

HON. THOS. TONGUE Points Out a Few Facts

HAS NOT NEGLECTED COOS BAY INTERESTS

Coal Competition Shut Out— Engineers Responsible for the Jetty Proposition.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
WASHINGTON CITY, D. C., Apr 10, 1902
To the Editor of the COAST MAIL
MARSHFIELD ORE.

A copy of your editorial of the 26th ult. has just been sent to me. In that article the claim is made in substance that I have neglected the interests of Coos Bay. That your section of the State "had been getting the chilly shoulder" that Portland is jealous of your growth and "that I am too closely in sympathy with Portland." The expression of these statements is certainly a very great surprise to me. It is to be regretted that you did not specify more particularly. That would have limited the inquiry into the foundation of these statements. But let us review the facts briefly and see whether they bear out this claim.

I became a member of Congress March 4, 1897. The year prior to this there had been imported into California, almost wholly into San Francisco, about 340,000 tons of so-called Anthracite coal. This importation had been made free of duty, as Anthracite coal was then and now is on the free list. It was not genuine Anthracite coal. The importation was fraudulent. But the law did not prescribe any test, or define Anthracite. This 340,000 tons of coal was a very serious competitor in the San Francisco market with coal exported from Coos Bay and vicinity. The Ways and Means committee had substantially completed the Dingley bill when Congress met in special session, and it was impossible to induce the members to

make any change, or to amend the old law in that particular. Wholly through my efforts with the Senate committee, and with the Senate, the bill was amended prescribing a test for Anthracite coal and defining what constituted it to entitle it to be admitted free of duty. As a result, the total Anthracite coal imported into the United States during the last fiscal year amounted to just one ton. A serious competitor to the Oregon coal in the San Francisco market was removed. My whole effort in this direction was for the purpose of assisting the coal industry in the vicinity of Coos Bay.

When I entered Congress, there was lying in the treasury, the sum of \$27,300,000, appropriated for the purpose of dredging the inner harbor of Coos Bay and removing certain obstructions, principally at what is called the Hogs Back. The appropriation, however, was entirely useless, because the terms of the act required that it should be first expended in the construction of a dredge. The engineering department alleged that the construction of such a dredge would absorb the entire sum, leaving nothing for its operation, and therefore had refused to expend a dollar. It is unusual to legislate on such subjects except through the river and harbor bill. I succeeded, however, in getting the law changed, a year prior to the passage of the River and Harbor bill, authorizing the money to be expended under contract, and the work was completed.

Now in reference to River and Harbor bills. It has been usual to pass one through each Congress. There has been only one passed since my first becoming a member. This certainly is not my fault. It was continued from the long to the short session in the first Congress of which I was a member owing to the expense entailed by the Spanish war. In the last Congress, it was killed because of the unusual supply of gas generated by Senator Carter, of Montana. When the River and Harbor act was passed during the Congress preceding my election Mr. Hermann was a member of the River and Harbor committee of the House, ranking next to chairman. Senator McBride was a member of the Committee of Commerce in the Senate which handles the River and Harbor bill. Senator Mitchell was a member of the Senate, serving a third term, a gentleman of long experience, thorough acquaintance with the members of the Senate and the method of its work. Surely the interests of Oregon and of Coos county were in good and efficient hands. There can be no controversy upon that subject. That bill carried in all in round numbers in cash appropriated and contracts authorized, \$72,000,000. The largest River and Harbor bill ever passed in the history of the country. It carried for Oregon, including the Columbia River below Portland, in cash and authorized contracts \$1,964,390. The appropriations in which Coos Bay was interested amounted to \$146,390. The items were as follows:

Coos Bay and Harbor.....	\$95,000 00
Coos River.....	5,000 00
Inner Harbor of Coos Bay.....	14,390 00
Coquille River at its mouth.....	20,000 00
Coquille River above the City of Coquille.....	12,000 00
Total.....	\$146,390 00

The next River and Harbor bill passed was during the first Congress of which I was a member. I was not a member of the River and Harbor committee, and Oregon had but one member in the Senate. The bill was a very small one, carrying but little over \$30,000,000, about forty per cent of the amount carried by the bill in 1896. This bill carried for Oregon rivers and harbors, including the Columbia River below Portland, \$480,000, or less than one-fourth of the bill of 1896. Yet this bill carried for improvements in which Coos Bay was interested the sum of \$202,000. The respective items were as follows:

Coos bay at the entrance.....	\$150,000
Coos river.....	3,000
Coquille River, below Coquille.....	40,000
Coquille River, above Coquille.....	9,000
Total.....	202,000

In other words, in the only River and Harbor bill passed since I have been a member of Congress, a bill which contained 40 per cent of the bill of 1896, the appropriations for the rivers and har-

ports in which Coos county is interested were increased over 50 per cent. In the River and Harbor bill of 1896, the Coos county improvements were less than 14 per cent of the Oregon appropriations, while in the River and Harbor bill of 1899 they were over 40 per cent. Certainly this does not look like the interests of Coos county had been neglected so far.

Perhaps there is some claim that your interests are not properly provided for in the pending bill. It is rather early to criticize this bill. It is not yet completed. A river and harbor bill is the joint product of the House and Senate. A member of the House does the best he can for his constituents. The members of the Senate supplement his efforts and secure what they can, as far as they believe right, of the increases provided for by the Senate. This bill so far represents what one member in a body of 357 has been able to accomplish. Oregon has two Senators in a body composed of 90 men. Senator Perkins is a member of the Committee on Commerce in the Senate that has charge of this bill, and is personally and vitally interested in a business way in Coos bay. Certainly the interests of Coos county will not be neglected there. What increases they will be able to obtain yet remains to be seen.

But what are the complaints made against the bill as it passed the House? Certainly none so far as I have heard except that it does not contain a provision for restoring the jetty at the mouth of Coos bay to its original height. Now a few words in reference to this and the difficulties that I have been compelled to meet. The bill as prepared by the House carries practically \$60,000,000. The Engineering Department has recommended River and Harbor improvements in various sections of the country as worthy of being undertaken by the government that will cost \$300,000,000, or upwards. The committee was only able to take care of one-fifth of these improvements in the present bill. Had the Engineering Department recommended further appropriations for this jetty, it would still have been difficult to procure the full amount. On the contrary, they have not recommended such appropriations, but steadily opposed them. When it was called to my attention that the jetty was deteriorating at the sea end, a year ago, I examined the reports of the Engineering Department. These reports insisted that the money on hand was sufficient to secure all the improvement which the government had undertaken to procure. I corresponded with the officers in Oregon directly, and also through the Chief of Engineers. I enclose you the correspondence so far as received, not copies, but the original. In relation to that, Colonel Mackenzie, who has charge of the rivers and harbors in Oregon in the office of the Chief of Engineers, came before the committee and positively refused to recommend any present appropriation. It is asserted, as you will see, that notwithstanding the lowering of the end of the jetty at the sea end, that the jetty is still doing the work intended that it should do. That it is securing the depth of water originally intended to be secured, that the lowering of the jetty was more or less expected, and has been, and is doing, and will do, no harm. It is further insisted that the jetty has not yet lowered as much as it probably will be, and that at any rate, it would be prudent to wait until it has fully settled before attempting to rebuild it. The Department further says that it will take, including the cash on hand, \$153,223.95 to restore the jetty. That of this sum only \$107,251.20 is the estimated cost of placing the stone in the jetty, and that the remaining sum, between \$10,000 and \$50,000 will be for expenses. A very large proportion of expenses.

The officers further recommended that in view of the expenses involved of repairing the tramways, etc., it would be unwise to appropriate any money unless the whole sum amounting to over \$142,000 be appropriated. In view of these recommendations, it was impossible for me, as it would have been impossible for any living man to induce the committee to make this appropriation.

After the matter had been apparently decided, I did finally succeed in prevailing upon the committee to appropriate \$10,000, which, with the \$10,250 on hand, can be used for maintenance, for dredging and otherwise, and absolutely insures the maintenance of the present channel until another River and Harbor bill can be passed, the jetty will have fully settled, and the effect will have been ascertained. In the maintenance of your channel, with its present depth of water is what is needed that has been already secured, without any amendments in the Senate. If the expenditure of a large sum of money is needed, I have been unable to secure that, and I do not believe that any man in my place could have done so in the House. The Senate may, and I hope will increase the appropriation. Possibly if the appropriation in 1899 had borne the same appropriation to the amount provided for Oregon as the bill of 1896, and the remainder appropriated in this bill, no objections would have been made. But certainly if the appropriations were so liberal then, that none now are actually needed, there should be no complaint made. In other words, the people of Coos bay ought not to complain that the work was provided for too rapidly under a former bill.

This letter is too long already. But permit me to briefly notice another statement in your editorial. I do not believe Portland is jealous of the growth of Coos county. Portland, however, must answer this charge for herself. It is not in the First Congressional District. It does not help to either nominate or elect me to Congress. I owe Portland no political favors, and no public duty, that I do not owe to all of the state of Oregon. My first obligation and first duty is to the people who send me here. But the Columbia river is a great national highway. It carries the commerce largely of three states. The foreign exports and imports aggregate something like \$13,000,000 annually. The condition of the mouth of that great river directly concerns, not only every portion of the First Congressional District of Oregon, but directly every portion of the Northwest. Its improvement does not concern Portland alone. It does not even concern the state of Oregon alone, but it is of vital importance to every part of the congressional district which I represent. It is true, important in a less degree to the southwestern portion of the district. It affects the price of the product of every farm in Western Oregon, as well as the price of the importations consumed by the people of the state. There are a million and a half tons of commerce, and 202,000 passengers passing over the Columbia river bar every year. There are great ships that carry the commerce of the state to the other side of the world. And yet this river, upon which goes all of this traffic, has but little more water than exists at the entrance to Coos bay. The old jetty is still deteriorating and the channel is still shoaling. This condition is critical. If I did not endeavor to remedy it, I should be recreant to my duty, not only to the people of the First Congressional District, but to the people of the whole state of Oregon, and of the entire Northwest. I should be unfit to remain here a single day. Yet while the appropriation carried by the present bill is by far the largest ever made for that river, and is intended to cover the expenditures for at least three years, it is only about \$1 per ton for the annual traffic in a bill carrying \$60,000,000. While the appropriations for two years for the entrance to Coos bay carried in the bill of 1899 of \$30,000,000 were \$1.50 per ton. Large as the present provision is for the mouth of the Columbia river, it does not detract one dollar from the expenditure at Coos bay, further than the expenditure of a like amount of money for the improvement of the mouth of the harbor at Boston. Each project stands upon its merits, and the appropriation is determined by the amount of commerce, by the actual present needs of commerce, and the benefits to be derived from the expenditure. The entire Engineering Department, and every member of the River and Harbor Committee thorough-

ly believe that the expenditure of the money at the mouth of the Columbia river is imperatively needed and needed now. On the contrary, not a single member of the Engineering Department, or a single other member of the River and Harbor Committee could be induced to believe by anything I could do or say that the appropriation for restoring the height of the jetty at Coos bay is a present pressing need. The best that can be said is that the result is doubtful. That conditions may make it necessary, but that in the meantime, ample provision has been made to protect the navigation of Coos bay. These conditions explain why it was comparatively easy to secure an appropriation for the mouth of the Columbia river, but impossible to secure a large appropriation for restoring the jetty at Coos bay. It might just as well be frankly admitted that the difficulty was increased by the fact that the commerce of Coos bay has not increased of late, was less last year than for several years past, except one, and is less than one-half the commerce several years ago.

A letter from a friend at Coos bay indicates that there is some dissatisfaction because provision was not made for some improvements within the bay. If any such improvements are needed, none have ever been called to my attention, either by the people, or by report of any engineering officer.

I am not writing this as an apology, or in order to solicit votes. I write it in the full consciousness that I have done my full duty towards Coos county, and submit the facts to the candid judgment of your people.

Respectfully yours,
THOS. H. TONGUE.

CORRESPONDENCE AND REPORTS OF ENGINEERS

How They Sat Down on Further Appropriations For the Coos Bay Jetty.

PORTLAND, ORE., Jan. 21, 1901.
HON. THOS. H. TONGUE, M. C.,
House of Representatives, U. S.,
Washington, D. C.

Sir: I have the pleasure to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 15th instant, in which you request information about the Coos Bay improvement. The printed reports of the War Department appear to cover the ground so well that it does not appear necessary to add anything specially new.

The history, condition, etc., of the Coos Bay improvement may be summed up as follows: Before improvement the depth in the channel through the bar at the entrance to the bay was about 10 feet at low tide (or about 15 feet at high tide). The present project for improvement (report of Board of Engineers dated October 27, 1889, printed in the Annual Report of the Chief of Engineers, U. S. Army, for 1893, part 4, pp. 2875-43), provides for obtaining a channel through the bar at the entrance to the bay having the depth of 20 feet at low tide (or about 25 feet at high tide). The Board of Officers estimated that a north jetty 9,600 feet long and a south jetty 4,200 feet long would both cost \$2,496,412.20. Operations under this project have thus far been confined to the construction of the north jetty, and have resulted in practically completing that jetty throughout its entire length of about two miles. As to how successful the efforts to obtain the projected depth of 20 feet at low tide have been, attention is invited to the following extracts from the annual reports of the War Department for the past five or six years:

A vast amount of sand had been impounded and a minimum depth of 20 feet at low water maintained over the bar (page 443, Annual Report, Chief of Engineers, 1895).

During the winter, as the enrockment slowly grew, a marked change took place in the bar channel, and a depth of 28½ feet at ordinary high water was attained. A bar depth of 24 to 28 feet has been

Concluded on seventh page

Ask a healthy woman what she would sell her health for and she would tell you that the choicest diamonds in the world could not buy it. What use for diamond rings to emphasize the shrunken fingers, or earrings to light up the cheeks hollowed by disease?

Health is the first requisite to womanly happiness. General ill-health in women has its origin in local womanly diseases. Cure the diseases of the delicate womanly organism and the general health is perfectly restored. The remarkable benefits experienced from the use of Dr. Pierce's Favorite Prescription are due to this medicine's perfect cures of womanly diseases. It establishes regularity, dries weakening drains, heals inflammation and ulceration and cures female weakness.

It affords me great pleasure to be able to say a few words in regard to the merits of Dr. Pierce's Favorite Prescription and his 'Golden Medical Discovery.' writes Mrs. Flora Ann, of Dallas, Jackson Co., Mo. 'I was tempted to try these medicines after seeing the effect upon my mother. At an early stage of married life I was greatly bothered with painful periods, also a troublesome drain which rendered me very weak and unfit for work of any kind. I became so thin there was nothing left of me but skin and bone. My husband became alarmed and got me a bottle of 'Favorite Prescription.' After he saw the wonderful effects of that one he got me two more, and after I used those up there was no more pain, and I began to gain in flesh very rapidly.

'Favorite Prescription' makes weak women strong, sick women well. Accept no substitute for the medicine which works wonders for weak women.