

construct the bridge of progress with one end on an abundance of irrigation and the other on education.

If the subject should be relegated to the local legislatures let them decide. This is the spirit of the amendment. There may be States or Territories that might not want to devote the trust to education, but all to irrigation. Let them have their way.

Mr. Fish—I want to carry a little further that figure of the bridge. In the second resolution it is provided that after you have secured the population and a firm foundation for the irrigation end of the bridge, you can then proceed with the educational end and perfect your grand arch strong and durable.

An exciting debate followed and numerous amendments were offered, every delegation apparently cocked and primed with a peculiar way of its own to doctor the resolution up to a standard of perfection.

Mr. Irish—We are not constructing an act of Congress, but marking out a policy. The fact is, the States have sadly neglected some of their trusts. I do not want to invite attention to that slothfulness. There is such a thing as confusing a question. I want to centre the whole weight of this congress upon the one exclusive question of granting in trust the arid domain to the States and Territories.

An uproarious call for the question followed Mr. Irish's remarks,

The floor was given to Mr. Stanger, of Colorado. He wanted the grant absolute. He did not favor restriction, but wanted the people to be given the privilege of attending to their own business.

The first resolution was put and adopted in its original form.

On the second resolution Mr. Wright of California said he believed that if the funds to be raised through sale of the arid lands be devoted first to irrigation and second to the school fund it would satisfy everybody, and offered a substitute which he thought would meet the requirement. When it comes to the development of irrigation by private capital a monopoly is sure to follow. This is the most deplorable condition that could be reached. The water must belong to the land. When we ask for money for the schools the loan is only a temporary one. I say let the fund be turned over first to the school fund and then be paid out for irrigation development.

Mr. Estee—Wherein does your amendment unite the water and the land? I don't see how it does anything of the kind.

Mr. Wright—it prevents the fund from going to private corporations.

Mr. Wright was asked to read the resolution, which failed to make clear to Mr. Estee that there was any union of water and land in it.

There was then an uproar of voices out of which one of the opposing men from California was heard asking what good such a measure would do to California.

Mr. Wright—I do not know that it would do California any good. As I understand it, California is represented in this convention through her warm interest in the general progress of the West.

The president here took the chair to hear a report on a special order to con-

sider a paper by Mr. Greely. The order was suspended and the committee of the whole resumed.

Mr. Wright then withdrew his substitute and Mr. Irish once more pressed the adoption of the resolution. Not less than ten men arose before the mover had got through with his motion, and Mr. Clark, securing the floor, opposed the resolution. He could not see, if the reclamation of the lands was to come first, when the schools would come in for a share. There was no way to determine when the reclamation should stop. The speaker favored the first resolution, without any additions.

Mr. King, of Utah, moved to amend by providing that the language of the resolution should be so changed as to make it read in substance: "First, irrigation, and second, the schools," instead of, "First, irrigation, and the surplus for schools."

Mr. Irish protested that the language of the resolution was dictated by Judge Goodwin and all he wanted of the Utah delegative was to stand by their representation. What was the matter with Utah, which stood third in the list of States as to the education of her citizens? California was nine degrees below her. She ought to get along. He wanted the Utah delegation to respect not only its representative, but its own self-respect.

This brought Governor Thomas to the front with a bound. The matter of Utah was that she had rights in the convention and intended to maintain them. The matter of California was that its delegation came into the convention with a programme which it wanted to cram down the throats of the congress.

Mr. Mills denied the accusation in rather heated language, and the Governor returned by quoting the language of Mr. Irish charging bad faith to Utah.

Mr. Irish was on hand to explain that if a California delegation was cramming anything down the throats of the convention, it was the dose which Utah's doctor had medicated. It seemed to him that California was sitting as the patient in the case and swallowing Utah's little pill.

Mr. Irish, though maintaining his wonted deliberate manner and address was visibly paler than was natural to his robust physique, and in closing retired to the centre of a ring of his colleagues, who had risen to their feet.

Mr. Newlands, with a humor in his twinkling eyes that spoke his intention before he opened his mouth, advanced quickly to Mr. Irish's vacated place before the platform and delivered a speech, for which we have not space today.

The Governor then withdrew his objectionable remark with an apology, and at the same instant Mr. Irish made an equivalent concession. The same moment, at Mr. Newland's suggestion, the little serio-comic-tragic melodrama was transformed into a roaring farce by a formal handshaking between the erstwhile angry Governor and the president of the convention and chairman of the California delegation, Mr. C. C. Wright.

A vote by delegations was then taken on Mr. King's amendment, which carried by a vote of 307 against 118.

THURSDAY AFTERNOON.

The afternoon session of the congress was a busy one. Mr. Wright resumed the chair at 2 o'clock, and Mr. Botkin, of Montana, read the following resolution:

Resolved, That the thanks of this congress are hereby tendered to his Excellency Arthur L. Thomas, Governor of Utah, to Hon. George M. Scott, Mayor, and the authorities of the county and city of Salt Lake, to the Chamber of Commerce of Salt Lake City, and to John W. Donnellan, chairman, Frank K. Gillespie, secretary, and the members of the general committee of arrangements for their services in calling, promoting and entertaining the first Irrigation Congress of the United States, and that we feel that they will reap an abundant harvest from their labors in the results that will follow its session.

Resolved, That we tender our thanks to the Trans-Missouri Railway Association for reduced rates, and the officers of the Union Pacific Railroad and the Rio Grande Western Railway Company for gratuitous transportation to points of interest; to the Choral Society of Salt Lake City for its choice musical treat; to the Utah Sugar Manufacturing Company and the citizens of Lehi and Provo for their kind tender of hospitalities, and to the press for its efficient labors in enlarging the attendance and presenting fairly to the public in its reports of our sessions the justice, patriotism and humanity of our cause.

The resolution was adopted with applause.

The secretary then read telegrams from the Idaho board of trade and the mayor of Boise, Idaho, inviting the Congress to hold its next annual session at that city. A letter was also read from the St. Louis Merchant's Exchange.

The committee of the whole was here resumed and Mr. Irish as chairman of the committee on resolutions moved the adoption of the third resolution of the report of this morning.

Mr. Newlands of Nevada read the following resolution as a substitute:

Resolved, That it is the sense of this convention that the wisdom and intelligence of the legislatures of the respective States and Territories may be safely trusted to make such provisions of law as are necessary to secure the ownership of irrigable land to actual settlers in suitable holdings.

Mr. Estee then proposed this provision:

Resolved, That the trusts so created shall be so conditioned as to secure the ownership of irrigable land to actual settlers in suitable holdings not in any case exceeding 320 acres.

In support of his substitute Mr. Newland said: "Why should we limit the grant to be asked of the United States to 320 acres to each individual when the United States government already makes a grant of this amount and the law is inoperative in the reclamation of arid lands. If we can trust the wisdom of congress in the distribution of these lands we can trust the State legislatures. To seek to have congress place restrictions upon the management of this trust is to brand every State and Territory with incompetency to attend to its business or dishonesty. I say then that it should be left to the legislatures to determine the restrictions to be applied.

Mr. Estee said he objected to the "suitable holdings" proposition unless