

TAFT FIRM FRIEND OF CONSERVATION

His Address Before St. Paul Congress Leaves No Doubt as to His Position---Country's Duty Plain, He Declares Most Emphatically.

St. Paul, Sept. 5.—President Taft's speech here today before the National Conservation congress left his hearers in no doubt as to his position. In substance his address was as follows: Gentlemen of the National Conservation Congress: Conservation as an economic and political term has come to mean the preservation of our natural resources for economical use, so as to secure the greatest good to the greatest number.

Conservation as an economic and political term has come to mean the preservation of our natural resources for economical use, so as to secure the greatest good to the greatest number. The danger to the state and the people at large from the waste and dissipation of our national wealth is not one which quickly impresses itself on the people of the older communities, because its most obvious instances do not occur in their neighborhoods, while in the newer part of the country the sympathy with expansion and development is so strong that the danger is scoffed at or ignored.

As president of the United States I have, as it were, inherited this policy, and I rejoice in what I shall do as a high executive can do to help a great people realize a great national ambition. For conservation is national. It affects every man, every woman, every child. What I can do as president of a party, but as president of the whole people. Conservation is not a question of politics, or of factions, or of persons. It is a question that affects the vital welfare of all of us—of our children and our children's children. I urge that no good can come from meetings of this sort unless we ascribe to those who take part in them, and who are apparently sitting worthless in the cause, all proud motives and unless we judicially consider every measure or method proposed with a view to its effectiveness in achieving our common purpose, and wholly without regard to who proposes it or who claims the credit for its adoption.

Nothing can be more important in the matter of conservation than the treatment of our forest lands. It was probably the ruthless destruction of forests in the older states that first called attention to a halt in the waste of our resources. This was recognized by congress by an act authorizing the executive to reserve forest entry and set aside public timber lands as national forests. Speaking generally, there has been reserved of the existing forests about seventy per cent. of all the timber lands of the government. Within these forests (including 25,000,000 acres in two forests in Alaska) are 12,000,000 acres, of which 10,000,000 acres are in the United States proper and include within their boundaries the best of our timber. The remainder of the forest lands belong to the state or to private individuals. We have then, excluding Alaska forests, a total of about 14,000,000 acres of forests belonging to the government, which are being managed in accordance with the principles of scientific forestry.

The government timber in this country amounts to only one-fourth of all the timber, the rest being in private ownership. Only three per cent of the timber which the federal government owns is properly and treated according to modern rules of forestry. The usual destructive waste and neglect continues in the remainder of the forests owned by the government and by corporations. It is estimated that fire alone destroys \$50,000,000 worth of timber a year. The management of forests not on public land is beyond the jurisdiction of the federal government. It is within their power that it must be done by the state legislatures. I believe that it is within their constitutional power to require the enforcement of regulations in the general public interest, as to fire and timber on the land owned by private individuals and corporations.

I have shown sufficiently the conditions as to federal forestry to indicate that no further legislation is needed at the moment except an increase in the fire protection to national forests and an act vesting the executive with full power to make forest reservations in every state where government land is timber-bearing or where the land is needed for forestry purposes. Coal Lands. The next subject, and one most important for our consideration, is the disposition of the coal lands in the United States and in Alaska. First, as to those in the United States. At the beginning of this administration there were classified 5,478,000 acres, and there were withdrawn from entry for purposes of classification 17,867,000 acres. Since that time there have been withdrawn by my order from entry for classification 7,648,000 acres, making a total withdrawal of 25,515,000 acres. Meantime, of the acres thus withdrawn, 11,371,000 have been classified and found not to contain coal, and have been returned to agricultural use, while 14,144,000 acres have been classified as coal lands; while 79,788,000 acres remain withdrawn from entry and await classification. In addition 336,000 acres have been classified as coal lands without prior withdrawal, thus increasing the classified coal lands to 10,168,000 acres.

Under the laws providing for the disposition of coal lands, the minimum price at which lands are permitted to be sold is \$10 an acre; but the secretary of the interior has the power to fix a maximum price and sell at that price. By the first regulations governing appraisal, approved April 8, 1907, the minimum was \$10, as provided by law, and the maximum was \$100, and the highest price actually placed upon any land sold was \$75. Under the new regulations, adopted April 17, 1909, the maximum price was increased to \$250, except in regions where there are large mines, where no maximum limit is fixed and the price is determined by the estimated tons of coal to the acre. The highest price fixed for any land under this regulation has been \$200. The appraisal value of the lands classified as coal lands and valued under the new and old regulations is shown to be as follows: 4,203,921 acres, valued under the old regulations at \$71,432, an average of 16.8 cents an acre; and 5,844,732 acres classified and valued under the new regulation at \$24,203,242, or a total of 10,168,653 acres, valued at \$471,847,571.

For the year ending March 31, 1909, 27 coal entries were made, embracing an area of 25,331 acres, which sold for \$663,620.40. For the year ending March 31, 1910, there were 176 entries, embracing an area of 22,418 acres, which sold for \$608,312 and down to August 1910, there were 17 entries, with an area of 1,720 acres, which sold for \$33,910.60, making a disposition of the coal lands in the last two years of 277,415 acres, at an average of \$2.19 an acre. The secretary of the interior has separated the surface of coal lands, either classified or withdrawn for classification, from the coal beneath, so as to permit at all times homestead entries upon the surface of lands useful for agriculture and to reserve the ownership in the coal to the government. The question is whether the existing law for the sale of the coal in the ground should continue in force or be repealed and a new method of disposition adopted. Under the present law, the coal is sold to the private owner beneath the surface passes to the grantees of the government. The price fixed is upon an estimated amount of the tons of coal per acre beneath the surface, and the price is fixed so that the earnings will only be a reasonable profit upon the amount paid and the investment necessary. But, of course, this is more or less guesswork, and the government parts with the ownership of the coal in the ground absolutely. Authorities of the geological survey estimate that in the United States today there is a supply of about three thousand billions of tons of coal, and that of this one thousand billions are in the public domain, the other two thousand billions are within private ownership and under no more control as to the use or the price at which the coal may be sold than any other private property. If the government were to sell the coal lands to private owners, because of the large amount of coal which would be sold, and the conditions in its leases like those which are now imposed by the owners in fee of coal mines in the various coal regions of the east, the sale of coal lands to private owners would be a choice as to the assignee of the lease, or of resuming possession at the end of the term of the lease, which might easily be framed to enable it to exercise a limited but effective control in the disposition and sale of the coal to the public. It has been urged that the leasing system has never been adopted in this country, and that its adoption would largely interfere with the investment of capital and the proper development and opening up of the coal resources. I venture to differ entirely from this view.

lands in the United States, with provisions forbidding the transfer of the leases except with the consent of the government, thus preventing their acquisition by a combination or monopoly and upon limitations as to the area to be included in any one lease to one individual, and to obtain moderate rental, with royalties upon the coal mined proportioned to the market value of the coal either at Seattle or at San Francisco. Of course such leases should contain conditions reserving to the government the right to develop the property by modern mining methods and the use of every known and practical means and device for saving the life of the miners.

Oil and Gas Lands. In the last administration there were withdrawn from agricultural entry 3,500,000 acres of supposed oil land in California; about a million and a half acres in Louisiana, of which only 6,500 acres were known to contain oil. In the United States there are 17,500 acres in Oregon and 174,000 acres in Wyoming, making a total of nearly 4,000,000 acres. In September, 1909, I directed that all public oil lands, whether they be withdrawn or not, be set aside from agricultural entry pending congressional action, for the reason that the existing placer mining law, although made applicable to deposits of this character, is not suitable to such lands, and the further reason that it is essential to reserve certain fuel-oil deposits for the use of the American navy. Accordingly the form of all existing withdrawals was changed, and new withdrawals aggregating 3,500,000 acres were made in California, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah and Wyoming. Field examinations during the year showed that of the original withdrawals, 3,170,000 acres were not valuable for oil, and they were restored for agricultural entry. Meantime, other withdrawals of public oil lands in these states were made, so that July 1, 1910, the outstanding withdrawals then amounted to 4,300,000 acres. The federal government is essentially a leasing law. In their natural occurrence, oil and gas cannot be measured in terms of acres, like coal, and it follows that exclusive title to these products can normally be secured only after they reach the surface. It would be impossible to secure a commodity in terms of barrels of transportable product rather than in acres of real estate. This is, of course, the reason for the practically universal rule of leasing systems wherever oil land is in private ownership. The government thus would not be entering on an experiment, but simply putting into effect a plan successfully operated in government leases. Why should not the oil producer rather than through the intervention of a middleman to whom the government gives title to the land? The principal underlying feature of such leasing should be the exercise of beneficial control rather than the collection of revenue. As not only the largest owner of oil lands, but as a prospective large consumer of oil by reason of the increasing use of oil by the navy, the federal government is directly concerned both in encouraging rational development and at the same time insuring the longest possible life to the oil supply.

One of the difficulties presented, especially in the California fields, is that the Southern Pacific railroad owns every other section of land in the oil field, and in those fields the oil seems to be in a common reservoir or series of reservoirs, communicating through the oil sands, so that the excessive draining of oil at one well, or on the railroad territory generally, would exhaust the oil in the government land. Hence, it is important that the government is to have its share of the oil it should begin the opening of wells on its own property. It has been suggested, and I believe the suggestion to be a sound one, that permits be issued to a prospector for oil giving him the right to prospect for two years over a certain tract of government land for the discovery of oil, the right to be evidenced by a license for which he pays a small sum. When the oil is discovered, the licensee acquires title to a certain tract, much in the same way as he would acquire title under a mining law. Of course if the system of leasing is adopted, then he would be less than the above suggested. What has been said in respect to oil applies also to government gas lands.

Phosphorus is one of the three essentials to plant growth, the other elements being nitrogen and potassium. The three phosphorus is by all odds the scarcest element in nature. It is easily extracted in useful form from the phosphate rock, and the United States contains the greatest known deposit of phosphate rock in the world. They are found in Wyoming, Utah and Florida, as well as in South Carolina, Georgia and Tennessee. The government phosphate lands are confined to Wyoming, 245,000 acres. On March 4, 1909, there were 4,000,000 acres withdrawn from agricultural entry in the ground that the land covered phosphate rock. Since that time, 2,320,000 acres of the land thus withdrawn have been classified as phosphate lands in profitable quantities, while 1,678,000 acres were classified properly as phosphate lands. During this administration there has been withdrawn and classified 457,000 acres, so that today there are classified as phosphate rock land 2,115,000 acres. This rock is most important in the composition of fertilizers to improve the soil, and as the future is certain to create an enormous demand for this fertilizer, it is of the utmost importance to the public that the value to the public of such deposits as these can hardly be exaggerated. Certainly with respect to these deposits a careful policy of conservation should be followed. The law that would provide a leasing system for the phosphate deposits, together with a provision for the separation of the surface and mineral rights as is already provided for in the case of coal, would be the development of these deposits and their utilization in the agricultural lands of the west. If it is thought desirable to discourage the exportation of phosphate rock and the saving of the same for use in the United States, could be accomplished by conditions in the lease granted by the government to its lessees. Of course, under the constitution the government could not tax and could not prohibit the exportation of phosphate, but as proprietor and owner of the lands in which the phosphate is deposited it could impose conditions upon the kind of sales, whether foreign or domestic, which the lessees might make of the phosphate mined.

Water-Power Sites. Prior to March 4, 1909, there had been, on the recommendation of the reclamation service, withdrawn from agricultural entry, because they were regarded as useful for water-power sites which ought not to be disposed of as agricultural lands, 245,000 acres of vacant land, 211,507 acres on entered public land, or a total of 456,507 acres. These withdrawals made from time to time cover all the power sites included in the first withdrawal, and in 1909, on 125 rivers and in 11 states. The disposition of these power sites involves one of the most difficult questions presented in carrying out practical conservation. The statute of 1891 with its amendments permits the secretary of the interior to grant perpetual easements or rights of way from water sources over public lands for the primary purpose of irrigation and such electrical current as may be incidentally developed, but no grant can be made under this statute to concerns whose primary purpose is generating and handling electricity. The act of 1907 authorizes the secretary of the interior to issue revocable permits over the public lands to electrical power companies, but this statute is woefully inadequate because it does not authorize the collection of a charge or fix a term of years. Capital is slow to invest in an enterprise founded on a permit revocable at will.

It is the plain duty of the government to see to it that in the utilization and development of all this immense amount of water power, conditions shall be imposed that will prevent monopoly and will prevent extortionate charges, which are the accompaniment of monopoly. The difficulty of adjusting the matter is accentuated by the relation of the power sites to the water, the fall and flow of which create the power. In the states where the water sites are situated, the water does not control or own the power in the water which flows past his land. That power is under the control and within the grant of the state, and generally the rule is that the first water user is entitled to the enjoyment. Now, the possession of the bank or water-power site over which the water is to be conveyed in order to make the power useful, gives to its owner an advantage and a certain kind of control over the use of the water, and it is proposed that the government in dealing with its own lands should use this advantage and lease lands for power sites to those who would develop the power, and impose conditions on the leasehold with reference to the reasonableness of the rates at which the power, when transmitted, is to be furnished to the public, and forbidding the union of the particular power with a combination of other lands for the purpose of monopoly by forbidding assignment of the lease save by consent of the government. Serious difficulties are anticipated by some in such an attempt on the part of the general government, because of the sovereign control of the state over the water power in its natural condition, and the mere proprietorship of the government in the riparian lands. It is contended that through its mere proprietary right in the site, the central government has no power to attempt to exercise police jurisdiction with reference to how the water power in a river owned and controlled by a state should be used, and that it is a violation of the state's rights. I question the validity of this objection. The government may impose any conditions that it chooses in its lease of its own property, even though it may have a great deal of power in effect to accomplish just what the state would accomplish by the exercise of its sovereignty. There are those (and the director of the geological survey, Mr. Smith, who has a great deal of authority on this matter, is one of them) who insist that this matter of transmitting water power into electricity, which can be conveyed all over the country and across state lines, is a matter that should be controlled by the general government, and that it should avail itself of the ownership of these power sites for the very purpose of co-ordinating in one general plan the power generated from these government-owned sites.

Arguments Against Idea. On the other hand, it is contended that it would relieve a complicated situation if the control of the water-power site should be left to the state, and in effect in the same sovereignty and ownership, viz., the states, and then were disposed of for development to private lessees under the restrictions needed to preserve the interests of the public from the abuses and abuses of monopoly. Therefore, bills have been introduced in congress providing that whenever the state authorities deem a water power useful they may apply to the government for the site and the grant for the state of the adjacent land for a water-power site, and that this grant from the federal government to the state shall contain a condition that the state shall start with the title to the water-power site or the water power, but shall lease it only for a term of years not exceeding fifty, with provisions in the lease by which the rental and the rates for which the power is conveyed to the public shall be readjusted at periods less than the term of the lease, say, every ten years. The argument is urged against this disposition of power sites that legislators and state authorities are more likely to be influenced by the interests of the state than would be the central government; in reply it is claimed that a readjustment of the terms of leasehold every ten years would secure to the public and the state just as equitable terms.

I do not express an opinion upon the controversy thus made or a preference as to the two methods of treating water-power sites. I shall submit the matter to congress and urge that either the one or the other be adopted. I have referred to the course of the last administration and of the present one in making withdrawals of government lands from entry under homestead laws, and the course of congress in removing all doubt as to the validity of these withdrawals as a great step in the direction of practical conservation. But it is only one of two necessary steps to effect what should be our purpose, and it has produced a status quo and prevented waste and irrevocable disposition of the lands until the method for their proper disposition can be formulated. But it is of the utmost importance to the public that the step should not be regarded as the final step in the course of conservation, and that the idea should not be allowed to spread that conservation is the tying up of the natural resources of the government for the purpose of withholding from use and the remission to remote generations to decide what ought to be done with these means of promoting present general human comfort and progress. For, if so, it is certain to be the greatest opposition to conservation as a cause, and if it were a correct expression of the purpose of conservationists it ought to arouse this opposition. As I have said elsewhere, the problem is how to have and still develop; how to conserve and still develop; for no sane person can contend that it is for the common good that nature's blessings should be stored only for unborn generations.

I beg of you, therefore, in your deliberations and in your informal discussions, when men come forward to suggest evils that the promotion of conservation is to remedy, that you invite them to point out the specific evils and the specific remedies; that you invite them to come down to details in order that their discussions may flow into channels that shall be eloquent and entertaining, and that the people should be shown exactly what is needed in order that they make their representatives in congress and the state legislature do their intelligent bidding.

Real Devotion. William H. Crane, the actor, says he first learned what true love is by accidentally overhearing a brief conversation between a young man and a very pretty girl. "And you're sure you love me?" "Love you?" echoed the young fellow. "Why, darling, while I was bidding you goodbye on the porch last night your dog bit a piece out of the calf of my leg, and I never noticed it till I got home."—Judge.

Try to Come Back. Not long ago Lord Kinnaird, who is always actively interested in religious work, paid a surprise visit to a mission school in the east end of London and told a class of boys the story of Samson. Introducing his narrative, his lordship added: "He was strong, became weak, and then regained his strength, enabling him to destroy his enemies. Now, boys, if I had an enemy, what would you advise me to do?"

Right at Home. New Arrival—Do you recognize the profession, my good man? St. Peter—Profession? What profession, sir? New Arrival (resentfully)—Why, didn't you ever hear of me? I am one of the handiest harpists that ever broke into vaudeville.—Puck.

"NO FRILLS". Just Sensible Food Cured Him. Sometimes a good, healthy commercial traveler suffers from poorly selected food and is lucky if he learns that Grape-Nuts food will put him right. A Cincinnati traveler says: "About a year ago my stomach got in a bad way. I had a headache most of the time and suffered misery. For several months I ran down until I lost about 70 pounds in weight and finally had to give up a good position and go home. Any food that I might use seemed to nauseate me. "My wife, hardly knowing what to do, one day brought home a package of Grape-Nuts food and coaxed me to try it. I told her it was no use but finally to humor her I tried a little, and they just struck my taste. It was the first food I had eaten in nearly a year that did not cause any suffering. "Well, to make a long story short, I began to improve and stuck to Grape-Nuts. I went up from 135 pounds in December to 194 pounds the following October. "My brain is clear, blood all right and appetite too much for any man's pocketbook. In fact, I am thoroughly made over, and owe it all to Grape-Nuts. I talk so much about what Grape-Nuts will do that some of the men on the road have nicknamed me 'Grape-Nuts', but I stand today a healthy, rosy-cheeked man—a pretty good example of what the right kind of food will do. "You can publish this if you want. It is a true statement without any frills." Read the little book, "The Road to Wellville," in pkgs. "There's a Reason." Ever read the above letter? A new one appears from time to time. They are genuine, true, and full of human interest.

A STITCH IN TIME

Every form of cutaneous disease could be cured in its incipency if a jar of Resinol Ointment were kept at hand. A little of this excellent Ointment applied in time will effectually ward off and cure a starting trouble which, if neglected, may prove a troublesome and often obstinate case of Eczema or other disfiguring skin disease. For burns, scalds, slight wounds, sores, eruption of poison ivy, sunburn, it is a quick and sure remedy, usually curing these troubles over night. To the unfortunate sufferer with Hemorrhoids (Itching or Inflamed Piles) resinol ointment is indeed a godsend. The intense pain and intolerable itching of this trouble is instantaneously relieved and a cure effected in a very short time.

The bath room or family medicine case is incomplete if not equipped with Resinol Soap and Ointment. They are most valuable accessories in every well regulated household, and can be obtained at any drug store. Resinol Medicated Shaving Stick is also highly appreciated by men who regard a good complexion and a face free from pimples and blotches. Booklet on Care of the Skin and Complexion sent free on application. Resinol Chemical Co., Baltimore, Md.

A Shipping Error. The young duchess of Westminster, wife of the richest peer in England, recently gave birth to her third child, a daughter. Thus there is no heir to the immense Grosvenor fortune, Earl Grosvenor, the duchess's second child, having died at the age of four.

Apocryph of all this, a rather cruel story is being told in Newport about Lady Ursula Grosvenor, the eight-year-old daughter of the young duchess. A friend, the story goes, called at Eaton Hall, and as she sat in the drawing-room, little Lady Ursula entered.

"Oh, good afternoon," she said, gravely. "Mamma can't see any one today. She's upstairs with the new baby. They sent her, you know, a girl when she'd ordered a boy, and she's so upset that she's quite ill."

Try to Come Back. Not long ago Lord Kinnaird, who is always actively interested in religious work, paid a surprise visit to a mission school in the east end of London and told a class of boys the story of Samson. Introducing his narrative, his lordship added:

"He was strong, became weak, and then regained his strength, enabling him to destroy his enemies. Now, boys, if I had an enemy, what would you advise me to do?"

A little boy, after meditating on the secret of that great giant's strength, shot up his hand and exclaimed: "Get a bottle of 'air restorer.'"

Slightly Confused. All of us become confused and all of us mix our language sometimes, but the preparation of an old negro preacher's sermon was the greatest confusion of metaphors I ever heard, says a traveler. When the lengthy discourse was nearing its close and he had reached his "Twenty-third and lastly, brethren," he wound up by the following elaborate figure: "Everywha, bredren, we see de Almighty—all down de untrodden paths of time, we see de footprints of de Almighty hand."—Human Life.

Right at Home. New Arrival—Do you recognize the profession, my good man? St. Peter—Profession? What profession, sir? New Arrival (resentfully)—Why, didn't you ever hear of me? I am one of the handiest harpists that ever broke into vaudeville.—Puck.

"NO FRILLS". Just Sensible Food Cured Him.

Sometimes a good, healthy commercial traveler suffers from poorly selected food and is lucky if he learns that Grape-Nuts food will put him right.

A Cincinnati traveler says: "About a year ago my stomach got in a bad way. I had a headache most of the time and suffered misery. For several months I ran down until I lost about 70 pounds in weight and finally had to give up a good position and go home. Any food that I might use seemed to nauseate me. "My wife, hardly knowing what to do, one day brought home a package of Grape-Nuts food and coaxed me to try it. I told her it was no use but finally to humor her I tried a little, and they just struck my taste. It was the first food I had eaten in nearly a year that did not cause any suffering. "Well, to make a long story short, I began to improve and stuck to Grape-Nuts. I went up from 135 pounds in December to 194 pounds the following October. "My brain is clear, blood all right and appetite too much for any man's pocketbook. In fact, I am thoroughly made over, and owe it all to Grape-Nuts. I talk so much about what Grape-Nuts will do that some of the men on the road have nicknamed me 'Grape-Nuts', but I stand today a healthy, rosy-cheeked man—a pretty good example of what the right kind of food will do. "You can publish this if you want. It is a true statement without any frills." Read the little book, "The Road to Wellville," in pkgs. "There's a Reason." Ever read the above letter? A new one appears from time to time. They are genuine, true, and full of human interest.