583 CONGRESS DELEGATES DISFRANCHISE THEMSELVES

EL PASO HAS GOOD LEAD IN FIGHT FOR CONGRESS

(Continued from Page 1.)

any importance was transacted until the evening session, when the proposition to repeal the two acts mentioned came up for endorsement. Ex-Senator J. M. Carey of Wyoming nd W. S. Johnston of Colorado led the fight against action favoring a repeal, while a number of the delegates spoke in favor of the proposition. Senator Carey began his fight the day before in his speech to the Washington correspondents.

He had considerable more to say before the committee.

When the question came to a vote there was an overwhelming majority in favor of the repeal. A resolution asking congress to take such action will be reported and the fight will be renewed on the floor of the Irrigation congress. The committee is endeavoring to confine the discussions to the subject of irrigation as much as possible, eliminating by unfavorable reports resolutions dealing with other matters. The report will not be ready until the last day of the congress, Friday.

TOPIC WAS COLONIZATION AT MORNING SESSION OF THE IRRIGATION CONGRESS.

(Special to The Herald.)

Ogden, Sept. 16.—Colonization was the theme of the speakers at the morning session of the congress and some excellent addresses were made, notable among them being the one by Commander Frederick Booth-Tucker of the Salvation Army, a speech that was received with tremendous favor by the congress, which gave the noted Salvationist three rousing cheers when he concluded.

In the absence of E. M. Brannick of Portland, T. G. Hailey of the Oregon delegation spoke briefly on "The Relation of Irrigation to the Internal Trade and Commerce of the Country." Fisher Harris of Salt Lake was on the programme to deliver an address on "Intensive Irrigation," but he was not present, so the delegates were denied the pleasure of hearing the distinguished toastmaster's views on this important matter. C. E. Wantland, in discussing colonization, took the position that the national irrigation law would fail in part unless right methods of colonization were adopted in connection with it. He mentioned the movement of colonists to Canada and other countries while, he said, 3,000,000 acres of good land were lying in the United States in such shape that it cannot be used for homes. There are, he said, no state bureaus of immigration worthy the name west of the Missouri river, which he construed to be a reflection upon the intelligence of the legislators and business men of the states. He urged that the government take up the colonization question and give it earnest and careful attention.

Major Carson, Washington correspondent of the New York Times, delivered a carefully prepared and scholarly address, dealing with the subject in a most intelligent manner.

Apostle Smith Speaks.

John Henry Smith of Utah made an eloquent speech on the colonization idea, taking the case of Utah for his chief illustration. He began by saying the idea of colonization was as old as the world, as Adam and Eve started it, and their children had been following it up ever since. Utah's early history, the privations and difficulties which beset the pioneers, the problems that confronted them and how they solved Utah's agricultural question formed the basis of an address that made a deep impression on the congress.

Governor Pardee of California, though suffering from a severe cold contracted en route, made a brief address on the topic of the session, dwelling on the importance of it and the importance of the congress in shaping national legislation along that line. He told of the successful colonization experiments made in California and heartily endorsed the idea.

Booth Tucker Speaks.

General Booth-Tucker was the next speaker and occupied the time until the noon recess with a speech that was easily conceded to be the great effort of the session. He illustrated his points by some of the cleverest little stories and anecdotes heard in Utah for a long time. The burden of his talk was a plea for the poor, who cannot afford to pay cash for land, but who, when given proper assistance as the government is able to give it, could be lifted out of poverty and misery into prosperity and happiness. He pledged the Salvation Army to do its share in bringing about this result and told with pardonable pride of the three successful colonies the Army has in Ohio, Colorado and California, peopled by men, women and children who are taken from among the poor of the great cities and converted into successful farmers. General Booth-Tucker's address appears on the next column.

GREAT MAJORITY OF DELEGATES VOTE TO DISFRANCHISE THEMSELVES.

At the opening of the afternoon session arose the first scrimmage of the congress, and when this was over there was scarcely a vestige of one side left. The controversy came up over the number of votes to be given each delegation. The number of delegates exceeded the provisions of the constitution, which gives each state a maximum of twenty votes.

A motion was made to amend the constitution to allow each delegate present a vote. This was overwhelmingly defeated by a vote of 342 to 3.

The question came up following the report of the committee on credentials, of which John Hall of Texas is chairman. The report was as follows:

Ogden, Utah, Sept. 16, 1903.

Mr. President and Members of the Eleventh National Irrigation Congress:

Your committee on credentials begs leave to report that the total number of delegates attending this convention is 945, the several states and territories being represented as follows:

Arizona	49
Alabama	1
Arkansas	4
California	51
Colorado	32
District of Columbia	2
Idaho	146
Illinois	14
Iowa	9
Kansas	29
Missouri	4
Nevada	19
Oregon	63
South Dakota	11
Utah	244
Washington	35
Michigan	1
Minnesota	24
Montana	45
Nebraska	55
New Mexico	14
New York	2
North Dakota	6
Oklahoma	4
Pennsylvania	1
Texas	29
Virginia	2
Wisconsin	8
Wyoming	41

The following states and territories are not represented: Connecticut, Delaware, Georgia, Florida, Indiana, Indian Territory, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Mississippi, New Hampshire, New Jersey, North Carolina, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Vermont, West Virginia.

Call Was Erroneous.

The large number of delegates in attendance is due to the fact that the call for the eleventh National Irrigation congress provided for the appointment of a larger number of delegates by the governors of the several states and the mayors of incorporated cities than is authorized by the constitution of this congress.

Your committee desires to call the attention of the delegates to articles VI and VII of the constitution of the National irrigation congress, as follows:

"Article VI. The membership of this congress shall be as follows: Five delegates from each state and territory, to be appointed by their respective governors; one delegate from each city of the United States having a population less than 25,000, and two delegates from each city having a population over 25,000; one delegate from any regularly organized agricultural and horticultural society, society of engineers, irrigation companies, agricultural colleges and commercial bodies, and duly accredited representative of any foreign nation or colony; any member of the United States senate or house of representatives, and governor of a state or territory, any member of a state or territorial irrigation commission, may be chaiman of each section and the permanent officers of the congress.

"Article VII. Each member of the congress shall be entitled to one vote, provided, no state shall have more than twenty votes, and provided, when a state is represented by less than twenty delegates, said delegates, if all are present, may cast ten votes for said state; if some of the delegates of said state are absent, those remaining may cast their proportion of ten votes."

Limiting the representation of each state and territory to twenty votes, as provided by the constitution of this congress, the several states and territories would be entitled to cast the following number of votes, to-wit:

Alabama	1
Arizona	20
Arkansas	4
California	20
Colorado	20
District of Columbia	2
Idaho	20
Illinois	14
Iowa	9
Kansas	20
Michigan	1
Minnesota	20
Missouri	4
Montana	20
Nebraska	20
Nevada	19
New Mexico	14
New York	2
North Dakota	6
Oklahoma	4
Oregon	20
Pennsylvania	1
South Dakota	10
Texas	20
Utah	20
Virginia	2
Washington	20
Wisconsin	8
Wyoming	20
Total	382

Your committee emphatically recommends that the secretary of this congress provide a method for tabulating delegates attending the next session of the congress that will relieve the committee on credentials of the large amount of clerical work that has been required of it at this session.

Thirtieth State Represented.

The credentials of the delegate from Vermont had not been presented. His name was added to the list, making a total of thirty states represented. The report was then adopted.

General Donovan of Montana then moved that articles 6 and 7 of the constitution be amended to permit all delegates present to vote. A motion was made to table this.

A discussion followed.

"If you don't table this motion," remarked Senator Smoot, "it will mean that over 300 votes from Utah can vote all the rest of you down."

When it came to a vote, which was carried out in accordance with the provisions of the constitution limiting each state to twenty votes, there were 342 ayes and only a trio of noes—these from Nebraska.

A letter was read from Professor F. H. Newell, head of the reclamation bureau of the United States geological survey, asking suggestions on the work of the bureau.

Ex-Governor L. Bradford Prince of New Mexico moved that a committee of five be appointed to report on revision of the constitution. The motion prevailed.

John Noonan of Colorado introduced a resolution favoring the construction of small reservoirs near headwaters of streams.

The topic for the afternoon was a discussion of the legal questions allied with irrigation.

Senator F. T. Dubois of Idaho was scheduled to speak on "The Intent of the Reclamation Law," but he was absent. Consequently the first address was on "The Repeal of Some of Our Land Laws," by Senator Paris Gibson of Montana. Senator Gibson's address appears elsewhere.

Congressman Frank Mondell took an opposite view on the repeal of the desert land and the timber and stone acts. His subject was "Value and Importance of the Desert Land Law." He began by declaring that the Ogden hospitality of the previous evening had left him rather the worst for wear. Taking up the main subject, he said:

Mondell Against Repeal.

"The agitation for the repeal of the desert land law, the timber and stone act and the commutation clause of the homestead act will receive scant support in the public land states.

"Under the desert land law more land has been reclaimed from the desert and made fruitful than under all other laws and its repeal would greatly retard future irrigation development. The repeal of the timber and stone act would deprive the ranchman and farmer of an opportunity to secure a timber lot, would establish a government timber monopoly, troublesome, pernicious and contrary to the spirit of our institutions. The repeal of the commutation clause of the homestead law would discourage and retard settlement and development by reason of the menace to the homestead settler of loss of homestead right, labor and improvements should sickness, death, low prices or shortage of crops render it impossible for him to maintain continuous residence.

"The laws in question have furnished nearly $13,000,000 of the $16,000,000 now to the credit of the irrigation fund, and their repeal would amount to a repeal of the national irrigation law.

"The people of the public land states are forced to the conclusion that a large part of the agitation for repeal emanates from large corporate land and land-scrip owners, who see in the withdrawal of public land from market a greater demand for their property."

Congressman Mondell spoke without notes, with oratorical effect, and he stirred some demonstrations from the audience.

Mr. Wooldridge's Speech.

He was followed by W. M. Wooldridge, who read a paper on "The Utilization of the Public Grazing Lands of the United States."

Mr. Wooldridge went into the history of the use of the public lands for grazing, explained the practices and discussed the ways to get best results, protectin gall interests. He opposed the leasing system.

Senator Smoot was called to the chair by President Clark to preside during Mr. Wooldridge's speech. Senator F. G. Newlands of Nevada was on the programme for a talk on "State Co-operation With National Irrigation." As it was getting late in the afternoon, Senator Clark moved that an adjournment be taken until 9:30 o'clock this morning, making Senator Newland's speech the first thing on the programme today. This suggestion carried.

A large proportion of the delegates went out to the semi-arid states' exhibit at the Weber county fair grounds.

COMMANDER BOOTH TUCKER'S STRONG ADDRESS.

Salvation Army Leader Discusses the "Relation of Colonization to Irrigation," and Tells of Work Being Done By His Organization in Colorado and California.

THERE are probably few more important questions now occupying the attention of this country, nay, of the world, than that which is the occasion for the gathering of this national congress. To render habitable and to populate millions of acres of rich land which has hitherto been labeled "desert" and "arid," owing to the lack of water, is a magnificent undertaking, worthy of the combined genius of the national solons and magi—the wise men of the west—who have here gathered to exchange views and lay plans for the future. If Abraham was known as a friend of God and a father of nations, we may regard this perhaps as a congress of Abrahams—friends of man and fathers of nations, who shall, with God's blessing, fulfill the ancient prophecy and literally make the deserts of America, nay, of the world, "blossom as a rose," thus providing an ample home and harbor for its teeming millions.

In September, 1897, the Sixth National Irrigation congress passed the following resolution:

"Resolved, That we have heard with great interest and great pleasure Mrs. Booth Tucker's presentation and explanation of the purposes of the Salvation Army in organizing colonies of the worthy poor in our great cities to settle and build homes upon the rich irrigated lands of the west. This is a grand, noble and patriotic work, and deserves the earnest commendation and support of every citizen of our country. The west extends a hearty welcome to these people, and we pledge our sympathy and support in aiding these people to make happy homes upon our rich and productive land."

Expectations Fulfilled.

That was "looking forward," before a single colony had been started or a spade turned. The hearty ring of that genuine western welcome has echoed in our ears ever since, and has had much to do with the subsequent success of our plans. On the present occasion instead of "looking forward" to what might appear an optimistic view of the prospects in favor of colonization, we are able to "look backward" and to say that our most sanguine expectations have been fulfilled, and to thank this national congress for the early and intelligent interest it manifested in our effort to solve the important question of systematic colonization. Our methods and plans have since received the endorsement of the most eminent sociologists and statesmen of this country, and while the extent of our enterprise has been necessarily limited by the amount of capital at our disposal, the fact that with such limited resources God has enabled us to accomplish so much has made these results appear the more remarkable.

Personally I feel the deepest interest in the question of irrigation. Having spent some twenty years in India, part of the time as a government official responsible for the welfare of the people, and part of the time as a Salvation Army missionary wearing the Hindoo garb, dwelling in their houses and intimately acquainted with their daily life, I have had perhaps exceptional opportunities for witnessing the immense advantages that lie within the reach of systematic irrigation. In India some of the largest rivers are captured and guided from their mountain sources to their ocean outlet, reclaiming millions of acres that would otherwise be mere desert, and returning in some cases as much as 15 and 20 per cent interest on the capital invested. Not only so, but the Hindoo farmer also utilizes to the utmost the underflow by means of wells worked day and night with Persian wheels and bullock power.

Success in India.

One main reason, however, why in India irrigation has met with such remarkable success has been the fact that on the borderland and often in the very midst of these irrigated areas dwells an enormous and purely agricultural community consisting of small farmers—a nation of market gardeners one might almost call them—who are ready to occupy every acre of land as fast as it is irrigated, and who have been trained in all the advantages of irrigation from childhood. The movement of population has here been automatic, and has required but little guidance or encouragement on the part of the government.

Our case is somewhat different and the fact that this congress is bestowing careful consideration upon the kindred subject of colonization, is to me full of encouragement.

To irrigate is to populate, to populate is to colonize. This congress cannot, I believe, too strongly emphasize the fact that irrigation is dependent for its success upon population. Colonization may be defined as the populating of hitherto unoccupied tracts of land. Systematic, scientific colonization is to haphazard colonization what the railroad is to the prairie schooner, or what irrigation is to the mountain torrent, or what the red Indian tepee is to the modern city hall, or what the galley of Columbus is to the Atlantic liner.

Lack of System.

The lack of systematic colonization has caused the failure of not a few excellent and thoroughly practicable irrigation schemes. The reason for this is not far to seek. A canal which will irrigate say 100,000 acres of land is necessarily a costly enterprise. The interest and upkeep can easily be met if the whole tract be quickly occupied. But if a small portion only be settled, either the colonists will be disheartened and driven away by the heavy charges made in the effort to meet expenses and pay dividends, or the investors will become discouraged at the long delay and non-receipt of a fair return for their investment. In either case the enterprise will be killed in its initial stage.

Scientific colonization can secure the rapid and immediate enjoyment of the fruits of irrigation. Each is a necessity to the other. An ill-digested and haphazard scheme of irrigation will injure, if not ruin, colonization. Similarly an unsystematic plan of colonization will retard (as it has already done) and frequently ruin the best laid and most feasible plans for irrigation.

Scientific colonization will not wait for the farmer with capital, any more than manufacture will wait for the laborer with capital. Imagine the captain of industry who would employ no laborer who did not possess a few thousand dollars. And yet this is the course which colonization has pursued.

The most that the capitalist, or land owner, or irrigationist, has been willing to do in the past has been to bring the water to the land and accept time payments for the latter from the settler. Further than this they have been unwilling to venture. And hence the colonization of irrigated lands has been almost entirely limited to farmers possessing capital.

Disadvantages.

This has had several serious disadvantages.

1. Irrigation lends itself much more readily to the small intensive farm than to the large ranch from which such settlers usually come.

2. The small farmer who is not too high-toned to cultivate the land himself will succeed where the "gentleman" farmer who employs hired labor and sends his children to college will fail, even though the latter may control ten times as much land as the former, and possess a few thousand dollars. Give the former a chance, select him with care, and back him with say $50 cash for a start, and he will succeed better than the latter every time. With ample funds for irrigation now in sight, and with some of our brainiest engineers working out extensive plans, what our "arid west" calls for is not the non-resident gentleman farmer with his staff of cowboys, but the resident twenty-acre horny-handed son of the soil, who does not consider it beneath his own or his children's dignity to drive the plough, milk the cow and earn an honest living by his sweat of brain and brow. The old-time governor of Virginia was right when he told King George that he would rather have a dozen such than a shipload of the ladies and gentlemen whom the latter proposed to send out.

But granted that such settlers are desirable, why should there be any difficulty about obtaining them? For the simple reason that they have no capital and cannot move themselves.

That there are millions of them prepared to move at a few hours' notice from all quarters of this and other lands in just such numbers as may be desired, cannot be denied. The talk about their unwillingness to leave the cities, or go back to the land, is pure undiluted moonshine. The simple fact is that those who wish to be moved, and who would make the most desirable colonists, are blessed with large families, are often hampered with debt, and are unable to move without financial assistance. Who will pay their traveling, buy their livestock, fix up their cottages, and trust them with land? The farmer, like the manufacturer, wants the single man, or woman, and they must be young at that!

COMMANDER BOOTH TUCKER

Case of a Colonist.

Into my office there walked a few days ago a New York banker, escorting a splendid specimen of physical manhood—a typical former, hale, hearty, manly. His wife was with him—every inch a farmer's wife. He held excellent certificates from an ex-governor of New York and other prominent gentlemen on whose estates he had worked. But with a family of eight children he had been unable to more than barely pay his way. He had no wish for the city. But his large family made him undesirable to the farmer, and he had no capital with which to give himself a start. We made immediate arrangements to settle him on one of our colonies. This is but a typical case among tens of thousands. Not only do our cities abound with them, but multitudes of them may be found in our best agricultural districts. Why do our land agents pass over these laborers in favor of the farmer who has to sell his land in order to move? Not because the latter would make a better colonist, but because he has cash, while the former would require assistance.

Now scientific colonization uses the worthy family that has no cash. It says in brief, "Place this waste labor upon the waste land by means of waste capital, and thereby convert this trinity of waste into a unity of production." It has been argued on the other hand that, first they would not go, second they would not stay, third they would not work, and last, but by no means least, they would not pay. We set to work some six years ago to put our theories into practice, and are now able to say positively after more than five years' experience that they have gone and stayed, they have worked and paid. Even the comparatively few failures we have encountered have been a valuable education to us, and we are now in a position to handle the largest schemes with self-sacrificing and expert managers to direct the same, and with a practical code of regulations to guard us from the rocks on which so many similar enterprises have been wrecked.

Army Colonies.

Our three colonies are located in Colorado, California and Ohio, and comprise nearly 3,000 acres of land on which about 400 men, women and children have been settled. On the first two colonies every family is entirely self-supporting, and the repayments have amounted to considerably more than $30,000.

On the California colony last year the settlers averaged a cash income of $850 per family, each twenty-acre farm being worth, with its improvements, about $3,000. The Colorado farms are worth from $2,000 to $5,000, according to their location and improvements. On the townsite have been established some twenty country stores, most of which are operated by colonists. A commercial club has been formed for the development of the business interests of the settlement. Their turn-over last year amounted to about $200,000, while the railroad received some $30,000 for freight from our little country depot.

On the California colony a thirty-acre tract has recently been sold for $4,350, including orchard, farm house and other improvements, being at the rate of $155 an acre for land, which cost us some five years previously $50 an acre. I mention these facts to prove that we were not over-sanguine when we argued that land thus thickly settled would by its own rapid increase in value, amply protect the investor against loss. Thus even supposing that the colonist himself could not, or would not pay, the populating of the land would so add to its value that in the course of a few years it could be sold for a sufficient sum to cover the colonist's entire indebtedness and leave him a handsome margin with which to make a new start.

The further extension of colonization will depend, not on land being available, nor on the ability to secure colonists, but on the supply of capital. That this can be safely invested we think we have sufficiently demonstrated.

Abundance of Land.

That there is land in abundance admirably suited for colonization no one will deny. We have ourselves under offer two most generous donations of land. In one case 50,000 acres of land, in another 20,000 have been placed at our disposal as a gift, but it would require about $500,000 in the one case and $250,000 in the other to establish a suitable colony. With this money we could place about 2,000 settlers (including men, women and children) upon either tract of land, which would then be worth from $50 to $100 per acre. Hence it will be readily seen that the security for a loan of the above amount would be ample, since, in the one case, the value of the donated land thus settled would be at least two-and-a-half million dollars, and in the other case not less than $1,000,000. There are also vast stretches of rich irrigable land near our California and Colorado colonies, while the new irrigation projects now on foot will make available immense regions with fertile soil and salubrious climate, suited in every sense to be converted into a veritable poor man's paradise.

What a magnificent outlet is here afforded for the lamentable congestion of our great cities. How unspeakably sad, nay, how incredible must it appear, that in this great, rich, prosperous country of ours no less than 3,000,000 of our fellow citizens—men, women and children—at least 50 per cent of them agriculturists—should be "cabined, cribbed, confined" in the unhealthy tenements of our cities, while there exists at the very gateways of our civilization these boundless prairies with their invigorating breezes!

Suffering Poor.

No thinking person can view without regret, mingled with apprehension, the sorrows of our suffering poor—needless suffering, I venture to say, in view of the possibilities created by this irrigation congress. The hunger-wail of helpless children, the secret tears of sad-faced mothers, the sullen despair of worthy but poverty-stricken fathers, the coalless attic, the empty cupboard, the scanty clothing, the comfortless home, the grim, eternal, hopeless battle with the wolf at the door—all these are facts, not fancies. Verily, the hunger roars of the lion of poverty are already heard in our midst, and it is well that we should give heed.

Hitherto society has had little to offer but the brand of pauperdom and the annihilation of the home as a condition of its assistance. Domicide, or the destruction of the family, is surely one of the worst signs of modern civilization. "I have three brothers," said one of our Bowery boys, adding with the mother wit which characterizes this class, "but only one is living, the other two are married!"

President Roosevelt spoke to the heart of the nation when he pointed out the dangers of race extinction and the importance of the family—the large family—to the well-being of the nation. The pivot of true social reform appears to me to turn upon the preservation, and if necessary, the restoration of the family unit. Destroy the home and you destroy the nation. We must show the poor man how he can afford to get married and can bring up his family in decency and comfort, and become a home-owner. If this cannot be in the city, let us throw open to him our irrigated lands and provide him with the means for making a start. There is no need to treat him as a pauper. We can charge him with every dollar that we expend upon him, and make him pay a reasonable interest into the bargain.

How much better would it be if the fifty to one hundred million dollars now expended annually in the relief of poverty in our great cities could be devoted to the placing of worthy families on these rich irrigated lands. Tax consumers would become tax producers. Pauper dependents on charity would be converted into affluent home-owners. The $50,000,000 annually expended for charitable objects would be turned into a rich investment which would be amply secured and ultimately repaid out of the profits from these irrigated lands. In ten years the money thus invested would amount to $500,000,000, which would suffice to locate 5,000,000 souls, upon, say, 20,000,000 acres of irrigated land, which would produce to its owners an annual income of say $400,000,000, while the value of the land at $50 per acre—a moderate estimate for land so closely settled—would be no less than a billion dollars.

Opportunity Desired.

What our American poor ask for is not charity, but opportunity. Let this congress then throw wide open before our working classes that door of opportunity! Let it place within the reach of the landless man our manless lands! Let it speak with a voice which cannot be misunderstood, and let it thunder at the doors of our national capitol and of our states legislatures, till colonization is made as much an imperative and practical question of the hour as by its brilliant and persistent efforts irrigation has already become. The association of these two powerful factors, irrigation and colonization in the welfare of our nation, will be well nigh irresistible, and with these mighty levers this congress will lift from the nation's pathway the deadweight of poverty and congestion which has obstructed our national progress, created internecine struggles between capital and labor, and threatened to shipwreck our future prosperity.

You will have heard the story of the eastern prince who gathered together his tenants for the removal of an immense boulder which had long obstructed their main thoroughfare. They had driven their wagons on this side of the rock and on the other, but none had manifested the energy to remove it. Finally with one united effort it was rolled away, when lying beneath it was found a great bag of gold. "This," said the prince, "was intended to be the reward of the tenant who, of his own accord, unaided and unasked, should remove the stone, but since all have accomplished the task which individual enterprise has neglected, the gold shall be distributed among the many which might have been the reward of one!"

Reward of Industry.

Gentlemen, lying in the pathway of our national advance is the rough rock of poverty. Beneath it lies the golden reward of industry to those who shall, with God's help and blessing, remove it—may I not say, to this congress, and to the multitudes whom it shall help to colonize.

But it matters not, methinks, whether the question be viewed from the standpoint of the sociologist devising a way of deliverance from the perplexing problems of poverty, the philanthropist desiring to permanently better his fellowmen, the millionaire wishing to leave an everlasting monument to his name, the statesman desiring to build up the future welfare of his nation, the politician seeking for a desirable plank in his party's platform, the manufacturer welcoming a vast outlet for his productions in the creation of a home market, the newspaper with its finger upon the throbbing pulses of humanity, the landowner hoping to enhance the value of his land, the capitalist requiring a safe and profitable investment, the workingman laboring to carve out for himself and family a reasonable living, or the religious leader aiming at the happiness of his flock on earth and their eternal welfare hereafter, colonization presents to each and all a common ground on which all may meet, none can differ, and our entire nation, from the White House to the dugout, from the mansion to the attic, will unite in rising up and calling blessed that congress, that body of wise men from the west, that nation, that society, that statesman, that individual, who shall make habitable and shall colonize the vast domain of America's irrigated lands.

MERGER PROPOSITION KILLED UNANIMOUSLY BY DELEGATES AT OGDEN.

(Special to the Herald.)

Ogden, Sept. 16.—The National Irrigation congress and the Trans-Mississippi congress may merge some time, but it will be a long time from today, judging by the reception given the plan by the Irrigation congress. At the congress in Colorado Springs last year the proposition was referred to a special committee headed by ex-Senator Carey of Wyoming with instructions to report to the present congress. The committee unanimously opposed the plan and submitted their reasons for the adverse report in the following resolution, which was reported to the congress at the morning session today and unanimously adopted without discussion, proving that the members of the Irrigation congress are of one mind in regard to the matter:

To the National Irrigation Congress, Eleventh Session.

Your committee elected by the National Irrigation congress, which convened in Colorado Springs in September, 1902, to whom was referred the memorandum of a plan for uniting the National Irrigation congress and the Trans-Mississippi congress, with instructions to report on the first day of this session, begs leave to report as follows:

The National Irrigation congress was inaugurated to promote a sound public sentiment and secure adequate legislation to bring about the irrigation, reclamation and settlement of arid lands in the western half of the United States.

Ten sessions of the congress previous to the present one have been held. The sessions in each year have been held in a different city. Many questions have been discussed, but only those affecting irrigation—in other words, it has been strictly an irrigation convention.

At the time the congress was inaugurated the subject of irrigation was little known and understood outside of the arid states and territories, which alone then appeared to be directly interested.

These congresses have gathered together in convention practical farmers and irrigators, scientific agriculturalists, civil engineers, the representatives of the departments of the states and general government, state and national legislatures—and from time to time the executives of several of the states of the Union, indeed, men of the very best type, representing the agricultural, business, political, and scientific world.

That the Irrigation congress has from year to year fulfilled every purpose contemplated by its founders cannot at this day be successfully denied. It has a national reputation and its influence is felt all over the United States. The question affecting irrigation which are local, have become of national import. The public man and the economist, who were indifferent, are giving all the questions which concern the reclamation of the arid lands in the western states and territories deep thought and consideration.

Since the inauguration of the National Irrigation congress very significant legislation has been enacted in the right direction. The two most important laws being the donation land act, known as the Carey law and the national irrigation act. All questions affecting irrigation have become, and are today great national questions. The committee does not claim that the National Irrigation congress has accomplished all the important things which have been done to promote the cause of irrigation, but it does believe and know that the National Irrigation congress has been an important factor in the great work.

The work however, has just been commenced. The questions bearing upon the forests and forest reservations and the flood waters which are needed in the arid regions and which, permitted to go to waste, bring destruction and ruin in the fertile fields of the Mississippi and Missouri valleys, which directly concern the irrigation problems, have scarcely been considered.

But the most important of all the future is the faithful carrying out in letter and spirit the laws already enacted and those yet to be passed, affecting the reclamation of lands in the arid states and territories. In all these questions the irrigation congress must in the future be deeply concerned.

For the reasons stated the committee is of the unanimous opinion that the memorandum referred to should be not adopted and that the identity and effectiveness of the National Irrigation congress should be maintained and that its sessions annually be held.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

JOSEPH M. CAREY.
M. C. JOHNSTON.
L. W. SHURTLIFF.

MANY RESOLUTIONS TOUCHING DIFFERENT QUESTIONS ARE INTRODUCED.

(Special to The Herald.)

Ogden, Sept. 16.—Senator Smoot of Utah has been elected chairman of the committee on resolutions of the congress, and H. D. Slater, editor of the El Paso Herald, is the secretary. Already many important matters have been embodied in the form of resolutions and placed in the hands of the committee, although action has not yet been taken on them. Senator Burton's resolution relating to flood prevention was published yesterday.

Ex-Senator Carey of Wyoming has introduced the following memorial to the United States congress, asking for enactments defining the rights of riparian owners:

Whereas, The broad statesmanship of our national congress, being governed by the desire to conserve and promote the best interests of the entire country, and to effectuate that purpose has enacted laws authorizing and encouraging the taking and use of the unappropriated waters of the streams upon the public domain, for irrigation and fertilization of semi-arid lands since the year A. D., 1866; and

Whereas, By reason of the authority and encouragement of the general government, by the enactment of such laws, our agricultural area has been vastly increased and large bona fide settlements of great extent and value grown up, under the fostering care of the general care of the government, in all the arid and semi-arid regions of the United States; and

Whereas, By the continuance of the same enlightened policy and the enactment of laws for the storage of the flood waters, that otherwise go to waste, throughout the arid regions of the country, vast tracts of land now valueless will be reclaimed and rendered profitable for agriculture and thereby advance the general welfare of the country; and

Whereas, Grave doubts and contrarity of opinion, as well as conflicting claims of legal rights to the waters of the nat-

(Continued on Page Three.)