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The residents of that community—to build a little narrow-gauge railroad. It was not a syndicate at all.

Mr. DAVENPORT. Does the gentleman undertake to say now that the Home Railway Co. was financing that enterprise?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes, sir; and they were all residents of Alaska.

Mr. DAVENPORT. All residents of Alaska?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes, sir; all of them.

Mr. FRANCIS. Will the gentleman permit a question—just one?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Well, for the last one.

Mr. FRANCIS. I want to know if it is possible to build a practical railroad in Alaska without first settling with these interests of which the gentleman has spoken? Is it a fact that we will have to settle with them before we can build a railroad?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Not at all.

THE ALASKA SYNDICATE OPPOSES EXTENSION OF INTERSTATE-COMMERCE LAWS TO ALASKA.

The closing of the port of Skagway to independent steamships brought on a contest with the Humboldt Steamship Co. It was an independent company and sought to do business through the port of Skagway over the wharves and railroad of the White Pass Co., which was controlled by the Alaska Syndicate agreement. It failed to get any facilities for business and

was met with excessive special rates and all forms of opposition. It appealed to the Interstate Commerce Commission in 1909 for an order establishing fair rates at this port and over the White Pass route. The Interstate Commerce Commission denied the application of the Humboldt Steamship Co. upon the ground that Alaska was not a Territory within the meaning of the interstate-commerce law. The Humboldt Co. appealed to the courts in the District of Columbia for a writ of mandamus to compel the Interstate Commerce Commission to take jurisdiction and to establish a rule of equal right and facility over this line of transportation. Both lower courts denied the application, but the Supreme Court of the United States, on April 29, 1912 (224 U. S., 474), reversed the action of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the lower courts and held that Alaska was a Territory within the meaning of the interstate-commerce law and ordered the issuing of the writ of mandamus. Two of these companies in combination fought this effort of the people of Alaska to extend the benefit of the interstate-commerce laws to Alaska and through this gateway—the White Pass & Yukon Railroad, by its general counsel, who is now in the city of Washington walking the corridors, writing letters, and interviewing Members of the House in opposition to this bill, and the Copper River & Northwestern Railroad Co., the Alaska Syndicate's company. Both of these great companies fought every effort that was made by the people of the Territory of Alaska to get the interstate-commerce laws extended there, and we were finally forced to come to the District of Columbia and begin a suit against the Interstate Commerce Commission to compel it to take jurisdiction, and we only got a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in April a year ago.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I want to ask the gentleman this question: Are the British vessels running from Vancouver to Alaska in this combine?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes; but of course they carry only British freight. They do not carry local freight. Going from Vancouver to Skagway, they send their freight into the interior of Yukon territory, and it is not covered, of course, by the interstate-commerce law.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. That is true, but at the same time the British vessels carry freight from Seattle to Vancouver, and thence to points in Alaska.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. That is something that I do not know anything about; but I am not talking about that, and I wish the gentleman would not interrupt me with it.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I did not intend to bring that out; but inasmuch as the gentleman has answered the question in that way, I will say that the reason I asked the question is that a year ago I introduced a bill to prevent these vessels from engaging in the coastwise trade, and I remember the gentleman opposed it on the ground that it would destroy the competition between that syndicate and the combine.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes; on the ground that it would destroy another competitor.

Mr. TOWNER. Still, it would not be impossible for English vessels to take freight of any sort from Seattle to Alaska?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes. They took it to Vancouver and there transferred it.

Mr. TOWNER. That would be an evasion of the law.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes; but it was carried.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. They are still carrying it out, so far as freight is concerned, every day. I introduced a bill to correct that.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. What I was trying to call to the attention of the House was the fact that for years and years we undertook to get the interstate-commerce laws extended to Alaska, but had to get the case before the Supreme Court of the United States after years of waiting in order to do that.

THE ALASKA SYNDICATE RESORTS TO KILLING ITS OPPONENTS.

Now, I wish to call to the attention of the House a matter that was mentioned a few minutes ago.

In 1906 the Alaska Syndicate began the building of a railroad out of Valdez toward its copper mines, 180 miles from that harbor on the headwaters of the Chitina River. They built 10 or 15 miles of grade, but about that time found the Close Bros., representing the White Pass Railway, building from Cordova up the Copper River to the same common point at Chitina. The Alaska Syndicate forced the Close Bros. to join their combination, giving them participation in the Alaska Syndicate as a partner for the 20 or 21 miles they had then completed toward Copper River. Thereupon the Alaska Syndicate abandoned the Valdez grade. Immediately thereafter

the people of Valdez organized the Home Railway Co. and began the building of a railroad from the harbor of Valdez through the mountain pass toward the common point at Chitina. The officials of the Alaska Syndicate corporation sought in every way possible to prevent the building of this Valdez road. Every effort was made to bankrupt it, but the people of Valdez with picks and shovels went to work on the road, regardless of money, and sought to overcome all obstacles. Thereupon the Guggenheim officials employed two or three gunmen and sent them into Keystone Canyon with instructions to build a barricade and not to permit the laborers of the Home Railway Co. to come along their abandoned roadway. The laborers came along one morning with their picks and shovels on their backs and one of the gunmen, from behind the rocky barricade, fired upon them, killing one instantly, and as the frightened laborers ran he shot others in the back. The gunman was arrested and indicted for manslaughter, tried, and found guilty and sentenced to the penitentiary. The Alaska Syndicate employed an array of attorneys to defend this gunman and spent \$70,000 in that effort.

Here is a copy of an account and an explanatory letter signed by the attorney for the Alaska Syndicate to its treasurer, which shows how the case was tried. I will read the letter first. It is in possession of the United States, and has been for some years. It is a letter written by John A. Carson, an attorney at Salem, Oreg., who went up there for the Guggenheims and defended these fellows who did the shooting in the Keystone Canyon, to a personal representative of the Morgans in Seattle and another Alaska Syndicate corporation:

SEATTLE, WASH., May 6, 1908.

Capt. D. H. JARVIS,

Treasurer, Loanman Building, Seattle, Wash.

MY DEAR CAPTAIN: The inclosed account of Mr. M. B. Morrisey has been submitted to me by him. I do not claim to have personal knowledge of all of the items therein mentioned—necessarily I could not have such—but I do know that Mr. Morrisey was taking care of several of the Government's witnesses. I saw him take them into restaurants very many times (it was generally rumored around Juneau that the majority of the Government's witnesses were broken), and I have not the least doubt that Mr. Morrisey cared for them in the manner shown in his account.

In addition to this, I wish to express my appreciation of the services rendered by Mr. Morrisey, not only in Juneau but also at Valdez during the session of the grand jury there. I found him very efficient and competent, and his acquaintance with many of the Government's witnesses and control over them placed him in a position to be of the greatest possible service in defending this action.

I scarcely need tell you that Mr. Morrisey is an expert accountant employed by Mr. Heney at Cordova. He is anxious to return there promptly to resume his duties, and I trust that you will treat him in a very liberal manner.

Yours, very truly,

JOHN A. CARSON.

Entered, Voucher No. 3408.

It may be understood that the Katalla Co. was the construction company for the Alaskan syndicate, engaged in building the Alaska Syndicate road up the Copper River. This was an account against them by Morrisey—

Mr. MANAHAN. A representative of a subsidiary company?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes; of a subsidiary company. I want the lawyers to listen to these disbursements, or any other honest man that happens to be in the House. [Laughter.] Here is the account:

SEATTLE, WASH., May 6, 1908.

Katalla Co., in account with M. B. Morrisey:	
Moneys received from John A. Carson	\$650.00
Balance due me	482.40
	\$1,132.40

DISBURSEMENTS.

Expense on S. S. Farallon, Cordova-Juneau	5.00
Occidental Hotel, for M. B. Morrisey	22.60
Occidental Cafe, for witnesses	75.00
Alaska Grill, for witnesses	195.00
Cash to Jimmy Kelly	37.00
Cash to J. E. O'Riley	75.00
Cash to J. Rummel	9.00
Cash to J. A. Briggs	10.00
Cash to Tom Corcoran	10.00
Cash to Wm. Garster	12.00
Cash to Whitey Graham	26.00
Expense entertaining witnesses and jurymen	200.00
Personal expense for March and April	270.00
Expense cable, F. E. Youngs	3.80
Hotel Seattle, 6th to 8th (estimated)	15.00
Rent of typewriter	2.00
Stationery, etc.	1.00
Expense incurred at Valdez during grand jury session	120.00
Ticket, Seattle-Cordova, deduct	45.00
	1,132.40
	45.00
	1,087.40

Entered, voucher No. 3408.

Approved:
W. H. BOGLE.

That is approved by the general counsel for the Guggenheims at Seattle.

Mr. MANAHAN. Who is it?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. W. H. Bogle. It is entered voucher No. 3408 in the accounts of the company.

All of these matters have been brought out in other proceedings, and it is true that these people used the money charged for in this account for fixing jurors and witnesses, and so forth, in that case.

I call it to your attention, not as an attack upon the Guggenheims or upon the Alaska Syndicate, although there are many more things that we could attack them on if it is necessary, but to show the means to which they resort to kill other railroads in that country. And I want to say to you that nothing has been left undone by them, from manslaughter down to maintaining the worst lobby in this city at this moment that has ever been here, to kill this bill, and to kill every other independent railroad that has ever started in that country. [Applause.] And unless this House shall do its duty as trustees for that great Territory, it will be in their hands for the future. Talk about crime! The Alaska Syndicate is an organized crime, as far as Alaska is concerned.

Nor have its activities in a criminal way been confined to the coast of Alaska.

In 1908 certain citizens of Alaska sought to establish a base of operations on Controller Bay, and applied to Congress for an act giving them terminal rights for a railroad from Controller Bay to Bering River coal fields, and from Controller Bay up the Copper River toward the interior of Alaska.

Here is Controller Bay, opposite the Bering River coal field. These people applied for the organization of a corporation, through Congress, in order that they might build a railroad into that coal field and up the Copper River in 1908. It conflicted with the territory claimed by the Alaska Syndicate, and this is what happened. This application, of course, invaded what the Alaska Syndicate called its territory. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 6226, under date of May 14, 1908, is this statement:

Mr. Flint, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them each with an amendment and submitted reports thereon: * * *. A bill (S. 6925) for the relief of the Alaska Terminal & Navigation Co. (Rept. 657).

In the RECORD, page 6325, of May 15, 1908, is this statement in relation to the same bill:

ALASKA TERMINAL & NAVIGATION CO.

The bill (S. 6925) for the relief of the Alaska Terminal & Navigation Co. was announced as next in order.

Mr. GUGGENHEIM. I object to the consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made by the junior Senator from Colorado to the consideration of the bill.

In the RECORD, page 6533, for May 19, following, we touch a new interlocking interest:

ALASKA TERMINAL & NAVIGATION CO.

Mr. KEAN. I ask that the next bill on the calendar (S. 6925) for the relief of the Alaska Terminal & Navigation Co. be placed on the calendar under Rule IX.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will go to the calendar under Rule IX at the request of the Senator from New Jersey.

When the junior Senator from Colorado objected to this bill, Hon. Simon Guggenheim was a member of the Alaska Syndicate and directly interested in the matter before the Senate. When the Senator from New Jersey performed the last act of slaughtering it, Hon. John Kean, of New Jersey, was the treasurer of the Pacific Coast Co., a steamboat company engaged in Alaska transportation, and then in criminal combination with the Alaska Steamship Co. in maintaining monopoly and excessive rates at the port of Skagway, Alaska. Both these companies were indicted by the United States grand jury at Juneau, Alaska, for violation of the Sherman antitrust laws for this long-continued violation of the law, all of which is fully stated in the case of the United States *v.* Pacific & Arctic Railway & Navigation Co., Pacific Coast Steamship Co., Alaska Steamship Co., et al., decided by the Supreme Court of the United States on April 8, 1913 (228 U. S. Rep., 87).

Nor was this the only instance. The Assistant Attorney General told me that they had filched more than \$3,000,000 out of the Government in the sale of coals on the west coast.

I am trying to show you the connection between these people—trying to show you that, notwithstanding what the gentleman said a while ago, they do not hesitate to go to any length, from shooting men in the back to killing bills on the floors of Congress, to accomplish their purposes, and the records are perfectly clear on that. Many other instances could be shown, if the House had the patience to listen.

Nor have the criminal activities and combinations of the Alaska Syndicate and the Pacific Coast Co. been entirely confined to the port of Skagway. An indictment was re-

turned by the United States grand jury at Tacoma on August 12, 1911, against the treasurer of the Alaska Syndicate corporations in Alaska, the coal manager of the Pacific Coast Co., and another, for conspiracy to rob the Government by agreed bids in the sale of coal to Alaskan military posts. The representative of the Alaska Syndicate died before the indictment was returned, but the coal manager of the Pacific Coast Co. and another were tried, found guilty, and sentenced to a year in jail and a fine of \$2,000.

At the time when the coal manager of the Pacific Coast Co. and the confidential manager of the Alaska Syndicate engaged in this long-continued robbery of the Treasury of the United States in the transportation of coal to Alaskan military posts, Hon. John Kean, of New Jersey, was treasurer of the Pacific Coast Co. and received their share of the plunder, while Hon. Simon Guggenheim was a member of the Alaska Syndicate, which received its share. The United States is now maintaining a civil suit in the United States courts at Seattle to recover \$100,000 thus stolen, but it was found that the statute of limitations barred the greater amount, for they had been engaged in this robbery of the Treasury for years. No wonder the United States itself is beginning to prefer Government ownership to this kind of Guggenheim ownership. And no wonder that Congress has been laggard in transportation matters in Alaska when these masters of finance sat in high places and controlled legislation.

Many other instances could be shown, if the House had the patience to listen, where the Alaska Syndicate, in ways that are criminal and with a strong arm, prevented independent efforts to construct railroads into the interior of Alaska, which it claims as its territory. Their efforts along these lines have been incessant for 10 years or more, and their activities have covered the field of crime from manslaughter, assault, bribery of witnesses, conspiracy, and robbery of the Government down to maintaining an insidious lobby in the city of Washington at this moment to prevent the passage of this bill. The fact is the Alaska Syndicate do not intend to permit any other railroads to be built in Alaska unless the extension is grafted upon its road and it is given control to the sea.

COMBINATION WITH THE NORTHERN COMMERCIAL AND NORTHERN NAVIGATION COS.

During the four months' navigation possible in Bering Sea the Alaska Steamship Co., owned by the Alaska Syndicate, runs its vessels to St. Michael with freight from Seattle. The freight is transferred at St. Michael to another large interest in alliance with the Alaska Syndicate in Alaska transportation. The Northern Commercial Co. is the commercial side and the Northern Navigation Co. is the transportation side of this interest. The Northern Commercial Co. owns mercantile establishments at every steamboat landing along the 1,600 miles of the Yukon River to Dawson, and the 275 miles additional up the Tanana to Fairbanks. The Northern Navigation Co. is its Siamese twin and is the other half of the mercantile company. These twins are owned by the Sloss interests at San Francisco, which also owns the Alaska Packers' Association—the Alaska Fish Trust. The community of interest between the Northern Commercial and the Northern Navigation Co. is with the Alaska Steamship Co. in transportation matters. Through this combination these two companies jointly control the transportation of freight up the Yukon River to Dawson and up the Tanana River to Fairbanks.

EXCESSIVE FREIGHT RATES.

Now, I want to talk about freight rates in Alaska, and to show why these people are going so seriously into their opposition, not only to the building of this railroad in Alaska, but in their opposition to all other attempts to build independent transportation into that country.

It is in its control of the transportation business in Alaska, however, that the Alaska Syndicate is able to do the people of Alaska the greatest injury and themselves the greatest good. Its freight rates are the highest in the civilized world, and are so manipulated in connection with their mining business as to drive all mining competitors to bankruptcy, and to procure their assets at the minimum cost to the trust. It is in supreme control of transportation in Alaska, and it has abused that control to a greater extent than it has ever been abused elsewhere in American territory. Of course, the first result of unlimited power over transportation is excessive rates. The attention of the House is called to the United States Geological Survey Bulletin No. 442, Mineral Resources of Alaska, 1909. Upon page 25 of this official document it is stated:

The total transportation charge on the supplies of Seward Peninsula will, then, be about \$1,200,000, or nearly 30 per cent of the value of the entire gold output of the year.

This camp is supplied with transportation by the syndicate boats, the Alaska Steamship Co.

On the next page this official statement is made:

No exact figures are available in regard to the amount of freight annually shipped to the Alaska portion of the Yukon Basin, but it is probably safe to say that this amounts to 30,000 tons, and that it costs over \$2,500,000 to land it at the end of steamboat navigation.

It does not take much of a mathematician to determine that if it costs \$2,500,000 to land 30,000 tons at the end of steamboat navigation, it is at the rate of \$83.33 per ton. The only incorrect part of that statement is that the lowest transportation rate that we get in that country amounts to nearly \$120 per ton instead of \$83.

The report goes on:

The total annual cost of freight for the Yukon basin is therefore probably between \$4,500,000 and \$5,000,000, or nearly 50 per cent of the value of the entire gold output.

The miners in the Tanana region have taken out \$74,000,000 in gold by hard work, and they paid one-half of all of it, or \$37,000,000, in freight in less than 10 years. Now, if they have paid 50 per cent of \$74,000,000 in freight, and you build a road, even if it costs \$35,000,000, upon that freight basis alone it will be paid for in 10 years.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Will the gentleman allow a question?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Certainly.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Are there any oil fields in Alaska?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. We do not know. It is thought there are, but there has not been sufficient work done to show.

This official statement goes on:

The data at hand seems to justify the conclusion that Alaska's annual expenditure for transportation of supplies and equipment is between \$7,000,000 and \$8,000,000. * * * The great tax on the mining industry of Alaska caused by the present system of transportation is strikingly illustrated by the fact that the annual freight bill—much, to be sure, paid indirectly—for every white man, woman, and child living in inland Alaska and on Seward Peninsula is over \$350. * * * If these estimates are correct the amount paid for freight in the placer mining camps of Alaska is equal to nearly half of the value of the annual gold production. The freight charges are reflected in the high cost of all supplies and of labor.

All of this clearly indicates why only the richest placer ground is being mined and suggests that the present industrial advancement of inland Alaska is small when compared with that which will take place when railway communication with tidewater has decreased the cost of operating.

These excessive freight charges prevent the opening of the mines in the interior of Alaska. Only the bonanzas can be worked, while the greater areas of low-grade ground await the coming of cheaper transportation and lower freight rates. The amount of gold which has been taken out of that region, as large as it is, is small in comparison to what the country will produce under better transportation conditions. Given a railroad from the coast to the Tanana River, with interstate commerce control of transportation rates of freight and passenger rates, the Fairbanks country will produce 10 times the amount of placer gold that has heretofore been produced there, and will open her quartz mines for a still greater production for an indefinite future.

Now permit me to give you some exact figures concerning the freight rates which are charged the people of Alaska by this dominating transportation trust which controls them.

THE NORTHERN NAVIGATION FREIGHT RATES.

I shall only present two freight tariffs, one affecting the interior rivers, and the other upon the Alaska Syndicate railroad and over its Alaska steamship line to Puget Sound. These are the lines which we are now obliged to patronize. When the Senate committee conducted its hearings upon the Alaska railway bill I filed a copy of the rate sheet of the Northern Navigation Co., in connection with the Alaska Steamship Co. and the Pacific Coast Steamship Co., for rates charged between Seattle and San Francisco and the Yukon and Tanana River points. That rate sheet will be found on page 637 of the Senate hearings. I call your special attention to it. Fairbanks is the central point in that entire country. It is the distributing point for all freight, passengers, and mail. An inspection of this tariff sheet for the transportation of freight to the interior of Alaska will show that it provides a flat rate from Seattle and San Francisco to Fairbanks of \$60 per ton. That does not include the transfer charges from the Alaska Steamship Co.'s steamer at St. Michael to the Northern Navigation Co.'s boats. On first glance it would not appear that that rate is so excessive, even for all-water transportation, but upon a more careful examination you are led to inspect what is called a "list of exceptions" on the back of the tariff sheet. It is provided in the "list of exceptions" that all commodities mentioned in the list take the flat rate of \$60 per ton, plus the percentage of such rate shown opposite each article on the list of exceptions. Here is a statement showing the flat rate per ton, the additional percentage of exceptions, and the real rate per ton paid by the shipper.

Northern Navigation Co. in connection with Alaska Steamship Co. and Pacific Coast Steamship Co.
[Freight tariff from Seattle or San Francisco to Fairbanks, Alaska, via St. Michael.]

	Flat rate per ton.	Additional percentage on exceptions.	Rate per ton.
Automobiles.....	\$60	200	\$180
Boats and canoes.....	60	150	150
Burial cases.....	60	100	120
Cash registers.....	60	100	120
Cigars, not corded.....	60	200	180
Clothing and robes.....	60	50	90
Dry goods.....	60	25	75
Cornice, etc.....	60	200	180
Explosives.....	60	200	180
Eggs.....	60	100	120
Fresh fruits.....	60	25	75
Furniture.....	60	100	120
Glass, boxed.....	60	50	90
Hats, millinery.....	60	60	90
Live stock and poultry.....	60	(1)	(1)
Lumber.....	60	50	90
Merchandise.....	60	50	90
Oils.....	60	50	90
Personal effects.....	60	50	90
Plans and organs.....	60	50	90
Sewing machines.....	60	50	90
Show cases.....	60	100	120
Trunks and valises.....	60	50	90
Typewriters.....	60	100	120
Vehicles.....	60	100	120

¹Special contract.

Machinery.

Weight of machinery—	Rate per ton.
Under 2,000 pounds.....	\$60.00
2,000—4,000 pounds.....	66.00
4,000—6,000 pounds.....	69.00
6,000—8,000 pounds.....	73.50
8,000—10,000 pounds.....	78.00
10,000—12,000 pounds.....	82.50
12,000—14,000 pounds.....	87.00
14,000—16,000 pounds.....	91.50
16,000—18,000 pounds.....	96.00
18,000—20,000 pounds.....	100.50
20,000—22,000 pounds.....	105.00
22,000—24,000 pounds.....	109.50
24,000—26,000 pounds.....	114.00
26,000—28,000 pounds.....	118.50
28,000—30,000 pounds.....	123.00
30,000—32,000 pounds.....	127.50
32,000—34,000 pounds.....	132.00
34,000—36,000 pounds.....	136.50
36,000—38,000 pounds.....	141.00
38,000—40,000 pounds.....	145.50

The first article mentioned in the list of exceptions is automobiles, boxed or crated, and upon that class of freight the shipper pays 200 per cent additional, which makes the rate charged \$180 per ton upon automobiles, and this will be charged either by weight or measurement, as the Transportation Trust shall determine, and the transfer charge at St. Michael will be added. Following automobiles come bicycles, with a 50 per cent additional charge, or \$90 per ton. Boats and canoes, 150 per cent additional, or \$150 per ton. Burial cases, 100 per cent additional, or \$120 per ton, weight or measurement; cash registers, 100 per cent additional, or \$120 per ton; clothing and robes, 50 per cent additional, or \$90 per ton; and so on down the list.

But when it comes to mining machinery the rates mount up more rapidly. Our mines require much heavy machinery—such as boilers, engines, and hoists—and for this class of freight the extra rate is all the way from \$6 to \$85 a ton additional. Notice that on this class of freight the rate ranges from the lowest, or \$60 per ton, to the highest, or \$145.50 per ton. The average freight rate into the Tanana interior over the Northern Navigation Line, in connection with the Alaska Syndicate steamers, is more than \$125 per ton, or, as it is more graphically put by the Geological Survey, it amounts to more than \$350 per annum for every white man, woman, and child in the Territory.

The minority report innocently says the Yukon Basin "is already served by water transportation," and passes the matter with that remark, as if it was satisfactory to the minority members. I assume that the minority members understood the situation in the Tanana Valley and along the Yukon and Tanana Rivers when they approved that transportation system, but I earnestly protest that that country can not be developed when its shippers are obliged to pay from \$60 to \$180 per ton for the freight brought into the country, or a freight rate which in the aggregate amounts to 50 per cent of the total output of its mines and is equal to \$350 per capita for each man, woman, and child in the country.

THE SIAMESE TWIN TRANSPORTATION COMPANIES.

The Northern Navigation Co., which carries the freight from St. Michael to Dawson, 1,600 miles up the Yukon River and 275

miles up the Tanana River, is a Siamese twin with the Northern Commercial Co., both being owned by the Sloss interests in San Francisco, who also own the Alaska Packers' Association, the Alaska Fish Trust. The Northern Commercial Co. owns large mercantile establishments at every landing along the Yukon and Tanana Rivers. The Northern Navigation Co. carries all the merchandise for the Northern Commercial Co., as well as for the independent merchant in the Yukon interior. It is not under the control of the Interstate Commerce Commission, since the freight is entirely carried by water. For this reason the navigation company gives the commercial company the lowest rate the traffic will bear, while it charges the common enemy, the independent merchant, its competitor, the highest rate the traffic will bear. That system has lasted for 15 years in the Yukon interior, is the rule to-day, and has resulted in bankruptcy to every merchant who has attempted to establish a store in the Tanana or Yukon interior. It has resulted in giving the Northern Commercial Co. a monopoly in the sale of all groceries, mercantile supplies, and mining machinery sold in that region.

ANOTHER SIAMESE TWIN.

While I am on this point, I call the attention of the House to the fact that the Alaska Syndicate railroad, the Copper River & Northwestern Railway, down the Copper River, carries the ore produced by the Kennecott Copper Mines Co., also owned by the Alaska Syndicate, in connection with the Alaska Steamship Co., also owned by the Alaska Syndicate, to the Tacoma Smelter, also owned by the Alaska Syndicate.

Mr. LINDBERGH. Are the passenger rates in proportion?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The passenger rates are in proportion. No man knows Alaska better than Dr. Brooks. No man has given better service to the people of Alaska and to the people of the United States than the man who has charge of the Alaska branch of the Geological Survey. He is unprejudiced, is a good man in every respect, and thoroughly competent to speak of matters in Alaska. If this House would consider the statements made by Dr. Brooks in his official reports, which I can not read, because I have not the time, you would have no hesitation or doubt as to the duty which you should perform in voting on this bill.

Now, I place a good deal of stress on this Siamese-twin corporation method of doing business on the Yukon River, because these two big interests—the Sloss interest, of San Francisco, and the Alaska Syndicate in New York—largely control all the transportation of Alaska. They have duplicate companies in the commercial interests—

Mr. MANAHAN. Is there any connection between the two groups?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes. That enables the transportation companies to charge independent miners in the country as much as they please and still do their own company no damage. It enables the company to charge merchants as high as they like—and they do charge \$180 a ton—and they get their own freight at a low rate. It enables them to charge a competitor about as much as he can make in the matter of profit, and thereby take his business away from him, and it thereby enables the Alaska Syndicate and copper business to destroy all competition.

Mr. MANAHAN. I meant to ask if there was any connection between the copper syndicate twin and the commercial transportation twin?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. There is. I will be able to give some evidence about that, but not as much as I would like to, because there is not enough of it in the record, but they work together in every respect.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Certainly.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Who are the individuals at the New York end of it? The gentleman spoke of the Sloss interest in San Francisco controlling the navigation on the Yukon from San Francisco up to that point.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. No; from San Francisco to St. Michael is controlled by the Alaskan syndicate. It controls rates at sea, but the Northern Navigation Co. controls the inland river rates. The syndicate is composed of Morgan & Co., Guggenheim, and Close Bros. That has all been gone over.

The opposition made to this bill by the gentlemen from Oklahoma is interesting from this point of view, for none of these Siamese-twin corporations could exist for one moment in the progressive State of Oklahoma.

Section 12 of article 9 of the Oklahoma constitution reads as follows:

SEC. 12. No railroad company shall ship within this State any article or commodity manufactured, mined, or produced by it or under its authority or which it may own, in whole or in part, or in which it may have any interest, direct or indirect, except such articles or commodity as may be necessary to and intended for use in the conduct of its business as a common carrier.

If the Alaska syndicate transportation lines, in connection with its Copper River & Northwestern Railway Co., should undertake to do this kind of business in the State of Oklahoma, under that constitutional provision, and should undertake there to carry freight for a Siamese-twin corporation, as these Alaska corporations do, the Siamese-twin connection would be promptly and rudely severed by the meat ax of the Oklahoma constitution. Such a system is vicious and in violation of every principle of just government and honest trade. From the viewpoint of the constitution of Oklahoma, adopted by the people of that progressive State, that which the minority report recommends Congress to do for Alaska is denounced and forbidden; that which the minority report denounces in unmeasured scorn is approved in Oklahoma and reserved by the fundamental law as among the most sacred rights of the people.

No government control is ever exercised over freight rates in the interior of Alaska. The millions of dollars of excessive rates that shippers are obliged to pay these transportation pirates prevents the development of Alaska. The rates are so excessive and the business is so manipulated by rebates and private contracts that independent merchants can not exist there. These transportation carriers—the Northern Navigation Co., with its mercantile Siamese twin; the Northern Commercial Co. and the Copper River & Northwestern Railway, with its mining Siamese twin; the Kennecott Copper Mining Co., whose ore it carries, are able to destroy every competitor and take their business or mine by charging the mercantile or mining competitor excessive rates equal to the profits which its twin wishes to make on merchandise or mining. And yet we find this infamous scheme for building monopoly and destroying competition calmly approved by the minority report.

THE FAIRBANKS-CHITINA LINE.

Fairbanks is the upriver end of the Northern Navigation Co.'s steamer line; Chitina, on the Copper River Railroad, is the point where travel and freight from that railroad leaves the line for the interior. Fairbanks and Chitina are connected by a wagon road built by the United States, and the more money the Government expends upon the wagon road the more the stage line which uses it charges the people of Alaska to travel on it. In 1906, when the road was first established, it cost a traveler \$125 to ride on the Orr Stage Line from Fairbanks to Valdez, a distance of 365 miles, but in 1908 this stage line was taken over by the one or both of these big transportation companies as a connecting link between them, and the terminal was changed from Valdez to Chitina, a point only 310 miles distant from Fairbanks. Notwithstanding the lessening of the distance, the rate was increased from \$125 to \$135 to Chitina. The Alaska Syndicate Railroad then taxes the traveler \$17.50 additional to get to Cordova where he meets the steamer, making his total passenger fare \$152.50, as against the original \$125 for the same service—an increase of 22 per cent.

Here is a receipt for money which I paid to the Orr Stage Co. for baggage from Fairbanks to Chitina, a distance of 310 miles. It is offered to show what this transportation monopoly makes the people of Alaska pay—at the rate \$1,000 per ton—for baggage, in addition to the \$135 for fare, over the national road, which the United States built, and over which it permits the Alaska Syndicate to fix rates of transportation without limit.

Trip No. 11. Consignee, Judge Wickersham, Chitina-Fairbanks, November 7, 1912.
Ed. S. Orr & Co. (Inc.), Fairbanks-Valdez Stage Line.

Description of article.	Weight.	Rate.	Amount.
1 trunk, 1 valise.....	173		
Less bag allowance on 2 tickets.....	80		
	93	\$0.50	\$46.50

Paid, Nov. 7, 1912. J. R. Fowle, agent.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of this House, we pay at the rate of \$1,000 a ton for taking our light freight and baggage over that wagon road, because the Guggenheims have charge of transportation on it.

Mr. COOPER. How long a distance is that?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Three hundred and ten miles.

Mr. MADDEN. How did they get charge of it?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. By building all of the road houses along the line and owning and controlling the stage line over it.

Mr. MADDEN. Why does the Government allow anybody to take charge of this road?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. That is what I am putting up to you now.

Mr. MADDEN. Who is responsible for it?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. You are. I do not mean you personally, but I mean the House of Representatives.

Mr. MADDEN. How?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Because it does not take charge of fixing rates.

Mr. MADDEN. Does anybody pretend to say that the executive officials of the Government, charged with the expenditure of millions of dollars for building private highways, have the audacity to turn that highway after it is built over to some private enterprise and then not be charged with the responsibility for neglect of duty?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. They did not turn it over in that sense.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman does not mean to assume that the House of Representatives is responsible for the failure of the executive branch to perform this duty?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes, I do; because the executive branch has nothing to do with fixing the rates and the House has.

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

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. There is a Government road built in British Columbia running from Ashcroft, about the same distance as this road. Does the gentleman know the relative rates charged on the Government road in British Columbia and this road?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. No; I do not.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I was in hopes that the gentleman did.

Mr. LEVY. Will the gentleman yield? If you build the railroad, would not that kill these excessive high freight rates?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. At present the only means of transportation into the interior of Alaska—

Mr. LEVY. If you build a Government railroad, that would kill the high-price freight rates that they have upon this line, would it not?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I think so; yes.

RATES OVER THE COPPER RIVER & NORTHWESTERN RAILWAY.

At present the only means of transportation to the interior of Alaska from the southern harbors is over the Copper River & Northwestern Railway, the Alaska Syndicate road, extending from Cordova, on one of the beautiful harbors of Prince William Sound, eastward 25 or 30 miles to the Copper River, and thence up the canyon of the Copper River to Chitina. The stage line from Fairbanks connects with the Copper River & Northwestern Railway at Chitina. During six months of the year this is the route to the interior. At Fairbanks connection is made with the Northern Navigation Co.

A COMPARISON BETWEEN THE ALASKA SYNDICATE RATES IN ALASKA AND TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY RATES.

I want to call the attention of the House to the rates charged on the Copper River & Northwestern Railroad, which belongs to the Guggenheim-Alaska Syndicate Co., a road only 196 miles from one end of it to the other. See what they charge for rates:

Alaska rates over Copper River & Northwestern Railroad from Cordova to Chitina, 131 miles.

	Per ton.
Grain and feed.....	\$25.00
Hay.....	20.00
Hardware.....	34.00
Mining machinery.....	34.00
Coal.....	7.00
Lumber.....per M feet.....	11.00

Alaska steamship rates from Seattle to Cordova, 1,236 miles.

	Per ton.
Grain and feed.....	\$11.00
Hay.....	20.00
Hardware.....	12.00
Mining machinery.....	15.00
Coal.....	8.00

Transcontinental rates, Chicago or New York to Seattle, 3,184 miles.

	Per ton.
Grain and feed, from Chicago.....	\$15.00
Hay, from Chicago.....	22.00
Hardware, from New York.....	35.00
Mining machinery, from New York.....	30.00
Coal, from Chicago.....	8.80

From Cordova to Chitina it is 131 miles. It is a mining country above Chitina, and hardware and mining machinery, grain and feed, hay, lumber, coal, and live stock are all necessary freight over the road. For transportation over this 131 miles the Alaska Syndicate Co. charges, for grain and feed, \$25 per ton; hay, \$20 per ton; hardware, \$34 per ton; mining machinery, \$34 per ton; lumber, \$11 per thousand feet; coal, \$7 per ton; live stock, per car—on horses, \$200; cattle, \$180; hogs, \$160; and sheep, \$160.

These rates are transcontinental rates. It costs only \$15 a ton to ship grain and feed from Chicago to Seattle, while the

Alaska Syndicate taxes the people of Alaska \$25 a ton for 131 miles. It costs \$22 a ton to ship hay from Chicago to Seattle and \$20 a ton from Cordova to Chitina.

But the real difficulty comes with hardware and mining machinery. They serve a really distinct mining country, where hardware and mining machinery are necessary to development. For these classes of freight the Alaska Syndicate railroad charges \$34 a ton, or 27 cents per mile, for the haul of 131 miles from Cordova to Chitina. The rate from New York to Seattle on hardware is \$35 per ton, while it is only \$30 a ton on mining machinery. If the transcontinental rate was charged at the Alaska rate it would amount to \$859.68 per ton. They charge \$7 a ton for coal from Cordova to Chitina, while the transcontinental lines charge only \$8.80 from Chicago to Seattle. And so it is with live stock and all other necessary freight for this mining country. The local rate is 10 times more in proportion for the same freight transportation than railroads in the United States charge.

Nor is this all—it is only a good beginning. You have seen that the freight from Cordova to Chitina, 131 miles, is the same or greater than the total transcontinental rate. The Alaska Syndicate owns the Alaska Steamship Co. and carries the freight from Seattle to Cordova on these steamers before it is transferred to their railroad and carried into the interior 131 miles. From Seattle to Cordova they charge an additional amount of \$12 a ton on hardware, \$15 a ton on mining machinery, \$11 a ton on grain and feed, \$20 a ton on hay, and \$8 a ton on coal. So that the Alaska miner pays freight at Chitina on grain and feed, \$36 a ton; upon hay, \$40 a ton; upon hardware, \$46 a ton; upon mining machinery, \$49 a ton; and upon coal, \$15 a ton, being the two local rates added. This is the highest freight rate paid anywhere in American territory. There is no limit upon the amount which this great syndicate may charge the people of Alaska for freight upon their steamers, for they carry only local freight at sea from Seattle to their wharf at Cordova, and in that way evade any control of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Add the freight from Seattle to Cordova by boat, the railroad freight from Cordova to Chitina, and the freight from Chitina to Fairbanks by stage or by any conveyance which the shipper may employ, and it amounts to confiscation. No independent concern can do business in the interior of Alaska with the Northern Commercial Co. and its Northern Navigation Co. twin at that end of the line, and with the Alaska Syndicate charging 25 times the transcontinental rate for its brief 131 miles, and both these in charge of the stage line connecting Chitina with Fairbanks.

We pay a freight rate of \$34 a ton for carrying mining machinery and \$34 for hardware over this line for a distance of 131 miles. Now, from New York to Seattle over the transcontinental lines, this same machinery is carried a distance of 3,184 miles for hardware \$35 a ton and for mining machinery \$30 a ton.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman permit one question in connection with the dialogue we had a moment ago?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Did the gentleman, knowing the facts with reference to the excessive charges there, ever introduce a bill to change the rate?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The gentleman never has, for the very good reason there never was the slightest sympathy for the Territory of Alaska until Woodrow Wilson became President. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Now, over this road from Cordova to Chitina, a distance of 131 miles, we pay the same rate which is paid from New York to Seattle on the same identical machinery and hardware. Nor is this all. We not only pay \$34 upon these commodities for this 131 miles of road, but we have to take those commodities from Seattle to Cordova. We can not get a through rate. You can not get through rates upon goods shipped upon any railroad in Alaska. The steamship companies will only take your freight from Seattle or San Francisco to the dock at Cordova. The contract from Seattle or San Francisco to Cordova is a contract for a shipment upon water, and does not come under control of the Interstate Commerce Commission. When you get the freight to the railroad in Cordova, you have to pay the rates approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission over the railroad; but that commission has no control over the steamship companies' rates from Seattle or San Francisco to Alaska, and there is no local control whatever over either the water or railroad rates.

I have shown the connection between the rates on the Yukon and Tanana Rivers, the rates over the connecting line between Fairbanks and Chitina, the rates on the Copper River & Northwestern Road and the Alaska Syndicate twin transportation line, the Alaska Steamship Co., for the purpose of demonstrat-

ing to this House that there is no possibility of any independent business in the interior of Alaska unless we get an independent transportation line which will deliver freight there at competitive rates. There is no competition now; it is an insolent monopoly.

Let us look at a new feature of this transportation question for a moment. I have attempted to explain to the House that the Northern Commercial Co., on the Yukon and Tanana Rivers, through its ownership of its own line of steamers under the corporate name of the Northern Navigation Co., is able to monopolize the whole mercantile business of that region as well as all the transportation business. It has been enormously profitable to this company, first, because it had a monopoly of the transportation, and, second, by reason of its monopoly of the transportation it has had a monopoly of all the mercantile business in the country, which it manages through its stores at every steamboat landing for 2,000 miles along the Yukon and Tanana Rivers. Its intimate relationship with the Alaska Syndicate line is well shown by their joint tariff rates, their joint management of the connecting line from Fairbanks to Chitina, and their joint control and management of the lines to the mouth of the Yukon River and from the White Pass Railway line down the Yukon to the interior, via Dawson.

There is no competition at all. The Alaska Syndicate controls the transportation to Alaska and in Alaska, and it manipulates the rates with water transportation and controls it in such a way as to exclude the control of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Now, I want to call attention to another thing. The Alaska Syndicate is very largely controlled by the Guggenheims. The Guggenheims are not railroad men. They are not engaged in railroad exploitation anywhere except as it becomes a part of their mining operations. The Guggenheims are the greatest mining trust in the world, and I expressed an admiration for their greatness a while ago. They control all the smelters on the Pacific coast. They control all the ore carried from Alaska to those smelters. They control the railroad up the Copper River to their great copper field, and they fix the rates. Now, I want to call attention to those rates and why they are fixed as they are.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I do not want to be bothered, if the gentleman will excuse me.

Mr. FESS. I would like to know why the Interstate Commerce Commission has not control over that?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Because it has no jurisdiction on transportation carried by water, but only on railroads. They do not carry by railroad, but by water. If they used the railroads the Government would have power over them. They opposed the application of the interstate-commerce laws to Alaska down to the last minute.

Permit me to call your attention to the excessive rates fixed by the Alaska Syndicate for carrying ore out of the Copper River country over its line of railroad and its ore-carrying steamship line—the Alaska Steamship Co. At page 616 of the Senate hearings on the Alaska railway bill will be found a copy of the Alaska Syndicate's ore rate sheet No. 1. It is marked "The rate sheet of the Copper River & Northwestern Railway Co. in connection with the Alaska Steamship Co." which are, of course, mere divisions of the Alaska Syndicate investments in Alaska. This ore tariff sheet fixes the rate of transportation from all points on this line of road in Alaska to their Tacoma smelter on Puget Sound.

The Guggenheim Copper Trust owns the Tacoma smelter, and all the copper from Alaska is carried in its boats to this smelter for reduction. The freight rate is based upon the value of the ore as given by this smelter on reduction of the ore.

Freight rate from points on the Copper River & Northwestern Railroad to Tacoma Smelter, Tacoma, Wash.

[Rates in cents per ton of 2,000 pounds, on value of ore at Tacoma Smelter.]

To Tacoma from—	Actual value per ton of 2,000 pounds not to exceed—								
	\$25	\$40	\$50	\$65	\$80	\$200	\$300	\$400	\$500
Alaganik.....	575	750	900	1,100	1,250	1,450	1,710	1,840	1,970
Bremner.....	985	1,150	1,300	1,500	1,650	1,850	2,190	2,360	2,530
Chitina.....									
Kotsina.....									
Strelina.....									
Chokosna.....									
Moose Lake.....	1,100	1,400	1,700	2,050	2,250	2,450	2,910	3,140	3,370
Long Lake.....									
Porphyry.....									
McCarthy.....									
Kennicott.....									

This table and the one following show the rates on carload lots, but on less than carload lots the rate is very much higher:

Table showing general average rates.

Value of ore.	Freight rate.		Average rate. ¹	
	Per ton.	Per cent.	Per ton.	Per cent.
\$1 to \$25.....	\$11.00	72	\$11.00	72
\$26 to \$40.....	14.00	46.9	14.00	46.9
\$41 to \$50.....	17.00	37.7	17.00	37.7
\$51 to \$65.....	20.50	35.8	20.50	35.8
\$66 to \$80.....	22.50	31	22.50	31
\$81 to \$200.....	24.50	21.2	24.50	21.2
\$201 to \$300.....	29.10	12	29.10	12
\$301 to \$400.....	31.40	9.1	31.40	9.1
\$401 to \$500.....	33.70	7.37	33.70	7.37

¹General average rate 30½ per cent total value.
²Of the total value.

In addition to the freight rate deducted at the Tacoma smelter there is a smelter charge of \$3.75 per ton, and the trust then takes the product at 3 cents a pound, or \$60 per ton, less than the market price. Of course this system of robbery is based upon monopoly and the fact that Congress is asleep while the trust is awake and active. Will Congress awake and perform its duty?

The Alaska Syndicate mines at Kennecott embrace about 4,000 acres and contain a copper deposit of unrivaled richness and magnitude. This area was obtained from the United States at \$5 per acre, and the Alaska Syndicate has United States patent for title. The ore is of beautiful peacock blue and is 75 per cent copper, with some values in gold. At one time this ore deposit occupied a solid vein in the mountain high above its present position. As the ages wore on more and more of the rock holding the vein was undermined, and the ore fell into the canyon where it now lies. When the Alaska Syndicate bought it for \$5 an acre from the United States this immense deposit of high-grade ore, quarried and ready for shipment, lying in this gorge was of the value of more than \$25,000,000. The vein yet remaining in place is of great extent and unknown depth, so that it really represents one of the great copper mines of the world.

But it may be asked, Why does the shipper not patronize another line of railroad, another line of ore-carrying boats, or another smelter, where he can get better rates? The answer to that is: There is no other line of railroad; there is no other line of ore-carrying boats; there is no other smelter. The miner of Alaska and those who are obliged to transport mining machinery or anything else for the development of the country are entirely at the mercy of a single transportation monopoly, headed by the Alaska Syndicate.

In 1910 copper to the extent of \$230,000 was mined in Alaska. In 1911 it had increased to nearly \$3,000,000; in 1912 it had increased to \$4,904,000, and it is expected to increase or diminish at the caprice or interest of the Copper Trust. Every dollar of all that ore was taken out by the Guggenheims and carried either to their Tacoma smelter or shipped to New Jersey, to one or the other of their smelters. No other person or corporation has mined or can mine copper in Alaska.

The opposition to our effort to relieve Alaska from this monopoly taunts us with the fact that there is but one copper mine in the interior of Alaska which is producing. That is undoubtedly true, and the reason for it is that the great Copper Trust, the American Smelting & Refining Co., of which the Guggenheims are masters, has used all the force and brutality of the Alaska Syndicate and its various transportation lines to prevent any other mine from being opened in that country except by themselves. There will not be any other copper mine opened there except by the Copper Trust, however rich and extensive the copper property may be, until the Government shall take hold of the situation with a strong hand and undo the monopoly which now exists there. Nowhere has monopoly so firm a hold on the undeveloped natural resources of a country as the Alaska Syndicate (Guggenheim Copper Trust) has upon the undeveloped copper resources of Alaska.

There is no power in the people of Alaska, nor by a combination of small interests, to compete with the Alaska Syndicate and its allied interests in Alaska. Unless this bill shall pass the syndicate will continue to be supreme in the Territory of Alaska, and will continue to gather to its owners the undeveloped resources of the country at Government prices. Shall the Government or the Guggenheims control Alaska? If this House shall refuse to pass this bill and, on the contrary, shall go back to the old system of the open door in handing out the resources of Alaska, it will be but a short time until they will all belong to the Alaska Syndicate, or at least all that it wishes to obtain.

There is no power in Alaska to restrain the entire monopoly of its resources by the Alaska Syndicate—there is none anywhere except in Congress itself. If you shall refuse to exercise that power in accordance with the highly patriotic policy announced in his message by President Wilson, your refusal means to aid the Alaska Syndicate in its campaign to further monopolize the resources of the Territory which the Constitution places under your charge as its guardian. Will you aid in its protection or permit monopoly to take it with your silent connivance?

GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP.

Some of the opponents of this bill object to it on the ground that it establishes Government ownership in Alaska, which they seem to fear more than they do Guggenheim ownership. Upon its face the bill authorizes the President to locate and construct a railroad in Alaska from one of its southern harbors to its great interior waterways. The bill creates a mortgage upon the public lands of Alaska as security for bonds to be issued in the sum of \$35,000,000. The President is authorized to sell the bonds and with the proceeds obtained therefrom to build the railroad. The bonds are to run for a series of years and are to be secured, not only by the public lands of Alaska but upon the property of the railroad itself. It is provided that 50 per cent of all the sales of public land in the Territory of Alaska shall be deposited in a sinking fund for the payment of the bonds when due.

Of course, the credit of the United States stands behind the transaction, because the public domain in Alaska belongs to the United States and the expenditure is to be met from a sale of the lands. But that seems a better plan than to give the lands to a private corporation and also a monopoly in transportation. Substantially the bill creates a plan for mortgaging Alaska, its resources, and its people to secure the money with which to build this road, but, of course, if they fail, which they can not, the Government must pay.

It will readily be seen that upon the face of the transaction it differs but little from the efforts heretofore made by Congress to develop other new territories. Congress appropriated millions of acres of the public domain in the West and South, and gave them as a bonus to private corporations to enable them to build trunk-line railroads for the development of those territories. There is no difference in principle between those appropriations of the public funds and public lands and the one under discussion, except that in this instance Congress acts more wisely, because it subjects the lands to be used for the building of the Alaska road to a mortgage upon which it procures the money, and with that money builds the road. In the meantime Congress will sell these lands to our own people, and thus we will have the land and the Government will have the railroad. Under the old system Congress made millionaires out of impecunious speculators, like those now roosting on the gallery rails of this House and crying out against this bill.

So far as the bill under discussion is concerned, there is no purpose in it to establish a system of Government ownership in Alaska or to acquire the railroads now constructed there. The purpose of the bill is to connect the Alaskan seaboard with the navigable rivers in the interior, and to build and operate a standard-gauge trunk line of railroad over the route. The bill provides that the President may either lease or operate this road.

AN ALASKA NAVAL BASE.

Under its constitutional grants of power Congress has authority to establish a naval base on any one of the great harbors in southern Alaska, and to erect such forts, public buildings, arsenals, dockyards, and other structures needed for the general welfare and protection of the United States. Under this constitutional authority Congress has the power to appropriate money, not only to pay for all these necessary public buildings and structures, but to build a railroad in connection therewith to any coal fields where fuel may be obtained for the use of the Army, the Navy, or other public use. Congress has the power under these constitutional provisions to extend that railroad from the seaboard to the great interior river waterways for the extension of trade and commerce and the general welfare and development of the territory there owned by the United States. Under its general authority "to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States" Congress has authority to create a mortgage upon the public lands of Alaska, and to provide for the payment of that mortgage out of the sale of the lands, and to use the proceeds for the purpose of building the railroad in question. These questions have been determined affirmatively by the Supreme Court of the United States so many times that it is not necessary to cite authorities, though the case of *Wilson v. Shaw* (204 U. S., 24-33) is in point.

It follows that "Government ownership," so far as it affects the location and construction of the railroad in question, is a constitutional power possessed by Congress. It is the duty of Congress to exercise its constitutional powers whenever a duty arises which requires it to do so. It is the duty of Congress to legislate in and for the development of the Territory of Alaska, and the time has now arrived in the development of the Territory of Alaska when we must either have "Government ownership" or "Guggenheim ownership," and it is now for the House to choose which it will take.

Under the constitutional power to provide for the common defense and general welfare, to borrow money, to maintain an Army and Navy, and to perform acts necessary for the protection of the country, Congress may, and when necessary its duty is, to establish a naval base on one of those great Alaskan harbors. It is necessary to do that at this moment, and this bill is the beginning of such an establishment.

Since the pillars of Hercules guided the first frail raft from the Mediterranean into the Atlantic the active scenes of maritime civilization have taken place on the Atlantic Ocean. When Columbus extended their activities to the New World the civilized nations of the Old were gathered along the European shores of the Atlantic. As people in the New World increased in number and erected new nations there, their hardy pioneers crossed the great deserts to the Pacific and built cities along its shores. California was made a State overnight without having worn the swaddling clothes of a Territory.

Trade and commerce have now gone into the Pacific; new lines of trade and travel have been established from our American shores to Yokohama, Shanghai, Hongkong, and the harbors of the Indian Sea. Our alliances with these Asiatic millions are becoming more fixed and valuable to us, and rapidly the scene of the world's activities in trade and commerce is changing from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Certainly the trade and commerce of the United States will be greater over the Pacific than over the Atlantic. Our trade relations with the Orient have so far been pleasant, agreeable, and profitable, but as our Nation is rapidly becoming the great maritime and commercial power in the Pacific we must make cautious provision for protecting that trade and commerce from unfair encroachment. It is the part of wisdom and it is your constitutional duty to make provision for the protection of our coasts in case of war with any of our neighbors on the Pacific. Congress has already spent millions of dollars in building forts, arsenals, dockyards, and other defensive works upon the Pacific, upon the Hawaiian Islands, and at Manila. But none of these are of value without the Navy. We need and must have such a navy upon the Pacific that no enemy will dare to attack us, and we will therefore always be at peace. There can be no navy without coal, and there is no naval coal on the Pacific coast except in Alaska.

In the hearings upon this bill before the Senate Committee on Territories naval officers were invited to be present, and their testimony was taken at some length in respect to the quantity and quality of the coal needed by the Pacific Fleet and the price to be paid therefor. This testimony was not repeated in the House hearings, but will be found in full in the Senate hearings, beginning on page 290, where there are also long extracts from the testimony of the Secretary of the Navy, given before the House Naval Committee in February, 1912, in which the Secretary speaks authoritatively and officially in respect to the quality of the coal in Alaska and the quantity of coal needed on the Pacific coast.

Now, I want to call attention to the fact that the rate for carrying ore in Alaska is fixed on the value of the ore in the Tacoma smelter. If you had ore on the line of this road you would have to transport it to Tacoma, because that is the only smelter that reduces copper; you would have to transport it on the Alaska steamship boats, and on their railroads, and finally they fix the value of the ore at their own smelter.

Mr. MANAHAN. Wherein would the building of a railroad break the control of their ore-carrying steamship companies? Granting the monopoly of the syndicate on the ore business, wherein would the building of the railroad alone by the Government break the control of that syndicate in the matter of charging by water and charging by smelting, and in the other respects?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Well, that is a very serious question; but if a railroad were built from Valdez to the copper region it would give the independent copper men in that country a chance for independent shipments. There is a new smelter in British Columbia. The Alaska ore could be shipped to that smelter, but there would have to be an independent railroad to get it out, and there would have to be an independent shipment on the sea down to the smelter. If the Government would build

a railroad from Valdez to that common point and afford the copper people an independent outlet for their copper, there would be plenty of boats to take the copper to where some chance of competition exists, but there is none there now.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Certainly.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. The exorbitant rates that the gentleman is discussing are fixed, are they, wholly in the Territory of Alaska?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Who controls and fixes those rates? Have you a railroad commission in Alaska?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. No, sir; there is nothing in Alaska in the way of a rate-fixing body except the Alaska Syndicate [laughter], which controls the rates in that Territory.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Have you any authority up there anywhere by which that situation can be remedied?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I said a moment ago that only a year ago we got a writ of mandamus from the Supreme Court of the United States to compel the Interstate Commerce Commission to take jurisdiction. But the Interstate Commerce Commission has no control over water rates. That is the trouble.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. Have the Interstate Commerce Commission taken any action or have they fixed any schedule of rates?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes; they have fixed the rates that I am talking to you about. They fixed them at that rate because nobody objected. Nobody is in a position to object, because if you fight their railroad rates and ship over their roads later they will take it out of you on the water rates and then again at the smelter. They have a chance at you in so many other ways where they now have a monopoly that no shipper dares to protest. But if we had some independent outlet from that country and some independent ore-carrying boats by which we could reach an independent smelter, our miners would have some chance to secure results. Now, what does this amount to? It amounts to so much that the Alaska Syndicate spent \$20,000,000 in building a railroad to their Kennicott mines. Those are the greatest copper mines in the world. That is a copper region. There are immense deposits of copper there, but the syndicate people have been able to get title to all portions of it which they wish, through the monopoly which they exercise over freight rates and the smelting of the ore.

Mr. SCOTT. What mileage does that cover?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. One hundred and ninety-six miles on the railroad.

Mr. SCOTT. Does that carry it to Chitina?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. That covers the whole line from Cordova to Kennicott. A new line of 160 miles of road would cover the whole situation. It would be sufficient to give competition with the Alaska Syndicate road. That is why we want two railroads in the bill. We want a railroad built from Valdez out to this copper region, so there may be an independent outlet for the copper independents. Then we want a railroad from Seward through the great Susitna Valley into the interior.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. I should like to ask the gentleman whether he is familiar with the acreage of copper mines that this company owns?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I am—only in a general way.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. And the supposed acreage not owned by the company, but by the Government and by other persons?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. There was some testimony taken on that subject before one of the Senate committees, and at that time it was admitted that the Alaska Syndicate had title to 3,240 acres of this copper land at Kennecott. I am told that since then they have acquired title to a large area on Prince William Sound; and wherever a bit of copper shows up that is of any value they sit right there until they get it away from the man for a song, and they usually sing the song themselves.

But it may be asked, Why does not the miner patronize another line of railroad, another steamboat company, and another smelter? The answer is, There is no other line of railroad; there is no other line of ore-carrying boats; there is no other smelter. Everything in the way of transportation which is worth having is owned by the Alaska Syndicate, and if it is not owned by them it is controlled by them.

If the House would have some committee inquire into these matters and secure the exact facts, it would be of great benefit to the House, to the country, and to Alaska.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. If the syndicate owns all of this country, what is the use of building a railroad there, to turn what is left over to those people who own or control everything there?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The syndicate does not own all of this country.

Mr. MADDEN. I thought the gentleman said it did.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I said it owned everything that was of any known value at this time.

Mr. MADDEN. Then there is nothing left.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The gentleman is mistaken. There is much left.

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

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. TOWNER. I understood the gentleman to say a moment ago that you ought to have two routes, and one of those would be a route connecting the port of Valdez with the copper region.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. TOWNER. Does the gentleman think this bill would authorize the building of such a railroad?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Undoubtedly.

Mr. TOWNER. I should like to know where the language is that authorizes it.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. It authorizes the President to locate such a route.

Mr. TOWNER. No; it authorizes the President to locate it, with two objects in view, and only two.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. TOWNER. One to connect a port on the open sea with the interior, and that certainly would not be within the purview of this act, and the other is to reach a coal field. Those are the only two objects. Now, the gentleman says he would like a road from Valdez to the copper mines, which is not included within any language, that I can see.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I think it is. It is in the interior, and it is for the development of the interior.

Mr. TOWNER. Oh, no; the interior, as the gentleman has told us a dozen times, means the valleys of the Yukon and its tributaries and the valleys of the Koskokwim and its tributaries. That is the interior of Alaska.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes; that is one interior, and I may have talked more of that than of the other; but I think the language is broad enough to cover both.

Mr. TOWNER. When I refer to the interior of Alaska I mean those valleys that contain the copper fields.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Well, it may be necessary to make an amendment if the gentleman is correct.

Mr. TOWNER. I am sure there would have to be an amendment.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Now, I want to call attention to this map of the great circle sailing route made by the Hydrographic Office. I call attention to the fact that it is so constructed that a straight line drawn on the map is the shortest line between two points, and I make that Irish statement because the roundness of the earth would render it untrue on a Mercator's map. A line drawn from Seattle to Yokohama passes through the Aleutian Islands. A line drawn from San Francisco to Yokohama and then to Hongkong, Shanghai, or Manila passes a little south but substantially near it. The navy yard and naval base at Hawaii are 1,500 miles off the line. In other words, all naval vessels going from Puget Sound should go by the Aleutian Islands. They should take the great northern route which was used by the Spaniards in the early days when they sent their ships from Manila to Acapulco, Mexico, and sought to escape the freebooters which infested the more southern routes. It is the old northern route, the great circle sailing route.

Now, in these great harbors in Alaska we have the finest naval base in the world. We have the navy coal back of the harbors, and this Government railroad, if built from one of the harbors back to the coal, would supply the naval base.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. In that connection, I understood that the Secretary of the Navy had recently said that this coal is not of a quality that can be used for naval purposes on board ships. Does the gentleman know whether that is true or not?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes; there was some coal taken out of the Bering River coal fields—taken out in a very inefficient way, filled with rubbish and rock. It was sent down and put on the dock at San Francisco or Puget Sound, and they undertook to clean and use it. It was not mined by miners; it was not mined by coal men, and I believe the report on that coal

was against it. It came from the Bering River coal fields and has nothing to do with the Matanuska fields.

Mr. DAVENPORT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. DAVENPORT. Was not this test made at Annapolis, where the most scientific tests can be made for the properties of coal?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I suppose it was. If the gentleman says so, I have no reason to dispute it.

Mr. DAVENPORT. I will ask the gentleman if the same authority that he relied upon a while ago—Dr. Brooks—did not say, in his testimony before the Senate committee, that the Bering River coal fields were better than the Matanuska fields for steam purposes?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. He might have said that, and he might have been right about it.

Mr. MADDEN. I want to ask the gentleman if the fact that the coal was not mined by miners had anything to do with the quality of the coal?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes; it might be clean or dirty coal.

Mr. MADDEN. In making the test for coal you do not test the dirt.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes; they tested the dirt.

Mr. MADDEN. Well, I do not know about that.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I do not know that I do, either.

[Laughter.] But I am informed they did.

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask if it is not a fact that the Secretary of the Navy stated that they used the washing, screening, and evaporating test at Annapolis in order to test this coal?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I do not know; but it may be.

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

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Certainly.

Mr. TOWNER. Is it not true that this coal that was taken out was merely surface coal?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. TOWNER. And was taken out by the Geological Survey men, or under their supervision at least?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. It was surface coal.

Mr. TOWNER. It was not mined at all; and is there not a very large difference between surface coal and coal taken from the interior of the mine?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I do not know. I am not a coal miner, and know very little about it, but I know it was surface coal.

I want to say to this House on this subject that you have not coal enough on the Pacific coast to last your Navy for 60 days in case of war. If to-morrow we had a war with a foreign nation on the Pacific coast, within 60 days your Navy would have to go into a harbor and get behind the fortifications. I want to say another thing. It costs you \$9 a ton to ship your coal around from Virginia and Baltimore for the use of the Pacific Navy, and you ship it in foreign bottoms manned by foreign seamen. You do not get the advantage of it at all in America. You are paying \$9 a ton for shipping coal around in that way which you could get in an independent naval-base harbor in Alaska for about \$2.50 a ton. You are not only paying \$9 a ton freight, but you are paying \$3 a ton for the coal on board of the collier at Norfolk or Baltimore, making \$11 to \$12 a ton for what coal you do get around there. You are getting about 250,000 tons per annum, according to the statement of Secretary Meyer. He also testified that in case of war you would need 2,400,000 tons in a year on the Pacific coast, and 2,400,000 tons, at \$9 per ton, would be \$21,600,000 that we pay for freight. We would almost pay for the railroad in one year under those circumstances, and, besides, you would have security for your country and a naval base that could not be attacked halfway between our ports and the Orient. [Applause.]

That is another reason why you ought to build a railroad in Alaska. It is for the benefit of your country. You could save almost enough out of that railroad in one year, certainly in 10 years, in your naval coal to pay for the railroad, and as we people in the interior of Alaska would save a million and a quarter dollars in freight per annum, you will see what an advantage it would be to the people of the United States, even if the road did not pay a profit on its running.

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

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. BRYAN. The gentleman said awhile ago that the Guggenheims had gotten the copper. Why did they not get the coal?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. They did not get the coal, because President Roosevelt stopped them.

Mr. BRYAN. When?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. In 1906, just as they had it in their hands and the price was practically paid and the deed delivered.

Mr. BRYAN. Then, if Roosevelt had not stopped them from getting the coal, Woodrow Wilson would not have been very much interested in establishing a naval base out there?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I am not criticising Mr. Roosevelt, for he did right and saved the situation in the first instance; but Mr. Wilson is the first influential force since that day to give any aid to open up the Territory of Alaska or develop it, and now we have sympathy and assistance not only from the administration, but from both sides of this House.

Mr. FESS. That is right.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. On page 292 he said:

Secretary MEYER. The Navy now consumes 160,000 tons a year on the Pacific coast. If the entire fleet were operating there at times after the canal is opened the amount will be about 300,000 tons. In time of war a fleet operating in the Pacific would require 200,000 tons a month. The analysis made of the sample recently obtained by the experts of the Bureau of Mines while in Alaska show that the Matanuska and Bering River coals are exceptionally low in ash and sulphur and very high in heating value, the British thermal units in some cases running as high as 15,400, while the eastern coals average a little under 14,800.

Mr. BUTLER. What is the freight from Newport News to the Pacific coast?

Secretary MEYER. From \$5 to \$8.

Even if you did not use any more on the Pacific than now, even if it is confined to what is used to-day, you can save a million and a quarter dollars per year by building this road to these coal fields, and in case of war it might save the fate of the Nation. The people of the interior would save a million and a quarter on freight per annum. I think it is time for the patriotic men of this House to get together and lay aside this talk about watermelons in Alaska and build this road and develop the country. It is a storehouse of great wealth and belongs to the people. If you will take up and understand the situation, instead of talking about watermelons and fighting about Government ownership, we will get something done in Alaska, and the people will thank you for it. [Applause.]

Mr. MADDEN. What is the total tonnage hauled over the railroads there now per year?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The Guggenheims hauled about four million dollars' worth of copper last year and about three and a half to four million this year.

Mr. MADDEN. How many tons?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I can not give you any idea, but it is the richest copper mine in the world.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman does not know what the total tonnage hauled over the railroads is?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. It is not a long railroad; it is only a short road of 196 miles.

Mr. MADDEN. They have five railroads?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. About 500 miles in Alaska, and some only about 10 miles long.

Mr. MADDEN. Does anybody know the tonnage hauled on those railroads?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. They are not hauling anything now.

Mr. MADDEN. Then they are not running successfully?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. No.

Mr. MADDEN. Is there any evidence this road would run successfully if operated?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Why?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Because it would run into a great rich, new country, and would not be under the control and domination of the Alaska Syndicate like these are.

Mr. MADDEN. Are there any laws now on the statute books of the United States that authorize the settlement of this country on an equitable basis?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. What are they?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The homestead laws.

Mr. MADDEN. Under what conditions are men allowed to homestead there?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. You are allowed to take 320 acres and prove up after three years, as they do in the States.

Mr. MADDEN. What do you have to do before you are entitled to the land?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. You have to live on your land and improve it, and other work has to be done, of course.

From this testimony it appears that when the Panama Canal is finished and the entire Pacific Fleet is operating there it will need 300,000 tons of coal per annum, and it will cost substantially \$3 a ton freight around the Horn or perhaps \$4 a ton through the Panama Canal. At the lowest price there is a direct loss of \$1,200,000 per annum on freight, upon coal for the Pacific Fleet, if brought from the Atlantic coast; but, the Secretary said, in time of war the fleet operating on the Pacific would require 200,000 tons per month, or 2,400,000 tons per annum. Upon this basis, the freight rate alone on coal from

the Atlantic coast through the Panama Canal would be \$9,600,000 per annum. Certainly these facts will make it the duty of Congress to provide transportation, so that if there is naval coal in the Territory of Alaska which can be obtained for the Pacific Fleet and delivered at a good naval base near the fleet it may be done. Not only that, but this House now has before it the statement of the officers of the Navy that there is not to exceed 90 days' supply of coal for the Pacific Fleet on the Pacific coast. If to-morrow a war should occur, which God forbid, between this country and any other country in Pacific waters, our fleet would have no more coal than is necessary to enable it to get safely into a harbor behind fortifications for protection. All our naval coal is carried to the Pacific Fleet in foreign bottoms, manned by foreign sailors. Coal is contraband of war, and it could not be obtained from a neutral or by neutral transportation in time of war, and we would have to depend upon our own resources to secure a sufficient supply in case of war.

This is the situation on the Pacific and must continue unless an Alaska railway is built to the naval coal fields in Alaska, for it is the only naval coal on the Pacific coast. Without coal a fleet is an expensive luxury in time of peace and impotent in time of war. We maintain our Navy now at an enormous expense for fuel, and for the want of a large and ready supply of fuel, in case of war, we might as well have no fleet.

For these reasons there is an immediate necessity to create a naval base in Alaska, and the railroad provided for in this bill is the first unit in that great establishment for the defense of our Pacific frontier. This railroad should be built, maintained, and operated by the Government rather than by the Guggenheims or any other corporate influence so that it may be as readily used for national protection in case of need, as the fleet itself.

Your attention is called to this official map entitled "Great Circle Sailing Chart of the North Pacific Ocean." It is so scientifically arranged that the shortest distance between any two points on the round earth represented by it is a straight line drawn between those two points on this map.

Your attention is called to the fact that a line drawn from the great navy yard at Bremerton, on Puget Sound, to Yokohama, Shanghai, Hongkong, or Manila, runs through the Aleutian Islands. It is a fact that vessels sailing between San Francisco or Seattle and the Orient go and come by the "northern route," as it is called, rather than by the southern route, via the Hawaiian Islands. The reason for taking the northern route is that it is much shorter in a straight line via the Aleutian Islands. From the Puget Sound Navy Yard to Yokohama it is only 4,280 miles, while it is more than 1,500 miles farther if the vessel sails via Hawaii. There is no coal-station on the short northern route and no place where a naval vessel can be repaired, victualled, or take on water or other supplies. Consequently in case of war there would be no resting place. However, the Government is establishing a base of supplies for just such an emergency on the Hawaiian Islands at Pearl Harbor, near Honolulu, where millions of dollars are being spent in building dry docks, wharves, and other structures, and in establishing a coal yard for the Navy. But it is 3,000 miles from the Bremerton Navy Yard to Pearl Harbor, and 3,450 miles from Pearl Harbor to Yokohama, making 6,450 miles by that route to the Orient as against 4,280 miles by way of the northern route, or more than 2,000 miles greater distance to be traveled. The purpose of the Government now is to save that 2,000 miles of extra travel, for which extra coal must be carried, and go by the northern route, and to do that a naval base must be established in Alaska.

Secretary Meyer's attention was called to this, and he was asked:

Mr. BUTLER. How far is the travel out of the beaten track to obtain this coal in Alaska?

Secretary MEYER. One hundred and eighty-four miles.

Mr. BUTLER. How far would the ships have to travel?

Secretary MEYER. The coal would have to come to the ships. It is cheaper for us to have the colliers bring it down than for the vessels to run up to Alaska.

Mr. BUTLER. What is the freight from Newport News to the Pacific coast?

Secretary MEYER. From \$5 to \$8.

The CHAIRMAN. Some one was asking about the distance awhile ago. This says that Resurrection Bay is 1,236 miles from Seattle, 1,750 miles from San Francisco, 3,000 miles from Japan, and 390 miles north of the great-circle route.

Briefly, then, in the establishment of this needed Alaskan naval base the first act to be done is to build the railroad provided for in this act. The Matanuska and Bering River coal mines will yield the best of their naval coal, which can be delivered at the naval base behind the islands fronting upon and protecting the great outer harbor of Prince William Sound.

Such other structures will be erected as dockyards, dry docks, buildings, and so forth, as may be necessary upon one of those great natural naval harbors, and with a railroad connecting the naval base with the naval coal fields and with the river systems in the interior the Navy can be certain of fuel supplies and protection in case of war. This naval base will be the outpost between the coast of the United States and the Orient, so that in case of war with any Asiatic power we will have an impregnable depot more than 1,200 miles away from our coast in the direction of the coast of Asia. Conceding that coal may be carried to the Hawaiian Islands and that a naval base should be established there, it is much more necessary that one be established in Alaska where there are so many great natural advantages to justify it.

Under the Constitution of the United States it is the duty of this House to establish a naval base on the Pacific for the protection of our country, with a railroad to the naval coal field. It is not "Government ownership" in the sense in which its opponents object to that principle, but a wise and constitutional exercise of the power with which Congress is invested, to protect the United States in time of war and to pass laws for the development of trade and commerce in its Territories.

Now, I hope the gentleman from Oklahoma will give me his undivided attention for a few moments, as I am going to talk to him about Government ownership.

OKLAHOMA DENOUNCING GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP.

The minority report, signed by two members of the Committee on the Territories from the great State of Oklahoma, makes the formal objection to this bill that it is the establishment of Government ownership of railroads in Alaska. In the thirteenth "view" they say:

The bill stripped of its dreams means Government ownership and operation, to be followed by Government leasing and operation of resources and utilities.

And in "view" No. 2 they say:

The construction of the railroad will in no sense solve this problem, because we think we have the right to assume that the Federal Government is not going to launch into agriculture in Alaska, launch in coal mining in Alaska, launch in gold mining in Alaska, launch in logging in Alaska, and we are opposed to the Federal Government being committed to any such scheme or propaganda.

Of course there is nothing in the bill which justifies this flaming denunciation of Government ownership in Alaska. Upon the face of the bill and upon the face of all the hearings before the committees it was perfectly apparent that this bill was an effort to give Government aid to the building of a railroad in Alaska upon the same principle and as nearly as possible in the same way that it was given to other States and Territories in the West and South. But it is surprising to hear such a vigorous denunciation of Government ownership from the Representatives of the State of Oklahoma. That great State adopted a constitution in 1907 containing a bill of rights and constitutional provisions of the most progressive type. The right of initiative and referendum was reserved to the people and complete control over corporations, and especially over public utilities, and the constitutional right is reserved to construct and operate them. But its most interesting reservation to the people, in view of the fierce assault made upon Government ownership contained in the minority report, which is signed by the two Representatives from that progressive State, is the reservation contained in article 2 of the constitution, being section 31 of the bill of rights. It reads as follows:

SEC. 31. The rights of the State to engage in any occupation or business for public purposes shall not be denied or prohibited, except that it shall not engage in agriculture for any other than educational and scientific purposes and for the support of its penal, charitable, and educational institutions.

Here, then, in the bill of rights, in the constitution prepared by the people of Oklahoma, is a reservation to the State as one of the "sisterhood" of the right of "Government ownership." The right is reserved to the State to engage in any occupation or business for public purposes. The State of Oklahoma may "locate, construct, and operate" a railroad in aid of her development. The State may "launch into agriculture in Oklahoma; launch in coal mining in Oklahoma; launch in gold mining in Oklahoma; launch in logging in Oklahoma." If the principle of Government ownership is thought to be vital to the prosperity and welfare of the people of Oklahoma, why is it declared to be "monstrous" several times in one letter to Members of the House? The people of Oklahoma prefer "Government ownership" to Guggenheim ownership. Why do gentlemen from Oklahoma try to force Guggenheim ownership on Alaska when President Wilson and Alaska ask for Government ownership?

The gentlemen who signed the minority report declare "we are opposed to the Federal Government being committed to any

such scheme or propaganda." What is the difference between such "a scheme or propaganda" in Oklahoma and in Alaska?

Mr. DAVENPORT. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. No. The people of Oklahoma prefer Government ownership to Guggenheim ownership. [Applause.]

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. No; I do not.

Mr. DAVENPORT. I think the gentleman ought to do so when he asks that kind of a question.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. All right, I will yield for a question, but not for a statement.

Mr. DAVENPORT. The gentleman knows, as he is a member of the committee, that from the time this bill was introduced up to this day not one single representative of the Guggenheims ever raised their voice against the bill, but the representatives before the Committee on Territories sat silently by and acquiesced in its report.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. That is another question. We are talking about Government ownership, not Guggenheim lobbyists.

Mr. DAVENPORT. I am asking the gentleman a question, and that question is, Why is he preferring Guggenheim ownership to Government ownership? I myself am opposed to it in everything where there is nothing to haul and nothing to produce.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. What is the difference between such a scheme in Alaska and in Oklahoma?

Mr. DAVENPORT. Oklahoma has not undertaken to build any railroads there.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. But she has reserved the constitutional right to do it.

Mr. DAVENPORT. That may be; but it does not bind all the people and guarantee that they will advocate it when it comes up. I am not going to pledge myself to a scheme of this kind until there is something to be brought out of Alaska and until steamships can be arranged for from the bays down to our ports.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The gentleman from Oklahoma does not seem to understand what resources we have in Alaska, but I assure the gentleman that the Guggenheims are not as ignorant of them as the gentleman is. They know what is up there.

Mr. DAVENPORT. I want to say to the gentlemen this that when he speaks of the Guggenheims he has perhaps at some time in his career represented the Guggenheims and has known them.

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

Mr. DAVENPORT. Well, the gentleman has met them.

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen should rise and address the Chair before interrupting a Member on the floor.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I have met some of their employees out on the coast. But when the gentleman has seen men here lobbying against this bill he has seen Guggenheim lobbyists.

Mr. DAVENPORT. I would like to know what Guggenheim representatives the gentleman has reference to. If there are any in Washington, the gentleman from Alaska should state their names, so that the Members of the House can be apprised of it.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I will tell you who they are in such a way that no mistake can be made about it. If the gentleman will get the Senate hearings and the House hearings, taken before the Committees on Territories, and will hunt up the fellows there who appeared fighting this bill, he will have them, and every one of them is a Guggenheim lobbyist.

Mr. DAVENPORT. I did not know it before.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. You know it now. [Laughter.]

Mr. DAVENPORT. I want to ask the gentleman whether he means Members of Congress who are fighting the bill, or whether he means other parties who testified?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Oh, no; only those who testified. I have no reference to the gentleman at all; not at all.

WILL PRIVATE CAPITAL BUILD A FREE ROAD IN ALASKA?

As a final blow to the bill its opponents declare that if Congress will refuse to pass the bill private capital will build the railroads needed to develop the Territory.

This blow is struck in the minority report in the twelfth paragraph, which reads as follows:

The testimony of the hearings before the committee on this bill show that private parties were ready and willing, and had provided the funds to construct and operate railways to the coal mines, and had it not been for the withdrawal of the coal from entry there would have been no necessity of the contemplated action of the United States Government, as stated in the bill before the House.

It is said that somebody has already offered to build these roads at once if this bill can only be defeated. No such proposal has ever been made except possibly as a final argument by

some of the impecunious lobbyists before the committee. These gentlemen have not two dollars among them to rattle one against the other, and could not obtain money for the building of a railroad in Alaska except from or with the consent of the Guggenheims.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. DAVENPORT. I will ask the gentleman if there is anything in the hearings where these parties stated that they had the funds to build a railroad, and later it was shown that they were impecunious really and do not have the necessary funds?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes; and if the gentleman from Oklahoma had attended the meetings he would have known those things.

Mr. DAVENPORT. I will say to the gentleman that I attended the meetings as much as I could, but the meetings were finished so quickly that I could not attend them; but I have read the hearings, and I have them here before me now, and I challenge the gentleman to show where any man proposed to build a railroad and it was shown that he did not have the money and could not raise it.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. CURRY. Does the gentleman remember that during the hearings I asked each and every representative of every proposed railroad that was before the committee who were behind them?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. CURRY. And where they had their money?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. CURRY. And each and every one of them said they were under pledge of secrecy and could not tell us, and said that if they could be relieved and released from that condition that existed between the attorney and the employer they would tell. But they have not told up to this time?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. They have not.

Mr. CURRY. And the gentleman will remember that I asked each one, if he was not in a position to tell the committee, to give that information confidentially to the chairman, and that none of them has thus far stated to the chairman who was behind them and where the money is.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I remember that distinctly, and if they had told you, and told you the truth, they would have carried it right to the Alaska Syndicate in each instance. I know them. I have watched the same fellows here for almost 10 years, lobbying and logrolling for the Guggenheims. There has never been an effort to do anything for the Territory of Alaska that that same bunch of pirates has not shown up here as lobbyists against it, not one. [Applause.]

Mr. Ballaine in his testimony, at page 36 of the Senate hearings on the Alaska railway bill, testified that in 1909 Mr. George W. Perkins, then a partner in the Morgan branch of the Alaska Syndicate, came to Seward to examine the Alaska Northern's 71 miles of railroad and see if it might be resuscitated. Mr. Ballaine testified about this conversation with Mr. Perkins, as follows:

He agreed with me that he should recommend favorably their taking up this plan, not alone on account of its merits, but because the firm of J. P. Morgan & Co., and their friends held one-third of the stock in the Sovereign Bank of Canada, which at that time was going through liquidation.

The Sovereign Bank had advanced the money for the building of the Alaska Northern and owned the bonds, and therefore the road. Later in the winter, or possibly in the spring, Mr. Perkins told me that the Guggenheim brothers had refused to give their consent to the plan for Morgan & Co. to take over the financing of this project as a narrow-gauge railroad from Seward, through the Susitna Valley, to the Tanana, on the ground that they regarded the Tanana Valley as their field. Mr. Perkins told me at the same time that Morgan & Co. were not prepared to encourage any railroad building in Alaska until the Government issued patents to coal claims then pending. I asked Mr. Perkins: "Do I understand from this that if I or any other individual, or any company, should go to some other bank or banker to raise money for building a railroad from Seward through the Susitna Valley to the Tanana I should meet with the opposition of the owners of the Alaska Syndicate?" He replied: "We could not allow a railroad to be built through the Susitna Valley into the Tanana. There will be no more railroad building in Alaska until the coal fields are opened."

That is not denied. Copies of that testimony were sent to George W. Perkins from the Senate committee officially, and he was given an opportunity to deny that and did not do it. There is no question about the truth of it.

This statement is not denied by Mr. Perkins or by any other member of the Alaska Syndicate, and undoubtedly states the determination of the Alaska Syndicate with respect to railroad building from the coast to the interior of Alaska, at least in what they are pleased to call "our territory." But there is

some basis for the statement made in the minority report and quoted above. There was a proposition made to extend the Alaska Northern Railway from Seward, and to that I now invite your attention.

At page 403 of the Senate hearings upon this bill will be found a letter from the Alaska Northern Railway Co. by its attorney, directed to the Secretary of the Navy, and dated March 30, 1912, in which such a proposal is made. That letter reads as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 30, 1912.

The SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: Referring to various interviews we have had with officials of your department, with the object of devising means whereby the department may be able to obtain at an early date, for the use of the Navy in the Pacific, regular supplies of high-grade Alaska coal at a large saving in cost, we now have the honor to state that, as soon as the department will be in control of coal lands in the Matanuska district containing coal suitable for the Navy's use, the Alaska Northern Railway Co. will be prepared to enter into either of the following contracts, at the option of the department:

A. A 10-year contract to deliver each year at the department's depot on Resurrection Bay 400,000 tons of bituminous coal, taken from seams to be designated by your department, at actual cost plus 10 per cent, the maximum total cost to the department not to exceed \$5.50 per ton, delivery to begin, under penalty, on or before December 31, 1913.

B. A 10-year contract to deliver each year at the department's depot on Resurrection Bay 400,000 tons of bituminous coal, taken from seams to be designated by your department, at actual cost plus 10 per cent, the maximum total cost to the department not to exceed \$4.50 per ton, delivery to begin, under penalty, on or before December 31, 1913.

CONTRACT B.

Contract B to be conditioned upon the passage, at this session of Congress, of an act guaranteeing principal and interest of 50-year 3 per cent bonds of the railway company to the extent of \$7,000,000, such bonds to be a first lien on the main line of the railway company from Resurrection Bay to the coal fields, with branches, spurs, equipment, etc., all representing an approximate cost value of at least \$11,000,000. In the mortgage securing these bonds the Government would be given full protection, both for its liability under the guaranty and for the due fulfillment by the company of its contract with the department; and out of any moneys due to the company under its contract, the department would be entitled to pay each year, direct to the trustees for the bondholders, a sum sufficient to provide not only for the annual interest charge, but also for a sufficient contribution to a sinking fund to provide for the payment in full of the bonds at maturity. Our only reason for any reference here to a guaranty of bonds is that with such guaranty the company would be put in position to furnish coal to the department at \$1 per ton less than would otherwise be the case; and unless we are able to obtain such guaranty from Congress it would not be possible to enter into a contract at a lower rate.

COMPARISON OF CONTRACTS A AND B.

Under contract A the department would save approximately \$1,000,000 per annum, as compared with the present cost of taking 400,000 tons of coal from the Atlantic coast. Under contract B this saving would be increased by \$400,000 per annum, or \$120,000 more than the total annual liability for both interest and sinking-fund payments on the company's bonds, the total saving to the department being about \$1,400,000 per annum, while the present annual coal appropriation is \$4,000,000 for the entire Navy.

ADVANTAGE TO THE GOVERNMENT.

The saving as shown above would result in time of peace; in the event of war, in which the fleet in the Pacific should play an active part and the coal consumption be correspondingly increased, the financial saving would be several times as great. In addition to any saving in money, the Navy would be in a position to obtain, both in peace and in war, uninterrupted supplies of the highest grade steaming coal, delivered by land in an impregnable harbor, occupying an ideal strategic position in the north Pacific. Having regard to the efficiency of the fleet in the Pacific and the safety of the country, the value of such a position can not be measured in money.

POLICY OF GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP.

The Secretary of the Interior has publicly advocated the purchase of the property of the Alaska Northern Railway Co. by the Government, and has asked us on what basis we can meet his views. We have stated to him that we are willing to sell at what, having regard to all the circumstances and considerations, may be considered a fair and equitable price. At present, however, the Government has no legal authority to carry out such a policy, and it is uncertain if and when Congress will give such authority. Having regard to interest charges, deterioration of property, etc., the company can not resign itself to inaction until the question of Government ownership as opposed to private ownership is determined, and it desires to proceed at once with construction. If, however, the Government should within a reasonable time be able to carry out the policy enunciated by the Secretary of the Interior, the company will still be willing to sell on the understanding set out above, making no addition to whatever price might be payable now beyond the actual cost of further construction with interest; and in consideration of the coal contract with your department the company would now enter into a binding agreement to make such sale to the Government. In this way any construction now undertaken by the company will be of great assistance to the policy of the Secretary of the Interior, inasmuch as access to coal for the Navy, as well as the beginning of the general development of the interior of Alaska, will be possible at a much earlier date than would otherwise be the case.

LEGAL POINTS.

We inclose a memorandum dealing with the law points involved.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.

We shall be glad at any time to meet you or any of the officials of the department to discuss any point on which you desire information, and in the meantime we submit these proposals for your valuable con-

sideration and such action as you may deem appropriate in furtherance of their object.

Very respectfully,

ALASKA NORTHERN RAILWAY CO.,
By GEO. H. PATRICK, Its Attorney.

The attention of the House is directed to the fact that here is a proposition by this company to extend the Alaska Northern Railroad to the Matanuska coal fields, and no farther. This extension is to be based upon a monopoly contract to be given by the Government of the United States to that company for mining and transporting 400,000 tons of coal from the Matanuska field to the Government bunkers in Seward at \$5.50 per ton. As an option, the second contract proposed was for the mining and delivery of 400,000 tons of coal at \$4.50 per ton, but this contract was to be conditional upon Congress passing an act guaranteeing the principal and interest on 50-year 3 per cent bonds of the company to the extent of \$7,000,000, such lien to be a first lien upon the main line of the railroad going from Resurrection Bay to the coal fields. The proposition then sets out in glowing terms how it would be possible, at either of these rates, for the Government, without assuming any great liability, to save enormous sums in the delivery of naval coal to its bunkers on Resurrection Bay.

Let the House note that this proposition, which seems to meet with the definite approval of the minority report, was to give this Alaska Syndicate Corporation a monopoly for 10 years upon mining and carrying the coal for the Government for naval purposes to the port of Seward at an enormous price.

Now, that was the only proposition ever made by anybody who had any money behind them to build a railroad into the interior of Alaska, and that was the proposition that was approved by the minority of this committee in the language I have read. It is the only proposition anywhere in the record, and it is an infamous proposition on its face. [Applause.]

I wish I had the opportunity to tell you more about it, but I have exceeded the patience of the House and I must hasten on. When they heard that sort of a proposition offered to create a monopoly in the Guggenheims again, the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Interior both turned it down cold and it never got any further. And that is the effort, and the only effort, that was every offered to open the interior of Alaska by the building of a railroad by private parties. It was simply another bright scheme on the part of the Alaska Syndicate to get its Alaska Northern Railway resuscitated by the United States, its losses returned, and a monopoly of Matanuska coal on a ten-year plan. It was, of course, refused consideration by Secretary Fisher.

Paymaster John S. Higgins, of the United States Navy, was before the Senate Committee on Territories, and his testimony will be found in full in the Senate hearings beginning at page 569. In his testimony he testified that the naval coal delivered at either Norfolk or Baltimore from the Virginia fields cost about \$1.40 per ton for transportation, and that the coal was delivered upon the colliers at Norfolk at \$3 per ton, including the price of mining and transportation. The distance is about the same as that from the Matanuska fields to Seward. The price demanded by the Alaska Syndicate Railroad from the Matanuska field is 50 per cent higher than the Virginia rate, for the lowest price, and almost 100 per cent higher for the higher rate. The lower price demanded by the Alaska Syndicate in its proposal to the Secretary of the Navy depended upon the guaranty of \$7,000,000 of Alaska Northern Railway bonds, while the higher price of \$5.50 is \$2 per ton more than the Virginia price.

There is more to this proposition of the Alaska Northern Railway. It is proposed to sell its railroad to the Government, and there are pages following this interesting letter devoted to persuading the Secretary of the Navy and the chairman of the Naval Committee of this House that it would be a great scheme for the Government of the United States to purchase the Alaska Northern Railway and complete it to the coal fields. On page 411 of the Senate hearings is a long argument upon this proposition addressed to the chairman of the House Naval Committee.

The proposal by which this syndicate railroad in disguise was to secure \$7,000,000 worth of Government guaranty was declined by the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Interior. Thereupon the officers of the Alaska Northern became violently opposed to Government ownership, and they have been most active lobbyists, both before the committees of both branches of Congress and around the corridors in the effort to defeat the bill now before the House. If Government ownership was honest when they proposed in their letter to sell their railroad to the Government, it is honest now, as a principle. Of course, their effort to procure Congress to give them monopoly of

traffic, the control of the naval coal fields, and immense profits in the way of a Government guaranty upon the Morgan-Sovereign Bank Railway can not be defended upon any honest ground.

This is the proposal, and the only one ever made by anyone speaking definitely or in a businesslike way, to build a privately owned railway for the development of Alaska, and it is the proposal which the minority report approves as justifying the Government to surrender its Matanuska naval coal field to the Alaska Syndicate monopoly. But notice that this proposal did not offer to build beyond the Matanuska coal fields. The reason for that was disclosed by George W. Perkins in his conversation with Ballaine. The Tanana Valley is claimed by the Alaska Syndicate as the territory of the Copper River & Northwestern Railway, and it did not intend and does not now intend to let any other railroad be built from Seward through the great Susitna Valley to the Tanana by private capital or otherwise. It is an invasion of their territory.

The Guggenheim branch of the Alaska Syndicate, which has control under its contract with the Morgans of the exploitation of Alaska, refused, and always has refused, to permit any railroad to be built to the Tanana country which does not connect with their line at Chitina. They have prevented the construction of every railroad attempted to be built from the coast near their territory to the interior, and they intend to continue to do so without it is constructed as an extension of their Copper River & Northwestern Road. They would agree, of course, to the building of a coal road from Seward to the Matanuska coal fields, as proposed by the Alaska Northern in its letter to the Secretary of the Navy, first, because it gave them a monopoly of Matanuska coal mining and transportation; second, it gave them a monopoly contract with the Government of the United States for 10 years for furnishing naval coal from this field; and, third, it gave them assurance doubly sure that there would be no road from Seward to the Tanana Valley into what they call their territory.

But the minority report is wrong when it asserts that there ever was any offer from responsible financial interests with ability to construct an independent line of railroad for the development of the Tanana Valley from Seward or Valdez or from any other harbor. All the evidence is against them on that proposition. If the two gentlemen who signed that report had attended the meetings of the Senate and the House Committee on Territories and had heard and understood the evidence, they would not have made such an unwarranted statement in their "minority views."

OKLAHOMA V. ALASKA—A SELFISH OBJECTION.

The fourth objection made by the minority report is a selfish one. The minority report declares they are opposed to the passage of the bill under consideration because there are but 35,000 white people in Alaska and because the appropriation and bond issue provided for in the bill is more than \$1,000 for each and every white person living there. They declare this sum to be out of proportion to the Federal aid granted to other sections of the United States for waterways, docks, good roads, rural routes, parcel post, and other internal improvements.

Of course, Alaska has more than 35,000 white inhabitants; but let us assume that number. The bill proposes to appropriate \$35,000,000 for the building of a railroad in Alaska. It is not to be assumed, however, that that is to be the end of population in Alaska. The Panama Canal has cost nearly \$400,000,000, and there were but 6,500 white people in the Canal Zone at the time it was begun; but the canal was not built for the few people who then resided there, but for the benefit of commerce and trade and the welfare and protection of the whole United States. And so it is in Alaska. It is also true with respect to this Alaskan population that since the purchase of Alaska in 1867 they have produced more than \$525,000,000 out of Alaskan fisheries and mines, and the end is not yet.

In 1912 Alaska produced \$40,354,178 in gold, copper, fish, and furs, or more than \$1,000 for each white man, woman, and child in the Territory. The trade and commerce that year was \$72,741,060, or more than \$1,130 for each of the 64,356 population, including Indians and Eskimo, and more than \$2,258 for each white person residing there. A population which produces \$2,258 per annum in actual wealth per capita each and every year as a beginning may well ask the Government to make an appropriation of \$1,000 per capita once in a century, especially when the Government retains the ownership of the investment and is merely aiding in the general purposes for which government is organized.

The minority report complains that such an appropriation for Alaska is unfair to the "sisterhood of States," and declares that Alaska is getting more than her share. Let us see how this

argument would apply to Oklahoma. In 1863 Congress passed an act making a grant of public lands in Kansas to the Leavenworth, Lawrence & Galveston Railway Co. (12 Stat. L., 772) and for the southern branch of the Union Pacific, which became the Missouri, Kansas & Texas. In 1866 Congress passed an act making a land grant for the Atlantic & Pacific Railway Co. (14 Stat. L., 292).

These grants applied in Kansas, Missouri, and New Mexico, and under these grants the Missouri, Kansas & Texas Railway, the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe, and the St. Louis & San Francisco trunk lines of railway were built through what is now Oklahoma. Upon an inspection of the census for 1870 one is surprised to find that neither Oklahoma nor Indian Territory are mentioned officially. There was no population officially acknowledged in what is now Oklahoma at that time, but in a footnote we discover that there were 2,409 white persons somewhere within its area. In short, when Congress passed these land-grant acts under which Oklahoma secured three trunk-line railroads to be built across her territory she had no white population—not even 35,000, as "dinky" as that may seem to them now. Not only that, but Oklahoma got these first trunk-line Government railroads at the expense of her neighbors—at the expense of that "sisterhood" whose rights are now so jealously guarded by her Representatives. The Oklahoma railroads were built out of land grants given out of the lands of the surrounding States—Kansas, Missouri, Arkansas, and New Mexico gave their lands to the building not only of the roads within their own territory, but to build the connecting lines across Oklahoma. Oklahoma never lost a foot of her land in aid of the development of her own railroads. Her neighbors built her early trunk-line railroads for her, and now she objects to her more distant neighbors building their own road out of their own resources. When these early roads were thus provided for by the United States aid and public lands Oklahoma had no white population, not even one-twentieth part of what Alaska has before it secures even first aid.

When the Northern Pacific Railroad land grant was made July 2, 1864, there was a very small population in all the great territory along its route. In 1870, six years after Congress created the grant, Dakota had only 14,181 population, Montana 20,945, Idaho 14,999, and the Territory of Washington 23,955, making a total of only 73,730, against a total population in Alaska in 1910 of 64,356. The Atlantic and Pacific land grant was made by Congress on July 27, 1866. By the census of 1870, four years later, the population of Arizona was 9,658, and all Indian Territory and the present State of Oklahoma had but 2,409. What argument there is in this matter of population is greatly in favor of the Territory of Alaska, and Oklahoma's Representatives ought to be ashamed to advance it in opposition to the development of Alaska.

The minority report also complains that the "sisterhood of States" is going to be cruelly treated if a railroad is built in Alaska. Not only were all the early railroads built across the State of Oklahoma at the expense of her neighboring "sisters," but no State in the Union has been so richly endowed out of the public funds and public lands as the State of Oklahoma. Under her organic act she has been given sections 13, 16, 33, and 36 in every township, or one-ninth of her whole area, for the maintenance of her schools and other public institutions. For certain of those lands lost to them by Indian settlements she was given \$5,000,000 out of the United States Treasury by the organic act creating the State. Mineral and oil lands were granted to her. Aside from these specific sections of land, the organic act creating the State of Oklahoma gave to the State more than a million acres of public land for the support of her universities and normal schools. A recent Oklahoma publication declared that the lands given to Oklahoma by the United States for the support of her State institutions are of the value of \$50,000,000, and I hope they are. Oklahoma is a great State; she has a great and progressive people, but they ought not to forget so quickly what the "sisterhood" did for them in their efforts to secure early railroad aid and later development from the public funds. They ought—and would if consulted—to do as they were so generously done by. Nothing can be more unfair to the "sisterhood of States," which the minority report seems so anxious to protect, than an objection which prevents the people of Alaska from having relief from Guggenheim domination.

The bill before the House does not assume to locate any route for the railroad authorized to be built; that matter is left entirely to the President of the United States. No restraint is put upon the President in this respect by the bill, and any location made under the bill must be made in the name of the President and by his authority. This bill was prepared with a view of placing the responsibility entirely with the President,

so that might be assurance of the highest integrity in the location and construction of the railroad if the bill shall pass.

POPULATION.

There is another small matter which is not a very serious one, and yet it seems to have appealed strongly to some gentlemen. It is that Alaska has only 64,884 people, and that there are only 35,000 white people in the Territory—that here is a proposition to appropriate \$35,000,000—\$1,000 for every white man, woman, and child in the Territory in the way of building a railroad there. Well, what of it? Suppose there are only 35,000 white people in that Territory and an appropriation is made of \$35,000,000. It is for the building of a great railroad, for developing one of the greatest undeveloped territories in the world, a Territory 99 per cent of which belongs to Congress as the trustee of the people. It is Government land, it is public domain, and it is under your control, and it is for you to develop it. It is now being monopolized by the Guggenheims, and I am appealing to you to take it away from them and develop it for the people. It does not make any difference whether we have 35,000 people or only 3,500 people. [Applause.] There were only 6,500 people in the Panama Canal Zone when we began spending \$400,000,000 to build a canal there, but nobody thought of objecting to it on that ground, because the canal was being built for the benefit of the whole people. This railroad ought to be built for the benefit of the whole people of the country. [Applause.]

Mr. HARDY. How many people were there in Alaska when we paid \$7,200,000 for it?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. When we purchased Alaska and gave \$7,200,000 for it there were not 10 of our people there, and only perhaps 1,000 Russians. I do not think that objection is a serious matter, but if it is let us stand Oklahoma up again as a standard. [Laughter.] In 1862 this House passed a bill giving a land grant for a railroad across what is now Oklahoma, then called the Indian Territory. Between that date and 1866 two more bills were passed for building railroads across the Indian Territory, that part which is now Oklahoma. For information I examined the census of 1870 and could not find any report on the Indian Territory, or Oklahoma, either. I learned subsequently that it was because there were no white people in the country, but only Indians not taxed. So that in 1870, after three land-grant bills had passed Congress which resulted in the building up of that great progressive State, there were less than 2,400 people in that region, and they were cattle rustlers from Kansas, Arkansas, and Texas. [Laughter.]

So if there is anything in this 35,000 proposition there ought never to have been any railroad grants made for roads in Oklahoma. Not only that—that is only half the Oklahoma story. Here is an official map showing the locations and areas of land grants made by Congress for western and southern roads. You may search the records and you will not find that Oklahoma ever gave up a foot of her land for building railroads across her area. Look at this map and the location of the land grants and you will see they run to the Oklahoma line and there they stop. Oklahoma got all of her railroads in those early days without giving up any of her land. The railroad land grants in Kansas, Missouri, Arkansas, and New Mexico built the first railroads across Oklahoma, and she never gave up a foot of her land. And yet you stand here and object to us having the benefit of our lands in Alaska that we want to mortgage and which we are willing to put up to build our own roads.

Mr. DAVENPORT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. DAVENPORT. I want to say that that part of the Indian Territory now embraced in Oklahoma was an Indian country.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. That is what I said.

Mr. DAVENPORT. And they could not give land grants to railroads anywhere in the United States.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Certainly; but Alaska is not Indian country and has 35,000 white settlers. When the Northern Pacific land grant was made in 1864 no consideration was given to the question of population. If population had been considered there would have been no land grant and no Northern Pacific. Its grant was not based on a population scheme as now suggested. On the contrary, the grants for the building of the Northern Pacific and the early roads across Oklahoma were given to help build up the waste places. The grants were made to assist in an undeveloped country, and the Congress did not wait until the people had done all the work before it assisted. And it is assistance of that kind that we want in Alaska. We want help to build up the country and to protect it from monopoly. Gentlemen talk about a "prairie schooner" and a "cowboy existence" in Alaska, as if somebody could go to Alaska in a "prairie schooner" and be a "cowboy." [Laughter.] The gentleman from Oklahoma

did not go to Oklahoma in a prairie schooner; he went in a Pullman palace car, upon a railroad built at the expense of the surrounding States. [Laughter.]

Mr. DAVENPORT. I want to say to the gentleman that I went to Oklahoma as a farm laborer. [Applause.] I rode in a railroad train in the smoker, as my friend did to Alaska, and the reason why was we were both broke. [Laughter.]

Mr. WICKERSHAM. There are those who know the value of the undeveloped resources of Alaska, though few of them are in Congress. Congress is the trustee for this tremendous storehouse and ought to have the most intimate knowledge of its value. A trustee of an express constitutional trust ought not to permit the trust estate to be wasted, squandered, or acquired by any other interest to the great loss of those whom he represents. It is quite possible that if an individual gave as little attention to his guardianship of a trust estate he would be compelled to pay the loss out of his private fortune.

Population is of value to a territory. Herewith is a statement of the population of Alaska according to the last census, after which follows a table showing the percentage of increase in the white population in Alaska from 1880 to 1910:

Population of Alaska by judicial districts, 1910.

First judicial district.....	15,216
Second judicial district.....	12,351
Third judicial district.....	20,078
Fourth judicial district.....	16,741

Total..... 64,356

Population of Alaska, 1900-1910.

Class.	1900	1910	Decrease.	Increase.
White.....	30,493	36,247		5,854
Indian.....	29,536	25,331	4,205	
Negro.....	168	209		41
Chinese.....	3,116	1,209	1,907	
Japanese.....	279	913		634
All other.....		347		347
Total.....	63,592	64,356		764

¹ Includes persons of mixed parentage; that is, of native Indian and Russian or other parentage, as follows: 1900, 2,497; 1910, 3,887.

Per cent of increase in white population in Alaska.

	1880	1890	1900	1910
Total.....	33,423	32,052	63,592	64,355
White.....	2,180	6,121	30,493	36,347
Per cent white.....	6.5	19.1	48	56.5

Congress will notice that the population of Alaska is small and is not increasing rapidly. The want of resources in the Territory of Alaska has nothing to do with this small population or its slow increase. The whole difficulty in the way of a large increase in the population is due to transportation. The western Provinces of Canada—Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba—have taken thousands of hardy immigrants of the United States because they have railroads to carry these people, their household goods, and live stock to farms in those northern regions. Given the same transportation facilities in Alaska, and the population of the Susitna and Tanana Valleys will increase very rapidly.

THE PRIZE—ALASKA'S VALUE.

A copy of the last report of the collector of customs of Alaska, dated January 31, 1913, will be found in full at pages 576-578 in the Senate hearings on this bill. The report begins:

Although there was no material increase in the population of Alaska during the calendar year 1912, the commerce of the Territory broke all former records in almost every particular. The total trade, valued at \$72,741,000, is 27 per cent higher than that for any previous year. The balance of trade in favor of Alaska is the largest on record, amounting to almost \$20,000,000. Gold, which until recent years has constituted the bulk of the Territory's export, though greater than for the two previous years, was 50 per cent less in value than the total of the other Alaskan produce shipped to the United States and was exceeded by the single item of salmon, canned and otherwise preserved.

For the first time both the shipments of merchandise from the United States and from Alaska to the United States passed the \$20,000,000 mark. The shipments to southeastern Alaska show an enormous increase and are more than double those of any one of the other three divisions. This increase was principally due to the establishment of 20 new salmon canneries throughout the division and the extensive development of mining properties in the Juneau district.

This report shows that for the year 1912 the people of Alaska purchased from the merchants of the United States nearly \$22,000,000 worth of merchandise and sent to the United States nearly \$25,000,000 worth of merchandise and more than \$16,000,000 in Alaskan gold.

THE PRODUCTION OF FISHERIES AND MINING IN ALASKA.

The production of the fisheries and mining of Alaska for the year 1912 amounted to \$40,354,178. To those who hesitate to give assistance to Alaska because she can not raise watermelons I suggest that \$40,000,000 worth of fish and gold is as good a crop as any State can raise.

The Tanana interior of Alaska is criticized because of its supposed want of value, yet the customs report shows that \$8,117,459 worth of gold was produced in that division during 1912, being more than one-half of the total output of gold for the Territory. When we shall get a railroad to the Tanana country it will be one of the greatest gold-producing territories in America. There are immense areas of low-grade ground which can not now be worked, but which will then employ a large force of men and machinery.

The customs report shows that in 1912, 22,712 persons came into Alaska, but it also shows that 21,877 departed from the Territory. I mention this fact to show that there is a very large movement of population in Alaska, and that as soon as there is a transportation route to the interior much of this movement will use it.

Of the \$21,992,761 worth of merchandise purchased from merchants of the United States in 1912, \$3,732,914 went into the Tanana country, or about one-fifth of the whole imports. This freight paid on an average \$125 per ton. If the rate had been reasonable, the merchants of the United States would have sold more than double that amount of merchandise to the interior.

I think Oklahoma is a grand and a great State, but I do beg her Representatives to give us a fair deal in Alaska and let us get out from under the domination of the Guggenheims.

Mr. DAVENPORT. I will say to the gentleman that I will vote with him—

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Thank you. [Laughter.]

Mr. DAVENPORT. Wait a moment—for the purpose of giving to the Territory of Alaska any reasonable help for its institutions, educational and otherwise, that he may think is proper and right. I am not standing in the way of the Guggenheims. Let the gentleman present the facts and not refer to the Guggenheims and we will get through with this discussion.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I expect it irritates the gentleman somewhat, but I have been relating the facts. [Laughter.]

Mr. DAVENPORT. Not at all. I never represented them, and I never tried to represent them.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. And I surely am not representing them now.

Mr. DAVENPORT. I know the gentleman is not.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. All that gentlemen need to do is to get the report of the collector of customs for 1912 and see what the commerce of Alaska amounts to. The United States maintains a fleet and a large force on the Pacific to keep an open door with China, and yet the trade in Alaska is within a million dollars of the total trade with China. The trade with Alaska is greater than the trade the United States has with 20 or 30 of the great countries in the world. People are not acquainted with the great resources of Alaska and the immense amount of merchandise that your merchants sell to it in the way of machinery, dry goods, and other merchandise. You are not acquainted with the fact that you get \$20,000,000 of gold out of the country every year and from seventeen to twenty millions of dollars' worth of fish. We ship fish from Alaska now to Boston. We compete with the Banks, and we ship better fish into Boston than they ever got from the Banks. Alaska is one of the richest regions in the world. And the Guggenheims are not ignorant; they know it; and they are getting control of its resources because they are lying around loose and they are valuable.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman explain to the committee how the gold and fish are dispatched from the interior of Alaska to the United States?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The gold is dispatched from the interior of Alaska over this line from Fairbanks and over the Copper River road to the States. The fish is canned on the coast and not in the interior. We pay so much greater prices for meat in the interior than you have to pay here that you would be amazed if you knew what the situation is, and yet we can not get the fresh fish from the coast, which we could get very cheap if we had a railroad.

I shall put into the RECORD a balance sheet showing on the debit side the production in Alaska of gold, silver, copper, gypsum, marble, tin, and coal, and its fur and fishery products, and also a statement showing the total amount of cash receipts that we have paid to the Government of the United States, and

you will be surprised when you learn that since 1867 the production of Alaska amounts to \$525,685,327.

Mr. MADDEN. But that has not gone into the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. No; but it went into the pockets of the people of the United States, which is a great deal better place for it.

Herewith is a balance sheet of the production of Alaska upon one side and the total cash disbursements of the United States upon the other:

Balance sheet—United States in account with Alaska, 1867 to 1913, inclusive.

Dr.		Cr.	
Production.	Dollars.	Total cash disbursement.	Dollars.
Minerals:		Purchase price.....	7,200,000.00
Gold.....	228,512,471.00	Treasury, 1867-1913....	27,795,525.92
Silver.....	2,037,280.00	Post Office, 1867-1913..	6,564,642.90
Copper.....	16,074,625.00		
Gypsum.....	647,345.00		
Marble.....	555,443.00		
Tin.....	88,062.00		
Coal.....	340,189.00		
Sea and fur products:			
Fur-seal skins.....	52,042,528.00		
Aquatic furs, except seal.	12,616,937.00		
Furs of land animals..	9,537,081.00		
Walrus products.....	368,053.00		
Whalebone.....	1,707,410.00		
Fishery products.....	182,569,625.00		
Total cash receipts.....	18,588,278.72	To balance due Alaska.	41,560,168.82
	525,685,327.72		484,125,158.90
			525,685,327.72

On the debit side of this balance sheet is a complete statement of the total amount of gold, copper, sea and fur products, and all the production of the Territory of Alaska from 1867 to 1913, inclusive; there is also an item showing the total cash received by the United States from the Territory of Alaska in the way of customs duty, payment for lands, taxes upon seal skins, etc., and items of receipts by the Government from Alaskan resources. On the other side is the amount which we paid Russia for the purchase price of this Territory, together with the appropriations expended through the Treasury and Post Office in maintaining government there from 1867 to 1913. The total expenditures of the United States in Alaska to the end of 1913 are only \$41,560,168.82, while the Government has received from Alaska \$18,588,278.72, leaving a balance against Alaska, including its purchase price, of about \$23,000,000. But this small balance against Alaska is overwhelmed by the production of the Territory, which gives a total balance due to Alaska of \$484,125,158.90. This shows the immense value of the Territory, because it is an actual demonstration of the amount of its production to date. We have not begun to develop the latent resources of this great Territory, although it has returned almost \$10,000,000 per annum profit since the purchase in 1867. Congress is not aware how valuable this great estate is, but the Guggenheims are well informed. The Alaska Syndicate has not expended \$20,000,000 in building a railroad in Alaska, more millions in purchasing steamboat lines, other millions in other developments, and other large sums in the accumulation of information about every little detail known of its natural resources without a purpose. The Alaska Syndicate knows that its resources are unprotected and that these immense values lie there to be taken by him who has the courage, the money, and the power to take them. It has already secured tremendous values of this undeveloped wealth of the people, and is securing a monopoly upon the remainder. It is not ignorant; it is not a pessimist; it knows; it acts upon knowledge acquired after the most patient research. The Alaska Syndicate knows that the strong bond of control is transportation. It realizes that with a monopoly of the transportation under its control, it will control all other resources.

With the transportation in their hands, the Alaska syndicate has no fear of any law which Congress is likely to pass. The prize in this great warfare is the wealth of Alaska, and it is to be acquired through monopoly and transportation. It is the duty of Congress to prevent monopoly and to secure the welfare of the people in that Territory through an independent line of transportation.

It is easy to get exact statistics of the value of the productions of Alaska, but it is not so easy to give the House a definite understanding of the value of the undeveloped resources of the Territory. One of the greatest of these is coal. I now exhibit to the House a large photograph of the Nenana coal measures as they actually appear in a state of nature near the mouth of

Lignite Creek, a branch of the Nenana River, some 50 miles southwest from the city of Fairbanks. This immense lignite bed is a valuable coal supply for the interior of Alaska, though we have not been able to touch a pound of it for many years.

On the opposite side of this picture of this Nenana coal measure is a map prepared by Dr. Brooks, of the Geological Survey. It shows the known area of coal-bearing measures in the Territory of Alaska. About one-fifth of this territory has been surveyed, according to the geological plan. On the same map is a map of Pennsylvania, drawn to the same scale as that of Alaska. The Pennsylvania map shows the location of the coal fields of that State on exactly the same scale. Compare the area of the Pennsylvania field with the present known area of the coal measures of one-fifth of Alaska and discover how much greater the one-fifth area in Alaska is than the whole of the Pennsylvania measures.

I quote from the official report of the United States Geological Survey, "The Mineral Resources of Alaska, 1909," prepared by Alfred H. Brooks, Bulletin No. 442, at page 49, where he says:

About one-half of the known tonnage of Alaska coal is lignite, a little over one-fifth is anthracite and high-grade bituminous coal, the rest falls into the bituminous and subbituminous classes. It is fair to assume that these ratios will hold for the coals of the areas on which no tonnage estimates are possible.

The anthracite of the Bering River and Matanuska fields is but little below that of Pennsylvania in composition. * * * The coals classed as semianthracite are of about the same composition as the Loyalsock or Bernice Basin coals of Pennsylvania. The higher grade bituminous (semibituminous) coals of the Bering River and Matanuska fields are comparable in composition and heating power with the Georges Creek, New River, and Pocahontas coals of the East. * * * The lower grade Alaska bituminous coals compare favorably in composition with the coals of Japan, Vancouver Island, Washington, and Australia. This is an important point, as these are the fuels with which the Alaskan coal must come into competition.

On page 50 Mr. Brooks says:

As only about one-fifth of Alaska has been surveyed geologically, it is evident that any estimate of the area of the coal fields serves only as a measure of the minimum area. With these limitations on the accuracy of the figures the total known coal fields included an area of about 12,667 square miles. It is not impossible that future surveys may prove that the coal fields embrace many times this area.

On page 68 Mr. Brooks further says:

On the other hand, the Bering River and Matanuska fields furnish the only known source of high-grade fuels near either the eastern or the western shore of the Pacific Ocean, unless such fuels may be had from the inland coal fields of China. They have, therefore, a great importance to industries of the Pacific coast. From them must come the high-grade steaming and coking coals and anthracite needed by the growing population of the Pacific seaboard States. Unless they are utilized the manufacturing and smelting industries and the Navy must depend largely on foreign fuels, except as coal may be brought around Cape Horn or until after the completion of the Panama Canal. Alaska's own need for high-grade coal can be supplied only from these two fields, unless it is furnished by such foreign fuel as is transported for a thousand miles or more.

Railway construction is necessary before the Bering River and Matanuska coals can be brought to tidewater. (See pp. 72-76.) The lack of railways is one of the causes which has delayed the development of these coals, as a large investment of capital is necessary before any returns can be expected. Moreover, it increases the cost of the product and places the coal at a corresponding disadvantage with that of such fields as those of Vancouver Island, New South Wales, and some of China and Japan.

No part of the immense coal deposits of Alaska have yet been mined; nor is there any means of transporting it if it was mined; nor is there any chance to secure the building of railroads for the development of these coal fields unless the Government will substantially give the builders of the railroad a monopoly of the coal as well as of transportation. The only proposition made to the Government—to which I have called your attention in these remarks—was based upon a proposed monopoly of transportation and mining. It fairly discloses the desire of the Alaska Syndicate in its dealings with transportation and coal matters. There is but one means of securing the development of Alaska and of these valuable resources of Alaska, and that is for the Government to build the railroad from the southern harbor to the Matanuska coal fields and thence into the interior. Not only must the Government build this trunk line, but it must take hold of the question of rates in the Territory of Alaska.

CONTROL OF FREIGHT RATES ON RAILROAD AND WATER.

Since the Interstate Commerce Commission was mandated into jurisdiction in Alaska transportation the White Pass Railroad, the Copper River & Northwestern Railroad, and the Alaska Northern Railroad each filed its tariff rates with the commission, which approved them. I have quoted from the official figures given me by the commission to show what excessive rates the Alaska Syndicate railroad, the Copper River & Northwestern, can still charge under the control of the Government. These rates must be reduced to fair and reasonable rates.

Railroad rates, however, as the situation stands in Alaska to-day, are not the rates which do the greatest harm to the

development of the Territory. The rates which rob the Territory of any chance of growth and development are those charged by the steamship companies carrying the freight by ocean to Alaska and the river steamers which carry the freight up the rivers to the interior points.

Now, these steamship and steamboat companies are not under interstate-commerce control, unless they undertake to transport through freight received from some railroad or to be delivered to some railroad in Alaska for continuous carriage. They take care not to do that. They do not receive freight for continuous carriage, except the Copper River & Northwestern receives the copper mined by its Kennecott Mining Co. twin and carries it to Tacoma under a through rate with its parent. But that is merely taking money out of one pocket and putting it into another, or rather it is bookkeeping. But if you attempt to get the Alaska Syndicate Steamship Co. to carry through freight for you it declines. It will carry your freight from the wharf in Seattle to the wharf in Cordova, but no farther. At the wharf in Cordova, after paying \$1.60 wharfage on each ton, you can still employ the railway company to carry your freight to Chitina or any other point on the road. If from Chitina you wish it conveyed into the interior you are obliged to do business with the third carrier, although it may belong, as the other two do, to the Alaska Syndicate. The point I am making is that water-transportation rates in Alaska are not covered by the interstate-commerce law, and the Interstate Commerce Commission has substantially no jurisdiction over such rates. So far as its jurisdiction could be extended it is met by the refusal of the steamship and steamboat companies to carry through freight in connection with the railroad. Ninety per cent of all the freight carried in Alaska is not under the control of the Interstate Commerce Commission. Ninety per cent of all freight carried in Alaska is carried upon rates fixed by the Alaska Syndicate without any control on the part of the Government. Ninety per cent of all the freight charged shippers in Alaska is carried by the Alaska Syndicate or its allied companies, upon rates fixed by themselves as high as their interests dictates. What Alaska needs is, first, a Government built, owned, and controlled railroad from one of the southern harbors to the interior waterways, and, second, complete Government control over transportation by water as well as by railroad. Until the Government shall take charge of and control rates from ports in the United States to ports in Alaska, and upon the interior waters of Alaska, that Territory will be restrained in its development by excessive and unconscionable rates.

Alaska has more coal than Pennsylvania, Ohio, West Virginia, and Virginia, and as good coal. It has more copper than Michigan, Montana, and Arizona; it has more gold than California and Colorado; it has more agricultural lands than Norway, Sweden, and Finland; it has more fish than all the balance of American waters together. This is the prize for which the Alaska Syndicate is seeking to control and to secure, as far as it can be secured, by corporate greed and monopoly.

INTERIOR TONNAGE.

The minority report admits very reluctantly that there is production and wealth in the coastal region of Alaska, but declares that there is nothing in the interior which will produce outgoing tonnage. It admits that there will be an inbound tonnage equal to the amount of merchandise purchased by the people of interior Alaska from the merchants of the United States, but insists that there is no chance for the creation of any tonnage coming out of the interior over the road. This statement is entirely assumed and is based upon a misunderstanding of the situation. When the Union and Central Pacific bills were before Congress a Senator with very much the same pessimistic turn of mind declared that while there might be westbound tonnage over this line equal to the amount of merchandise which the people near the Pacific terminus would buy from the manufacturers of the East there never would be any eastbound freight over the road. Very earnestly the Senator declared that there was nothing on the Pacific coast which could be utilized as tonnage toward the Atlantic, and he facetiously insisted that the only freight which might be transported eastward over this road would be "silks and opium" from Asia. The gentlemen who drew the minority report seem to have been afflicted with this "silk and opium" idea.

In the first place, I think it is altogether unimportant. If the road carries sufficient tonnage to the interior to pay maintenance and a profit, it would be a good investment even if not a dollar's worth of freight came out. Let us see what the facts show in respect to the ingoing tonnage alone. In his report on the mineral resources of Alaska for 1909, Mr. Brooks says:

No exact figures are available in regard to the amount of freight annually shipped to the Alaskan portion of the Yukon Basin, but it is

probably safe to say that this amounts to 30,000 tons and that it costs over \$2,500,000 to land it at the end of steamboat navigation.

The mining freight must then be hauled by wagon or sled, except at Fairbanks, where there is a railroad. It is estimated that this haulage from steamer to mines for the Alaska Yukon costs from \$2,000,000 to \$2,500,000 a year. The total annual cost of freight for the Yukon Basin is, therefore, probably between \$4,500,000 and \$5,000,000, or nearly 50 per cent of the value of the entire gold output.

Assuming this extract as my text, let us see what it leads to. A little further on in his statement Mr. Brooks declares that a "trunk railway into the Yukon," with a freight rate, for example, of 10 cents a ton-mile, would make a saving of at least 50 per cent in the cost of transportation of supplies and equipment to the Yukon camp.

Here would be a saving instantly to the people of the interior of Alaska of \$2,500,000 per annum. If the railroad is being constructed for the benefit of the people, here is a single item which would pay 7 per cent upon the investment of \$35,000,000. A 7 per cent dividend to the people would pay the entire cost of this road in 15 years, and the Government would have the road left. But, it may be said, the Government is to be considered rather than the people—that the saving of money to the people of the interior is not the important consideration for the building of the road. While I do not admit this, let us assume it for a further examination of the situation.

Leaving the question of the people's interest aside for the moment, let us see what the result would be to the enterprise itself. If it cost \$2,500,000 to land 30,000 tons of supplies in the interior at the end of steamboat navigation, it ought to be worth one-half that sum over the railroad, or \$1,250,000. The expense of carrying the mails to the interior would be reduced at least \$200,000 if they were carried over this road, while the Army freight bill would be substantially saved in the same way, amounting to \$75,000 per year. Thirty thousand tons of freight at a cost of \$2,500,000 is equal to \$83.33 per ton at the steamboat landing in the interior. Reduce that one-half to \$41.66 per ton, and the road would then have an income of \$1,250,000 for present freight demand for the interior.

The people of the interior now pay double what Mr. Brooks assumes as the interior freight rate. Instead of \$83.33 the freight rate will more nearly average \$160 per ton, but reduce it one-half from Mr. Brooks's statement and make it \$41.66; the freight rate then to the interior would bring the Government railroad \$1,250,000. Add the \$275,000 saved on mail and Government supplies and you have about \$1,500,000 income for the road. That is \$125,000 per month, and will much more than pay operating expenses if only the present amount of freight be carried; but if you add the passenger traffic it will be much more. We now pay \$152.50 to ride on the stage and the railroad from Fairbanks to the coast. Cut that to 10 cents a mile, or make the passenger rate \$40. At least 2,000 persons travel in and out per annum, which would make \$80,000 additional for passenger traffic. Assuming that a branch is run to the Matanuska coal fields and the Government shall haul coal for naval use and for sale to the coast towns—to Washington, Oregon, and California—that would add a very large traffic. The coal traffic would be largely outbound and not inbound.

Altogether it is safe to assume an income based upon present conditions of \$2,000,000 per annum. That is more than 6 per cent upon the amount required to build the road, and would save the people of the interior of Alaska substantially \$4,000,000 per annum on freight. Even if it is insisted that this road must be made to pay the usual percentage upon the investment, it is safe to say that it will do it when you consider the present freight rates to the interior of Alaska and the immense reduction which can be made from these rates. If you can save the people of the interior of Alaska \$2,500,000 per annum upon their freight bill and then secure a return to the road for freight in and out of \$2,000,000 per annum, it is a paying investment both to the people and to the Government. That appears to be the situation, based upon the amount of the present freight tonnage carried to the interior. But add the outgoing coal freight from the Matanuska coal fields and the saving on mail and it is without question a good investment both to the Government and to the people.

We have assumed that it will pay both the people and the Government to build this road, though there may be no increase in the development of the mineral or agricultural resources in the interior. But the building of this road will bring our mining machinery and our hardware and merchandise in for one-quarter of what we now pay for it, and will thereby enable the miners to extend their placer mining to an indefinite area of ground which is now too low grade to pay at the present excessive transportation rates. The quartz mining in the Fairbanks country is increasing very rapidly, and the lower transportation rate for machinery and supplies would enable the miners to develop large mines which are now worthless because too low

in value. The argument that there is no outcoming freight is entirely wrong. The Matanuska coal field would furnish sufficient freight of itself to pay one-half of the running expenses of the road.

Assuming that the road is built either from Seward or Portage Bay through the great Susitna Valley, over Broad Pass, via the Matanuska and Nenana coal fields to Fairbanks, it passes through a wonderfully rich country every foot of the way. From the moment it leaves Seward or Portage Bay it is in a highly mineralized region until it reaches the Susitna Valley. This great valley is an agricultural country, though the high land all around it is highly mineralized and contains some of the best mining prospects in the Territory of Alaska. Over every foot of the route of this 400 miles of road there are resources sufficient to maintain a large population, and it is the richest portion of the Territory of Alaska. The opportunity for return tonnage is far greater over this short line of road than it was over the long Union and Central Pacific. That great road has furnished immense eastward tonnage, and by the same token the trunk line into the interior of Alaska will furnish a large southbound tonnage as well.

Mr. MADDEN. How much of that \$1,250,000 would be absorbed in the management of the road?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Of that \$1,250,000 I speak about it might take it all, but I am not a railroad authority.

Mr. MADDEN. It would not take twice as much?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I should not think so. That does not take into account the needs of the Navy for naval coal and the Matanuska coal coming out. If that coal is what Mr. Brooks and other men who have examined it say it is, you would have a large tonnage from the Matanuska to the sea. If that coal is in demand for naval use and on the Pacific coast for mercantile uses, you would have another million and a quarter in carrying that coal out. There is no coal in California substantially, there is very little coal in Oregon—no valuable coal. There is a little more coal in the State of Washington, but it is not a high-grade coal. All of the high-grade coal we have on the Pacific coast is in Alaska, and the people want that high-grade coal and you can not get it outside of Alaska.

Mr. MADDEN. What does the gentleman think the royalty on that coal would be worth on the ground?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. That is a matter I could not tell you now.

Mr. MADDEN. The Government would be interested in that in the manner of the expenditure of the \$30,000,000.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. That would be in addition to what the Government would make on the road.

Mr. MADDEN. You can not get over 5 cents a ton at the mine.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Let me suggest to the gentleman, if you have ever read the Cunningham-Guggenheim contract you will know the Guggenheims—the greatest mining concern in the United States—agreed to pay the Cunninghams 50 cents a ton royalty for that coal. That is in the Cunningham contract. It is in this record.

Mr. MADDEN. Mines all over the United States are being operated on the basis of not to exceed 8 cents.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The gentleman is mistaken about that. If you will look at the record contained in the geological reports you will see it goes all the way from 5 cents up to a dollar.

Mr. MADDEN. I am talking from experience.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The gentleman may have some experience. In Illinois, where your country is underlaid with coal, of course the rate is cheap; but in Alaska where nature has given that Territory a monopoly the rate may be higher than in Illinois.

Mr. MADDEN. Miners all over the United States in bituminous coal think they are getting a good price if they get a dollar a ton for coal on the car.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

LOBBYISTS.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I must decline to yield. Now, I am going to talk about lobbyists for a moment and then I am going to quit. In his speech, and again upon the floor of this House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DAVENPORT] has referred very feelingly to lobbyists, and has pointed the finger of scorn at this bill, based upon the assumption that some lobbyist sat in the committee rooms and did not say anything. But the gentleman is mistaken. A lobbyist was in the committee rooms, and he did say something.

Mr. DAVENPORT. The gentleman is mistaken. I did not say "lobbyist." I said "the attorneys for the Guggenheims" or one of them; and if the gentleman has any doubt about it,

and if he will get the city directory and get the firm with which Mr. Law is connected, he will find him.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I have the gentleman's language here. He said:

This proposed road, if constructed from Chitina to Fairbanks, will connect with the Guggenheim road that runs from Cordova to the Bonanza mine, and, as I said awhile ago, during the hearings, notwithstanding the fact that Mr. Law, one of their firm, sat in the committee room, he never once opened his mouth in objection to it. That means that just as quickly as this appropriation is made they would try to get their road taken over.

Now, the gentleman was a member of that committee, although he did not attend its meetings; yet if he knew there was any scheme that looked like unfair dealing on the part of those people, he ought to have told his brothers on that committee. He never did that, and never did come to the committee and complain of anybody, and he never did anything else.

Mr. DAVENPORT. If the gentleman will permit me, I have not said that there was a scheme with the committee. I have not said that yet. I stated the parties that represented them, and I said then and say now that let the Government start to build this road and you will see if they do not try to get the road taken over at Chitina, where the road stopped that was to run from Fairbanks, 313 miles.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Well, I will say to the gentleman that I have confidence in President Woodrow Wilson. [Applause.]

Mr. DAVENPORT. But he will not go up there and see to it.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. No; but his secretary will, and Franklin K. Lane is just as honest a man as Woodrow Wilson is.

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I decline to yield further. Quotation is also made from Senator NELSON's conference with Senator GUGGENHEIM to show that if this bill passes the money appropriated by it will be misapplied by the purchase of the Guggenheim road. An assumption of this character is without any foundation either in the bill or in any of the hearings. It assumes a connivance of the President with the big interests for the purpose of taking over their bad investment, if it is bad, and thereby misappropriating the fund from the building of a trunk line of railroad for the development of Alaska into one of relief of the Guggenheims. It is amazing that such a statement should be made upon the floor of this House. Certainly the purchase of the Guggenheim railroad for ten millions or twenty millions of dollars or any other sum would be a misapplication of the fund. It is not the purpose for which the appropriation is made. The people of Alaska and the West—the people of the United States—would be shocked if any such disposition should be made of this appropriation, and nobody expects any such action on the part of the President. It is an amazing argument, without foundation in fact, to prevent the passage of the appropriation, and its proper application to the building of a railroad in Alaska for the relief of that great territory from the monopoly of the Guggenheims.

The reference to lobbyists, however, is interesting. Why lone Mr. Law should have been mentioned by the speaker is not apparent in his statement. Certainly lobbyists have surrounded the committee rooms during the hearings and arguments upon this bill. Had the gentleman from Oklahoma when he made this reference to lobbyists turned his gaze to the right and looked into the gallery just behind him he would have noticed three men sitting together, waiting with bated breath for the arguments as they fell from his lips in opposition to a people's road in Alaska. One of them, the president of the dummy Controller Railway & Navigation Co., who since the disappearance of the late Col. Mulhall is the dean of the Washington lobby, has been present at every hearing on these Alaska railway bills, always fighting in the opposition. His alliance with the Guggenheims is so intimately established in the hearings that there can be no doubt about it. Next to him sat the general counsel for the White Pass & Yukon route, whose owners are partners in the Alaska Syndicate. This general counsel represents the president of the White Pass & Yukon road, who had also appeared before the committee in opposition to this bill. At his right hand sat a banker from Alaska, who has long been the Alaska representative of the Guggenheims in the Territory of Alaska. He is one of their business associates, engaged in the closest interlocking alliance with them in their financial matters in that Territory.

Had the gentleman from Oklahoma turned to the left and looked into the gallery he would have discovered another small group of gentlemen greatly enjoying his opposition to the Alaska railway bill. The principal one of this group was the general manager of the Northern Commercial Co., the maker of rates and tariffs of the Northern Navigation Co., and the personal representative of the Alaska Packers' Association, all of which companies are so intimately interlocked with the Guggenheim

corporations in that Territory, in the maintenance of rates and in the exclusion of the interstate-commerce control, as to be substantially a part thereof.

If the gentleman from Oklahoma had attended the meetings of the Senate and House Committees on Territories and noted the combination of these lobbyists which appeared in opposition to this bill, he would have known, as other members of the committees did, that they were Guggenheim lobbyists.

There are lobbyists and then there are lobbyists, but the most venal and corrupt lobbyist is the literary lobbyist who sells his talents to monopoly to inflict wrong upon his countrymen. The Alaska Syndicate has long maintained a literary bureau for the purpose of minimizing the resources of Alaska, throwing obstacles in the way of others who wish to do business there, and thereby enable its members to secure more easily its undeveloped resources. Under this guise they are frequently enabled to get misleading articles published in magazines of the highest character and sometimes even in public documents. Such an article was published by one of their paid agents in the Saturday Evening Post, in February, 1910. And on February 25, 1910, the Senator from Colorado arose and asked that it be printed at length in the RECORD, where it will be found at page 3386 of February 25, 1910. That article was prepared in the interest of the Alaska Syndicate by one—or two—of their literary lobbyists in an effort to "bear" the resources of Alaska at a time like this, when it was to their interest to "bear." A careful reading of that article might induce a miserably suspicious person to accuse its author—or authors—of plagiarism in borrowing ideas from the minority report in opposition to the bill now before the House. And the gentleman from Oklahoma has been imposed upon in very much the same way. He asked leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing two statements prepared by literary lobbyists, one hailing from Chicago and the other from New York.

The attention of the House is called to the advertisement at the head of the first of these literary curiosities. It is, "Our Colonies. Article No. 45. By W. D. Boyce, organizer and leader of the Saturday Blade's South American expedition, African balloonograph expedition, and old Mexican research. This is the seventh article of Mr. Boyce's series on Alaska."

I repeat, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DAVENPORT] in his speech here permitted these people and those literary lobbyists to impose on him.

Mr. DAVENPORT. They did not impose on me at all, and I challenge the gentleman to deny the truth of Mr. Boyce's article and show that the conditions in Alaska are not as Mr. Boyce says they are.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Well, Mr. Boyce went on the trip to Alaska in the past summer with 114 representatives of the business interests and the press of the United States. One hundred and thirteen of them came back and went enthusiastically to work in aid of the development of Alaska in support of this railroad, and Mr. Boyce himself is the single exception.

Mr. DAVENPORT. The gentlemen stated that I placed in the RECORD what is not true. I deny it.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. After this flamboyant announcement we are prepared for the balloonatic declaration that during the few hours he spent in Alaska he saw a shaft 2,000 feet in depth and frozen from the bottom up. Of course, he saw nothing of that kind in Alaska. It is possible that during the 24 hours which he remained in the great Tanana Valley he saw some mining shaft out on the north hillside in the placer mining district near Fairbanks 200 feet deep and frozen. But what kind of entertainment my friends up there gave him to make him believe that it was 2,000 feet deep and frozen from the bottom up I do not know.

I have read his article with some amusement, but more disgust. He certainly discovered more things that are not true than any other literary lobbyist who ever spent so brief a time in Alaska.

Mr. BRYAN. That statement was used by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY].

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. PAYNE. That was a clincher. [Laughter.]

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes; that was a clincher. One hundred and fourteen representatives of the press of the country went through Alaska on the same excursion with him. One hundred and thirteen came back enthusiastically supporting every effort to develop Alaska, and especially this railroad bill, and he is the single one in opposition. However, he seems to reside very near to the White Pass & Yukon offices in the city of Chicago, and for some reason assumes to make their lobby fight. Of the other literary lobbyist quoted by the gentleman from Oklahoma little need be said. He is apparently the successor to the Alaska Syndicate's old literary bureau in New York, and does the best he

can under the circumstances. Neither of these men has any knowledge of Alaska which entitles him to speak with credit, and they are both discredited by the character of the lobby stuff they send to every Member of Congress. It is perfectly apparent that they have some special interest in defeating this bill. The gentleman from Oklahoma is right when he declares that there is a strong lobby at work on this bill. Any Member of this House who will examine the Senate and House hearings will soon discover that the lobby is maintained here by the Alaska Syndicate for the purpose of defeating this bill and protecting the strangle hold which they now have on Alaska, its natural resources, and transportation.

Mr. Boyce is the single exception among those who went on that trip. He went up there to secure a statement and firsthand information by which he might assist the White Pass route in its opposition to this bill.

Now, with respect to this lobbyist in New York. The Alaska Syndicate has long maintained this New York lobby and the literary lobbyists. They got a fine article published in the Outlook some two years ago, and another published in the Saturday Evening Post, which is copied in the Senate hearings. They impose them on the people.

They lay a cuckoo's egg of that kind in a nest every once in a while, and they even get some of them into the House. [Laughter.]

PESSIMISTIC ECHOES.

If Alaska is as utterly worthless as it is declared to be in "Minority views" in opposition to this bill and in the very interesting speech in opposition made by the gentleman from Oklahoma, then there is little need for legislation in aid of its development.

It is strange that the Guggenheims have not discovered how worthless it is. It is singular that the Alaska Syndicate was formed by the Morgans and the Guggenheims, and the wealth at their command expended in securing properties there and the control of its alleged resources. It is singular that those gentlemen, who are generally so discreet and well advised, should not have discovered what my friend from Oklahoma saw at a glance. They have had scores of agents throughout Alaska for years critically examining its fisheries, its mining resources, its transportation routes, its agricultural resources, and all of its undeveloped wealth, and they seem to have completely failed to discover how lacking in value it is. The Alaska Syndicate has invested \$20,000,000 in a railroad from Cordova to what it thinks is the most valuable copper deposit in America, probably as many more millions in steamship lines, and large sums in the exploitation of the region; but it has been reserved for a gentleman who never saw the Territory and who knows nothing about it from personal observation to balance accounts with it and place all its supposed wealth in the debit column. Like the poor, the pessimists are always with us, and other pessimists have occupied seats in Congress. Senator Benton, in a speech in 1825, said of the great West, with which he was subsequently acquainted:

The ridge of the Rocky Mountains may be named as the convenient, natural, and everlasting boundary. Along this ridge the western limits of the Republic should be drawn and the statue of the fabled god Terminus should be erected on its highest peak, never to be thrown down.

The Oregon controversy from 1825 to 1846 brought out a new crop of congenital unbelievers. Senator Dickerson, of New Jersey, was thus afflicted, as all Oregonians will agree. He said of Oregon in the period when national legislators knew as little of that region as some of them now do of Alaska:

Oregon can never be one of the United States. If we extend our laws to it we must consider it as a colony.

But is this Territory of Oregon ever to become a State, a member of this Union? Never. The Union is already too extensive and we must make two or three new States from the Territories already formed. * * * Yet a young able-bodied Senator might travel from Oregon to Washington and back once a year, but he could do nothing else. It would be more expeditious, however, to come by water around Cape Horn or to pass through Berings Straits, around the north coast of this continent to Baffins Bay, thence through Davis Strait to the Atlantic and on to Washington. It is true, this passage has not yet been discovered, except upon our maps, but it will be as soon as Oregon shall be a State.

There are gentlemen from Oregon here who know whether the Senator's statement is correct or not. [Laughter.]

Pessimism never dies, and even some great men are of this mournful type. Daniel Webster was a great man, but listen to this:

What do we want with the vast, worthless area, this region of savages and whirlwinds of dust, of cactus, and prairie dogs? To what use could we ever hope to put these great deserts, or these endless mountain ranges, impenetrable, and covered to their base with eternal snow? What can we ever hope to do with the western coast, a coast of 3,000 miles, rock-bound, cheerless, and uninviting and not a harbor

on it? Mr. President, I will never vote one cent from the Public Treasury to place the Pacific coast one inch nearer to Boston than it is now.

[Laughter.]

And that from Boston, too! Just think of it! And at that time that coast which he said was rock-bound and did not have a harbor on it, had the most beautiful harbor in the world—Puget Sound.

Daniel was here speaking of what is now known as Oregon, Washington, and Idaho, and of a coast which has many good harbors.

Another Senator was equally as doubtful as the Senator from Massachusetts or my friend from Oklahoma.

Senator McDuffie, of South Carolina, characterized the Oregon country in the following way, and incidentally damns the agricultural resources of the States between the Mississippi and the Rocky Mountains with faint praise:

What is the character of this country? As I understand it, there are 700 miles this side of the Rocky Mountains which is uninhabitable, where the rain never falls, mountains wholly impassable except through gaps and depressions to be reached only by going hundreds of miles out of the direct course. Well, what are you going to do in such a case? How are you going to apply steam? Have you made an estimate of the cost of a railroad to the mouth of the Columbia? Why, the wealth of the Indies would be insufficient. Of what use would it be for agricultural purposes? I would not, for that purpose, give a pinch of snuff for the whole territory. I wish the Rocky Mountains were an impassable barrier. If there was an embankment 5 feet high to be removed, I would not consent to spend \$5 to remove it and enable our population to go there.

And on another occasion, when his digestion must have been worse than usual, the same Senator declared:

And if there ever was a country upon the face of the earth in which I should consider it a great misfortune for the poorest man to settle—if there be any country in the world which has been blasted by God, which is utterly destitute of all conceivable attraction, in so much as to be scarcely capable of sustaining the life of human beings, it is this very Territory of Oregon."

And Senator Dayton, of New Jersey, declared:

That with the exception of land along the Willamette and strips along other water courses the whole country is as irreclaimable and barren a waste as the desert of Sahara; nor is that the worst, the climate is so unfriendly to human life that the native population is dwindling away under the ravages of malaria.

This region was alleged to be utterly worthless only when it was as unknown to the Members of this House as Alaska seems to be now.

And then, in answer to the nugacious opinion so freely announced by my friend from Oklahoma, that Alaska is not and can never become an agricultural country, permit me to make a further quotation from Senator Dickerson, by way of giving his then generally accepted opinion of the value of the Great American Desert, and particularly of that part of it which is now occupied by the truly agricultural State of Oklahoma, for the purpose of demonstrating what such opinions are worth:

From the meridian of Council Bluffs there is an immense region, extending to the Rocky Mountains, containing about 160,000 square miles, which from the sterility of the soil, the want of wood and water, can never be cultivated and, of course, never admit of civilized population. An accurate description of this region may be found in Maj. Long's Expedition (vol. 2, p. 350). After describing this country, he says, on page 361:

In regard to this extensive section of country I do not hesitate in giving the opinion that it is almost wholly unfit for cultivation and, of course, uninhabitable by a people depending upon agriculture for subsistence. Although tracts of fertile land considerably extensive are occasionally to be met with, yet the scarcity of wood and water almost uniformly prevalent will prove an insuperable obstacle in the way of settling the country. This objection rests not only against the immediate section under consideration, but applies with equal propriety to a much larger portion of the country. Agreeably to the best intelligence that can be had concerning the country both northward and southward of the section, and especially to the inferences deducible from the account given by Lewis and Clarke of the country situated between the Missouri and the Rocky Mountains above the River Platte, the vast region commencing near the sources of the Sabine, Trinity, Brazos, and Colorado and extending northwardly to the forty-ninth degree of north latitude, by which the United States territory is limited in that direction, is throughout of a similar character. The whole of this region seems peculiarly adapted as a range for buffaloes, wild goats, and other wild game, incalculable multitudes of which find ample pasturage and subsistence upon it.

[Laughter.]

When the gentleman from Oklahoma described my beloved Territory in language of mournful pessimistic minimization the other day I was grieved, but since it is officially admitted that a member of the United States Senate once declared the region of Oklahoma to be unfit for any other agricultural purpose than to serve as a pasture for wild goats, the score is settled. I forgive him. [Laughter.]

The Great American Desert, and especially the region described as so utterly worthless by the Senator from New Jersey, is now occupied by the agricultural States of Nebraska, Colorado, Kansas, Oklahoma, and Texas. This region was alleged to be utterly worthless only when it was as little known as Alaska is in Congress to-day. To those of us who know Alaska and the States of the Great American Desert it

is clear that those States do not have the great natural resources now possessed by the Territory of Alaska and which will in due time compel the formation there of four or five great States in the Union, each equal to any one of those mentioned.

The minority report in opposition to this bill, with its excessive depreciation of the natural resources of Alaska and its mournful prognostications with respect to its future development, brings to mind another minority report of a similar kind.

In 1868, when the bill for the payment of the purchase price of \$7,200,000 to Russia for Alaska was before the House, it was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. That committee made a favorable report, supported by all the members but two, and those two, as now, made a minority report. That minority report is an interesting document. There is much in common between the two reports besides the fact that both were minority reports and both were signed by but two members of the committee. Both are depreciatory in the extreme. That of 1868, however, can now be examined in the light of history and development. It denounced the Territory, alleging that it had neither fisheries nor mines, nor agriculture, nor any other known resource of value. Concerning its fisheries that report said:

The report of Prof. Davidson in the main seems candid and truthful, but when he, with seeming honesty, tells us that salmon are so plenty that the bears come down in numbers to feed upon them, their delicate appetites selecting the heads only; that the bays south of Alaska are so crowded with that fish as to impede the passage of boats and that the beaches are sometimes strewn with stranded salmon 2 or 3 feet thick, and that the fish sell for 8 cents per pound, the minority of the committee may be pardoned if they manifest some incredulity. The story is a good one and would have done no discredit to Capt. Lemuel Bulliver or Baron Munchausen.

This was considered "a clincher" in the effort of the minority to laugh the fishing resources of the Territory of Alaska out of court, yet since that time the people of the United States have taken from those same waters nearly \$200,000,000 worth of salmon.

The minority report of 1868 declared there was no coal in the Territory of Alaska, but to-day we know that Alaska has more coal than Pennsylvania, Ohio, and West Virginia.

They declared that there was no gold or other mineral in the Territory of Alaska, yet since the date of that report the miners in Alaska have extracted more than \$200,000,000 from its gravels and are now beginning work upon the greatest quartz mines ever discovered in the world. And so it usually is with pessimistic statements by men who do not know what they are talking about. The Territory of Alaska has yielded more than \$500,000,000 in actual production since those two minority members in 1868 sought to minimize its wealth and to prevent its purchase. To those who now know Alaska the pessimistic statements contained in the minority report seem as humorous as these early declarations about regions of which the speakers were as little acquainted as the opponents of this bill are with Alaska.

THE REMEDY.

The remedy which the two minority members propose in their report to cure the ills of Alaska is hardly in keeping with their pessimistic statements touching the value of the resources of the Territory. In paragraph 2 of their "minority views" they say:

Alaska needs more than anything else clear-headed, patriotic attention looking to the early revision of her land and mineral laws.

And so forth.

Why should there be any clear-headed, patriotic revision of the land and mineral laws if there is no land fit for agriculture, nor mineral lands worth developing? If Wyoming has more coal than is needed "to supply this sisterhood of States for a thousand years," and there is no naval coal in Alaska, why should a "clear-headed, patriotic" statesman waste his time in revising the land and mineral laws that "the sturdy pioneer may go there and develop Alaska in an honorable, straightforward manner"? Did it ever occur to you that a revision of the land and mineral laws which would compel "the sturdy Alaska Syndicate to go there and develop Alaska in an honorable, straightforward manner, free from graft and free from monopoly," would be a wise effort? Would it not be just as clear-headed and patriotic to erect a barrier against the further monopoly of the resources and the transportation of Alaska as to "raise the embargo" and let the syndicate acquire the coal and other resources? But if there is no coal of value there, and no agricultural lands, and nothing to justify Government aid in building a trunk line of railroad, why not go to sleep again and let the burglar help himself? If all the statements made in the minority report and in the speech of the gentleman from Oklahoma are correct, nothing ought to be done with Alaska except to forget it.

The minority report opposes the bill under consideration and declares the only thing needed to secure free development in Alaska is to raise the embargo and let the coal and other lands go free to whoever will take them. In short, it means to return to the conditions which existed in December, 1906, when President Roosevelt blocked the most gigantic monopoly of our public coal lands ever undertaken by the Alaska Syndicate. It means to invite the Alaska Syndicate to take up this original plan and carry it to the conclusion which they thought they had attained at that moment. It means to give to the transportation monopoly which now exists in Alaska the approval of Congress. It means to open wide the door to all the efforts which the Guggenheims made and which they now wish to continue to further monopolize, the resources of Alaska by entries of the land which contains her mineral resources. It means to take away from the people of Alaska all hope of any assistance from the United States in developing the Territory. It is an invitation to the Alaska Syndicate to come back to Alaska and do it again. It is reactionary and an abandonment of those progressive pledges which the Democratic Party made to the people of the United States upon which they elected President Wilson. It is the adoption of a plan which the Alaska Syndicate wishes adopted. It is the adoption of a plan which the Alaska Transportation Trust, represented by the Alaska Syndicate, wishes adopted. It is a violation of the pledge made by the Democratic Party in its Baltimore platform when it declared that—

Immediate action should be taken by Congress to make available the vast and valuable coal deposits of Alaska under conditions that will be a perfect guaranty against their falling into the hands of monopolizing corporations, associations, or interests.

It is in violation of every principle of true Democracy, for it means the surrender of the rights of the people in Alaska and of its resources to a single monopolizing interest which now almost controls both. It is a remedy which meets the immediate approval of the Alaska Syndicate, the Alaska copper trust, the Alaska fish trust, the Alaska transportation trust, and all of the subsidiary trusts which gather under the wing of the Alaska Syndicate. It is a refusal to do for Alaska, out of her own resources, what Congress has done for every other Western State and Territory, in giving aid to the building of railroads for the development of Alaska.

If Congress will pass this bill and support President Wilson in his efforts to settle these Alaskan problems he will be successful. We people in the great Northwest have long waited for sympathetic assistance from Congress and the administration in power.

We have confidence that President Wilson intends to stand by the pledges in the Baltimore platform and see that Alaska is developed without monopoly, and the people in Alaska intend to give him hearty support and cooperation. We believe that the day of development and prosperity is soon to dawn in that great Territory. We have confidence in the plan which the President announced in his message to secure that result. It is a progressive plan and ought to have the support of every progressive legislator, whether he is called Democrat, Republican, or Progressive.

Give Alaska an opportunity to mortgage her own land and secure the building of a trunk line of railroad from some of her southern harbors to our interior waterways that she may be freed from burdens which now oppress her. Pass this bill and give her freedom from the robber barons of 165 Broadway. We have wealth of every variety in that great Territory. We have more coal than Pennsylvania, Ohio, and West Virginia; more copper than Michigan, Arizona, and Montana; more gold than California and Colorado; more agricultural land than Norway, Sweden, and Finland; and more fish than all the balance of American waters together.

What we need is a clear understanding by Congress of the true value of Alaska and a proper appreciation of its duty as the trustee of the people there. Give us some attention and your sympathy. Get information and learn something of the great wealth of the resources of that Territory. Pass this bill and let the President build a railroad for its development, and Alaska will then offer homes to 10,000,000 people who will live happily within its borders. What we need is wisdom, knowledge, and wise action on the part of Congress, and immediately population will fill Alaska's thousand valleys, open her mines, build roads, churches, schools, and homes, and establish there the last and best American State. For the Americans now there, your brothers and sisters from New England, from the North and the South—from Massachusetts, Virginia, and Texas—from the Mississippi Valley, the plains and far coasts of the West, I beg you to vote for the bill now before the House and give them aid in nation building. [Prolonged applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Before the gentleman from Kansas proceeds I should like to inquire whether the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HOUSTON], chairman of this committee, intends to ask the committee to proceed after the gentleman from Kansas concludes his remarks?

Mr. HOUSTON. That will depend upon how much time is occupied by the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. MURDOCK. I expect to occupy 15 minutes.

Mr. HOUSTON. One or two other gentlemen have asked for the opportunity to speak 5 or 10 minutes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will there be any business transacted tonight after that?

Mr. HOUSTON. I presume not.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can the gentleman give any assurances on that point?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Speaker will give the assurance that as soon as the committee rises the House will adjourn.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, to my mind the most remarkable part of the remarkable speech which we have just heard, carrying the abundant information it did, was this: That until now it has not been possible for any man to give as much information about Alaska as the gentleman who has preceded me [Mr. WICKERSHAM] gave us—for new wonders about this vast and interesting Territory have opened before us almost daily since the gold discoveries—and I think all will agree with me when I say there is no one on earth who could have given that information with the completeness that marked the address of the gentleman from Alaska. [Applause.]

And while I am loaded up with flowers, I should like to drive around to the front door of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HOUSTON], the chairman of this committee, and leave a bouquet for him, for the expedition, the dispatch with which he has brought this measure before the House. [Applause.] That activity is just as commendable in him as has been the splendid initiative in this matter shown by President Woodrow Wilson. [Applause.] We have no time to lose in this matter of protecting and developing Alaska. I favor the measure, and my advocacy of it is touched peculiarly with an element of personal observation. I, as boy and man, saw one new country develop. I came into consciousness in this world in a little collection of yellow, unpainted houses, out on a floor-flat, treeless, unbroken prairie.

I saw this collection of crude stores and homes grow into a city. For the men who settled there built up a great city, reared a magnificent mart, a milling, jobbing, packing center, Wichita, now a prosperous metropolis, surrounded by a populous territory. That process of building was made more difficult because of the early practices of those who controlled privately owned railroads. It is a common thing among railroad men to say that the development of the great prairie West was due primarily to the railroads. It was not due primarily to the railroads; it was due to the settlers. And the chief instrument in his hand was not the railroad; it was the small unit of 160 acres as a homestead. Originally greeted with enthusiasm by the settlers and with gratuities, the railroads came to be regarded with distrust and bitterness by the people. I saw my community and communities like it struggling with increasing intensity against extortions and discriminations and abuses by these corporations. This was true not only in small matters but in great ones. Economic alliance in my part of Kansas is not naturally with the eastern seaboard. We are at one economically with the territory south—Oklahoma and Texas—our ports are naturally the ports of Houston and Galveston. Much of the heavy shipments from my city, which is a grain center, should go to Galveston and Houston.

The haul is short, the grades easy, and yet for over a quarter of a century those who controlled the privately owned railroads forced by artificial means the traffic to the east and in other ways took an extortionate toll from the people who were getting the product from the ground in the sweat of their brow. Therefore I was pained to find that the only report in protest against this new proposition of aiding Alaska by a Government-owned railroad came from two Representatives from Oklahoma. These gentlemen from Oklahoma can not have forgotten the arrogance of the corporations which their own State has witnessed. They can not have forgotten the experience of the cities in the Cherokee Strip, which were designated as town sites by the Government. For instance, under the administration of Grover Cleveland the Government designated as a town site Enid. The railroad established another town a few miles north, and called it North Enid. Then the officials of the railroad shot their train through Enid and stopped them only

at North Enid, to break the Government town and build up the railroad town.

I remember of hearing in my youth a story to this effect: The commissioners of my county had in their possession some of the securities of the Santa Fe Railroad, and at that time there was a conflict between two factions of financiers for the control of that system. One of the factions came to the county commissioners and asked them to surrender this block of securities. The three commissioners, honest men, who wanted to serve the community and not the corporation, decided to ask the market price for their securities, and the faction which purchased them had to give the market price. But thereafter, for 20 years, because of that transaction, because three men served the people who elected them and not the corporations, our town was penalized by the system. For in the development of the new country, railroads discriminated not only between men but between towns. They had their favorites and their victims, and most of the development which came in my country came through the hardest sort of hard work and against evil practice and injustice; not half the story of the struggle has ever been told or ever will be.

Here is Alaska, a new proposition. It will not be an easy Territory to develop; it will prove a difficult one. Because of physical peculiarities, it is absolutely necessary that the Government take hold of this Territory to save it and the people's right to it. Men have heard here to-day that not all Alaska is cold, that there are portions that are mild, that there are parts of it very fertile, that it has magnificent valleys, broad streams, untold deposits of wealth, and rich fisheries. Now, how can we develop it? Best of all by taking off from the shoulders of the people of Alaska the embargo of privately owned railroads and by giving them the assistance in development that will come through Government-owned railroads. There are 50,000 people only in Alaska, the bulk of which is above 60°. Yet there are north of 60° in Europe—in Norway, Sweden, Finland, and the Russian Provinces—11,000,000 people supported by agriculture, and they are among the sturdiest people on the face of the earth.

The political authority given by the chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HOUSTON], for this bill is a plank from the last Democratic national platform. I read it with great interest, because I could not find precisely the specific authority for the bill, much as I favor the measure and glad as I am that it has been advanced so far. He quotes the national Democratic platform adopted at Baltimore as follows:

Conservation. Immediate action should be taken by Congress to make available the vast and valuable coal deposits of Alaska under conditions that will be a perfect guaranty against their falling into the hands of monopolizing corporations, associations, or interests.

The proposition of a Government-owned railroad, so far as that text is concerned, is only inferential. But the chairman of the committee is fair enough to quote the Progressive national platform upon this subject, and, like all of that platform, this plank means precisely what it says:

Alaska. We demand also that extortion or monopoly in transportation shall be prevented by the prompt acquisition, construction, or improvement by the Government of such railroads, harbor, and other facilities for transportation as the welfare of the people may demand.

Mr. Chairman, this is specific; this is definite; it is unmistakable. The Progressive Party made this, the only real Alaskan pledge. The Democratic leaders came to the Progressive platform for the suggestion of a real reform, and I congratulate them upon it.

Mr. WINGO rose.

Mr. MURDOCK. Oh, I have only a few moments, and I want to show the origin of this legislation.

Mr. WINGO. Can the gentleman give me the origin of that plank and who wrote it?

Mr. MURDOCK. It is a mighty fine plank, and I am not concerned about its origin.

Mr. PAYNE. Will the gentleman please tell us what the Socialist Party said about that?

Mr. MURDOCK. I do not know; but I have looked carefully through the Republican platform, and, as usual on vital questions, it said nothing. [Laughter.]

Mr. PAYNE. It says nothing that comes from the Socialist platform, as this does.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, what is the origin of this proposition? During the administration of the last Republican President, Mr. Taft, it developed that the administration of the Department of the Interior was giving Alaska over to the Guggenheims. An investigation resulted, and the commission appointed to investigate this matter reported. All of the Republicans upon that committee save one upheld the Taft-

Ballinger-Guggenheim policy in Alaska. One Republican, Mr. Madison of Kansas, held against the Guggenheim policy, and with him were all of the Democrats. I do not know what the attitude of the Republican leaders upon this subject is to-day. I do not know what their attitude will be upon this bill. I do not know whether they are still standing for the Taft-Ballinger-Guggenheim policy. I suspect they are, and I base my suspicion upon the fact that they still indorse the action of their national committee in perpetuating a system which perpetrated in 1912 the Chicago convention outrage. I do not think it is possible for them to change; I do not think they will; they never learn; but so far as I am concerned, and I think I speak for every Progressive on this floor, I am glad, with all my heart and soul, that the Democratic leader, President Wilson—and he is in this a leader—took this thing up at once; that he found perfect accord in the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Houston]; that they brought this matter out of committee quickly; that they got it on the calendar speedily; that they took possession of Calendar Wednesday; and that they are occupying that day until they shall write this measure into law. The Nation wants it, Alaska needs it, and I, speaking for all the Progressives here, I think, without exception, rejoice at the good work. For in this House and in the country a Progressive is always for a meritorious measure no matter what its origin. [Applause.]

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. SHACKLEFORD having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message, in writing, from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House of Representatives that the President had, on December 23, 1913, approved and signed bills of the following titles:

H. R. 7837. An act to provide for the establishment of Federal reserve banks, to furnish an elastic currency, to afford means of rediscounting commercial paper, to establish more effective supervision of banking in the United States, and for other purposes.

H. R. 11003. An act to provide for expenses of representatives of the United States at the International Maritime Conference for Safety of Life at Sea.

RAILROADS IN ALASKA.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Tennessee if he is going to rise to-night, because he will have to have a quorum here in order to prolong this session very much longer.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the indulgence of the gentleman for 5 or 10 minutes longer.

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Chairman, I think at the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BATHRICK], who speaks next, the committee will rise.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BATHRICK].

Mr. BATHRICK. Mr. Chairman, I intend to support this bill for the very essential reason, as I look upon it, that it is a proper expression of government; that it does something for the people that is material and important; that it does not go to the people and hand to them a disquisition upon government philosophy in the place of material help. The time has come in this country, and some of us have noted it fully, that we must perform the functions of government in a manner that will give satisfaction to the people and make them believe that government really means something for them. The time has gone when we can throw a bare philosophical government out into the hands of the people and say to them, "Now, help yourselves." What has been the result of doing this heretofore? Private profit, a strong element of monopoly, a system of money control, a system of industrial control has operated to put the privileges of the people in the hands of the few so that the many have been totally unable to help themselves. And so we come to this Alaska proposition, which is essentially a matter of Government aid to a depressed portion of the people of this country, a governmental aid for a very worthy object, Government aid extended to the people of the Territory of Alaska which, if it works out as I hope it will and as it appears it will, will give us an example for Government aid for other directions in this country. I trust that after this bill has been passed and this railroad is in operation that the people of this country will discover there an example of what their Government can do for them aside from merely saying, "We will give you the right to work out your own salvation." That is why I am standing here, gentlemen, and telling you that I am in favor of this bill. I know that later on in this session other matters of Govern-

ment aid will be brought to our attention, but here is a glowing example of the extension of Government credit to the people in order to assist them to help themselves. It will serve as a start toward accomplishing actual help instead of forever feeding the people upon theory.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly the committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HARRISON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 1739, and had directed him to report that it had come to no resolution thereon.

PANAMA RAILROAD CO. (S. DOC. NO. 382).

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States.

The Clerk read as follows:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the Sixty-fourth Annual Report of the Board of Directors of the Panama Railroad Co., for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1913.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 14, 1914.

The SPEAKER. The message is ordered to be printed and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, but the accompanying documents are not ordered to be printed yet.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned to meet to-morrow, Thursday, January 15, 1914, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting draft of proposed legislation authorizing the Secretary of War to prescribe regulations under which licenses may be granted to persons qualified to act as guides to the Gettysburg Battle Field (H. Doc. No. 591); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a copy of a letter from the presiding judge of the United States Commerce Court, inviting attention to a typographical error in the statement of expenditures (H. Doc. No. 451, pt. 2); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting reports from this department and the various bureaus and offices thereunder, showing the name of the offices, date and destination of travel, nature of official business, and total travel expense incurred by each (H. Doc. No. 592); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department and ordered to be printed.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 9479) granting an increase of pension to Juliett Fields; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 10034) granting an increase of pension to Frank Godfrey; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 8326) granting a pension to James A. Crowley; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 11616) to provide for the leasing of coal lands in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 11617) to provide for a site and public building at Viroqua, Wis.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GERRY: A bill (H. R. 11618) appropriating money for the improvement of Wickford Harbor, R. I.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BURGESS: A bill (H. R. 11619) to amend section 108, chapter 5, of the act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 11620) pensioning the surviving officers and enlisted men of the Texas Volunteers employed in the defense of the frontier of that State against Mexican marauders and Indian depredations from January 1, 1859, to January 1, 1861, and from 1866 to 1876, inclusive, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11621) providing for the purchase of a national forest reserve and park in the State of Texas to be known as "The Palo Duro National Forest Reserve and Park"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE: A bill (H. R. 11622) to provide water for the irrigable lands of the Yakima Indian Reservation, State of Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. EVANS: A bill (H. R. 11623) authorizing a preliminary examination and survey of Flathead River, Mont.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. DUPRÉ: A bill (H. R. 11624) to repeal an act approved March 2, 1895, entitled "An act to amend section 3 of an act entitled 'An act to regulate the liens of judgments and decrees of the courts of the United States,' approved August 1, 1888"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: A bill (H. R. 11625) to increase the appropriation for the erection of an immigration station at Baltimore, Md.; to the Committee on Public Buildings, and Grounds.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 11626) to construct and place a lightship near Block Island, in the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 11627) to authorize a survey for a bridge across the Colorado River near the Fort Mohave Indian Reservation, Ariz.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. VOLSTEAD: A bill (H. R. 11628) to prevent overcapitalization and consolidation of interstate carriers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HINDS: Resolution (H. Res. 368) authorizing preliminary survey of York Harbor, Me.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 27) directing the Secretary of War to have a survey made and estimate submitted of the cost of improving the Columbia River at Kennewick, Wash.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 28) directing the Secretary of War to have survey and estimate made of the cost of improvement of harbor at Olympia, Wash.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 29) directing the Secretary of War to have a survey and estimate made of cost of a canal from Olympia to Grays Harbor and other points; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. PETERS of Massachusetts (by request): Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 194) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR: A bill (H. R. 11629) granting an increase of pension to John H. M. Harrison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11630) granting an increase of pension to Michael H. W. Jameson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11631) granting an increase of pension to Ezra Deeren; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 11632) granting an increase of pension to Wilson S. Fouts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 11633) granting an increase of pension to William Armon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLAYPOOL: A bill (H. R. 11634) granting an increase of pension to Noah Blausen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11635) placing the name of Lafayette Hawk upon the unlimited retired list of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COLLIER: A bill (H. R. 11636) for the relief of the heirs or estate of William J. Milligan, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COX: A bill (H. R. 11637) granting an increase of pension to George W. Coward; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: A bill (H. R. 11638) granting a pension to John T. Biggers; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11639) granting a pension to Ernest W. Hilliard; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11640) granting a pension to James W. Sullivan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11641) to correct the military record of William Warner, alias Samuel Mee; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11642) to correct the military record of Jefferson Bailey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DONOHUE: A bill (H. R. 11643) for the relief of Kate Cunningham; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ELDER: A bill (H. R. 11644) for the relief of John W. Wright; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 11645) granting an increase of pension to John W. Marshall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FIELDS: A bill (H. R. 11646) granting a pension to James H. Gilley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11647) for the relief of the legal representatives and heirs of Nathan Gibbs, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 11648) for erecting a suitable memorial to John Ericsson; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. GRIEST: A bill (H. R. 11649) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of the Columbia National Bank, of Columbia, Pa.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 11650) granting a pension to Christina Whitcome; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 11651) granting an increase of pension to Henry B. Haines; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HENSLEY: A bill (H. R. 11652) granting an increase of pension to Catherine C. Birmingham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JACOWAY: A bill (H. R. 11653) granting an increase of pension to Samuel R. Price; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KEATING: A bill (H. R. 11654) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Clucas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11655) granting an increase of pension to George S. Merritt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11656) granting a pension to George C. Hazeltine; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11657) granting a pension to Flora V. Turnbull; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11658) granting a pension to Alice Connors; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11659) granting a pension to Tomasita M. Bustos; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11660) for the relief of James Noble; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 11661) granting a pension to Letitia M. Leopard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: A bill (H. R. 11662) granting a pension to John L. Shields; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. METZ: A bill (H. R. 11663) granting a pension to John Bleiweiss; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11664) for the relief of Frederick Wyneken; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11665) for the relief of John O. Nelson; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11666) for the relief of Cornelius Ver Planck; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOSS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 11667) for the relief of John H. Kidd; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MURDOCK: A bill (H. R. 11668) granting an increase of pension to William McCracken; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PETERSON: A bill (H. R. 11669) granting a pension to Euceba H. Sherman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POST: A bill (H. R. 11670) granting an increase of pension to Albert Fletcher; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11671) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of John M. Lower; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REED: A bill (H. R. 11672) granting an increase of pension to Adams H. Eastman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11673) granting an increase of pension to George P. Doeg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11674) granting an increase of pension to Isaac F. Jenness; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEDMAN: A bill (H. R. 11675) for the relief of the legal representatives of James Rierson, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: A bill (H. R. 11676) granting an increase of pension to Samuel S. Householder; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11677) for the relief of Lewis W. Crain; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11678) for the relief of George H. Burton, United States Army, retired; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11679) for the relief of Andrew A. St. John; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STONE: A bill (H. R. 11680) granting a pension to Odillon C. Schupp; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11681) granting an increase of pension to Charles Montooth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11682) granting an increase of pension to W. W. King; 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): Memorial of the Thomas Davis Club, of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against appropriation of funds for celebration of "one hundred years of peace among English-speaking people"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), memorial of the Socialist Party of New York City, favoring a congressional investigation of strike conditions in Michigan; to the Committee on Rules.

Also (by request), memorial of Ancient Order of Hibernians, Division 17, Wilmerding, Pa., protesting against appropriation for "one hundred years of peace among English-speaking people"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), memorial of C. O. De Long, of Homestead, Pa., favoring Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also (by request), petition of C. O. De Long, of Homestead, Pa., protesting against House bill 9836, making Columbus Day a national holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), petition of James G. Thrasher, of Munhall, Pa., protesting against House bill 9836, making Columbus Day a national holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAILEY (by request): Memorial of Blandburg Local, No. 2092, favoring an investigation of conditions in the copper regions of Michigan; to the Committee on Rules.

Also (by request), petition of citizens of Six Mile Run, State of Pennsylvania, protesting against the passage of the Sabbath-observance bill (H. R. 9674); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: Memorial of Brand's Local Bronx (N. Y.) Socialist Party of America, favoring an investigation of the conditions in the copper region; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BUTLER: Memorial of Anna M. Ross Council, No. 101, Daughters of Liberty, of Spring City, Pa., favoring the passage of a bill restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CALDER: Petition of F. M. Crouch, of New York City, N. Y., favoring the passage of House bill 29, relative to the hours of working women; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of the Twelfth Assembly District Regular Democratic Club, favoring the direct primary as applied to presidential elections; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of Regular Democratic Club Twelfth Assembly District of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the direct primary as applied to presidential elections; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

Also, petition of National Camp Patriotic Sons of America, at Trenton, N. J., favoring the passage of the immigration bill (S. 2453); to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DICKINSON: Petition of members of Socialist Local of Nyhart, Mo., favoring congressional investigation of strike conditions in Michigan; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petitions of John F. Harder and other citizens of Clinton, Mo., protesting against the passage of the Hefin bill (H. R. 9674); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DONOHUE: Memorial of Business Men's and Taxpayers' Association of Frankford, Philadelphia, Pa., favoring the Philadelphia Navy Yard for new dry dock; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ELDER: Papers to accompany a bill (H. R. 11644) for the relief of John W. Wright; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of general council of Winnebago Indians in Nebraska, favoring the passage of the amended Stephens bill to open the Court of Claims to all tribes and bands of Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Resolutions of the twelfth assembly district, Regular Democratic Club, of Brooklyn, N. Y., indorsing extension of the direct-primary system for selection of candidates for President and Vice President; to the Committee on Election of President and Vice President and Representatives in Congress.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring legislation in the form of pension bills for the relief of the United States Military Telegraph Corps; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARDNER: Memorial of Socialist Local of Cape Ann, Mass., favoring a congressional investigation into strike conditions in Michigan; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Memorial of the Daniel H. Comber Club, of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against an appropriation by Congress for the celebration of "One Hundred Years of Peace With England"; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petitions of Fredonia Council No. 52, Order United American Mechanics, of Philadelphia, Pa.; National Camp Patriotic Order Sons of America, Trenton, N. J.; Olney Council No. 7, Olney; Philadelphia and Washington Camp, No. 303, Patriotic Order Sons of America, Philadelphia, Pa., favoring the passage of the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against the passage of House bill 8826, relative to the hours of labor for persons engaged in producing interstate commerce; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. HAYES: Memorial of Central Labor Council, of Santa Clara County, Cal.; United Laborers' Union, No. 14190, San Jose, Cal.; Local 393, Plumbers' Union, Local 162, Carpenters' Union, San Mateo, Cal.; Local 848, Carpenters' Union, San Bruno, Cal., favoring seamen's bill; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, resolution of California Branch of the American School Peace League, favoring plan for a "naval holiday"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Pacific Coast, favoring the strengthening of the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HELVERING: Petition of sundry citizens of the State of Kansas, favoring the passage of the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Petition of O. R. Preble and other residents of Rhode Island, favoring passage of House bill 1873; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: Memorial of the Tenth Ward Branch Local, Lycoming, Socialist Party of America, favoring an investigation of the conditions in the copper regions of Michigan; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of the National N. L. W. V. of Denver, Colo., favoring the passage of House bill 1672, placing on the pension rolls the survivors of the early Indian Wars; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MADDEN: Petition of United Lithuanian Societies of Chicago, Ill., protesting against the literacy test in the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MAHER: Memorial of State Administration of Vocational Education at a conference in New York City, December 13, 1913, favoring the passage of Senate joint resolution 5, for national aid for vocational education; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of Cigar Makers' Union No. 149, of Brooklyn, favoring the passage of legislation for a thorough congressional investigation of the whole strike system in the copper regions of Michigan, as well as in other parts of the United States, and that the Government acquire possession of the copper mines and operate them under union conditions; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of members of the Twelfth Assembly District Regular Democratic Club, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the

direct primary as applied to presidential elections; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

Also, petition of Women's Trade Union League of New York City, N. Y., favoring an investigation of the conditions of the copper regions of Michigan; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RAINEY: Resolution of Socialist Party of Beardstown, Ill.; White Hall, Ill.; and Havana, Ill., favoring investigation of strike conditions in Michigan; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petitions of C. Hopewell and 48 others of San Jose, Ill., favoring the passage of the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of C. Hopewell and 48 other citizens of San Jose, Ill., protesting against the passage of the Columbus Day bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts: Evidence in support of bill (H. R. 9960) granting a pension to Elizabeth N. Hussey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, evidence in support of bill (H. R. 10923) granting a pension to George Downing, alias Henry Harris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petition of International Brotherhood of Stationary Firemen, Local No. 55, of Newark, N. J., and vicinity, favoring an investigation into the conditions of the copper regions of Michigan; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of American Association of Foreign Language Newspapers, of New York City, protesting against the passage of the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of the Sea Bright Board of Trade, of Sea Bright, N. J., favoring an appropriation by Congress for protecting the shore front; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SELDOMRIDGE: Petition of Washington Camp, No. 15, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Denver, Colo., favoring Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of citizens of Colorado Springs, Colo., favoring a two-battleship program; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. J. M. C. SMITH: Memorial of Painters, Paperhangers, and Decorators, Local No. 812, of Kalamazoo, Mich.; Cigar Makers' Union of Battle Creek, Mich.; and Bakers' Union No. 159, of Kalamazoo, Mich., favoring Federal investigation of strike conditions in Michigan; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of editor of Hollandsche Amerikan, protesting against Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Memorial of Local No. 374, Iron Molders' Union of North America, Los Angeles, Cal.; Lodge No. 311, Machinists' Union, Los Angeles, Cal.; Local No. 1763, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Los Angeles, Cal.; Local No. 949, Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paper Hangers of America; and Local No. 3818, International Longshoremen's Union, Los Angeles, Cal., favoring seamen's bill (S. 136); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petitions of California Veekoblad and Italo Americano, Los Angeles, Cal., protesting against Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petitions of citizens of Burbank and Los Angeles, Cal., favoring Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of certain citizens of California, favoring a bill granting relief to persons who served in the Military Telegraph Corps of the Army during the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Miss H. R. Heapp, of Sawtelle, Cal., favoring increased pensions for Army nurses who served in Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of the Anti-Saloon League of Hawaii, favoring Gronna bill relative to Federal prohibition of liquor for Hawaiian Islands; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, petition of Ex-Union Volunteer Officers' Association, Pasadena, Cal., favoring the Volunteer officers' retired list bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of citizens of Los Angeles, Cal., protesting against the Sabbath observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: Papers in support of bill (H. R. 9108) granting an increase of pension to James H. Clutts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of McMillan Lodge, No. 445, International Association of Machinists, of Williamson, W. Va., favoring an investigation of strike conditions in Michigan and elsewhere; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of 130 members of the Ohio Valley Trades and Labor Assembly of Wheeling, W. Va., protesting against the circulation of petitions in sympathy with and opposed to Government dissolution of the United States Steel Trust; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALLIN: Petition of editor of *Il Messageri*, of Amsterdam, N. Y., favoring elimination of the literacy test from House bill 6000; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: Petition of the Women's Trade Union League of New York, favoring the passage of the eight-hour-a-day bill for women employed in various occupations; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of the members of the Twelfth Assembly District Regular Democratic Club, favoring the direct primary for presidential elections; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. WINGO: Petitions of Local No. 2110, United Mine Workers of America, of Millard; Local No. 1526, of Hartford; Central Trades Council of Hartford; and Rose Hill Lodge, No. 479, Arkansas, favoring an investigation of conditions in the copper regions of the State of Michigan; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WOODRUFF: Memorial of the International Union of the United Brewery Workmen of America, favoring an investigation of the conditions in the copper regions of Michigan; to the Committee on Rules.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, January 15, 1914.

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

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

TRAVEL OF EMPLOYEES OF INTERIOR DEPARTMENT (H. DOC. NO. 592).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, statements giving the names of officers of the various bureaus and offices in the Interior Department who have traveled on official business, together with the date and destination of travel, nature of official business, and total expense incurred by each, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

FINDINGS OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate communications from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims transmitting certified copies of the findings of fact and conclusions filed by the court in the following causes:

In the cause of Mary Ann Jackson *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 363);

In the cause of Henry Comeaux *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 364); and

In the cause of A. A. Goodwin, jr., administrator of succession of Emile Rost, deceased, *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 365).

The foregoing findings were, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO. (H. DOC. NO. 597).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. for the year 1913, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented memorials of George Washington Branch, American Continental League, of Brooklyn, N. Y.; of Local Division, No. 17, Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Wilmerding, Pa.; and the Wolfe Tone Society, of Pittsburgh, Pa., remonstrating against any appropriation by Congress for the proposed celebration of the so-called "100 years of peace among English-speaking peoples," which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I received a telegram this morning that I wish to lay before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator desire to have it read?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Let it go in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

[Telegram.] CHICAGO, January 13, 1914.

HON. JAMES E. MARTINE,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The national executive committee of the Socialist Party commissioned Victor L. Berger, Charles Edward Russell, and Seymour Stedman to