Col. Thomas H. Ball of Houston, author of the intimate history of the Port of Houston. Colonel Ball, since 1891, before his election to congress, has been one of the foremost leaders in the conception and development of the Houston Ship Channel. From first hand knowledge he has written this "eyewitness" story of the feeble beginnings, the gradual gathering of strength and finally the glorious growth and development of what is today one of the world's great ports.
Here are grouped seven of the leading Houstonians with whom Colonel Ball conferred on plans for a ship channel to Houston at the time he was making his advocacy for congress in 1896.

When Colonel Thomas H. Ball, lower photo, came to Houston from Huntsville in 1886 in the interests of his candidacy for congress, the seven pioneer Houstonians shown above lost no time in getting him to "board the deep water train," as Colonel Ball expresses it. In other words, the deep water bandwagon. These seven men were among the foremost advocates of deep water for Houston. They are, left to right, H. W. Garrow, president of the Houston Cotton Exchange from 1897 to 1892; Colonel E. M. Johnston, then managing editor of The Houston Post; C. H. Milby of Harrisburg; T. W. House, banker; W. D. Cleveland Sr., chairman of the deep water committee of the cotton exchange; Congressman J. C. Hutchesson, Ball's predecessor, who had a bill passed in the Fifty-fourth congress providing for a federal survey of Buffalo bayou looking to the dredging of a 25-foot channel and Captain Sinclair Tallafarro.
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FOREWORD

For some time, friends have urged me to write the story of the Houston Ship Channel, so that the many obstacles overcome, and milestones passed, while we were on the way to success, might be mentioned, and the memories of those who by patriotic and unselfish service made the success of the venture possible might be recorded by one actively identified with its history for nearly 40 years.

With the influx of the multitudes who have come to help Houston become the foremost city in Texas, and the future metropolis of the Southwest, the memories of many pioneers and active workers who made possible the bringing of "deep water" to Houston have almost faded from the picture; a large majority thereof having crossed "over the river" to rest under the shade of the trees.

I am glad to write the story, as requested, in a way which will do justice not only to the pioneers of the movement to make Houston a deep water port, "where 18 railroads meet the sea," but at the same time make mention of the difficult problems met and overcome by those who followed them; and thereby make a record down to date of what a splendid citizenship can do by years and years of service and sacrifice in making a great vision come to pass in a way that no other city in our country has equaled, much less surpassed.

The story will be largely confined to events following Galveston's becoming a deep water port; as prior to that time Buffalo Bayou was only a light draft and barge canal, with scant recognition from the national government.
BUFFALO BAYOU

An interesting story might be written covering the period when light draft vessels and barges made use of Buffalo Bayou, from the foot of Main Street to Galveston, at a time when a like commerce was carried on upon the Brazos, Trinity, Sabine, Neches, Colorado and other streams and waterways in Texas.

The papers have carried from time to time very readable narratives, with illustrations in regard thereto, much more attractively written by those having personal recollection than I am capable of doing. Before beginning a history of the deep water project let me briefly mention some facts in regard to the use of Buffalo Bayou which have come to my knowledge.

In 1872, the national government made a small appropriation for a ship channel in Galveston Bay, and continued such appropriations until March, 1881, when the first appropriation of $25,000 was made for the upper channel, and thereafter appropriated sums to improve the channel both in the bay and the upper reaches of the stream until 1896, when such appropriations ceased, due to the concentration of appropriations for Texas to make a deep water port at Galveston.

During the period of light draft navigation of the bayou, numbers of Houston citizens, appreciating its importance, busied themselves in making the largest possible use of the bayou for commerce.

MORGAN LINE

Commodore Morgan, upon his own initiative, began the operation of a line of steamboats from the Louisiana coast to Clinton; where a railroad line, now owned by the Southern Pacific, connected; which service was important until discontinued. Thereafter, railroads now owned by the Southern Pacific, through a subsidiary, the Houston Direct Navigation Company, maintained a fleet of barges transporting principally cotton to a maximum in one year of 500,000 bales, and such use was important when a deep water channel from Galveston to Houston was being considered.

I am told that a company was chartered by a number of citizens, including Col. John T. Brady of Houston, who lost a good sum in promoting navigation upon the bayou.

Colonel Brady, one of Houston's most progressive citizens, together with associates, bought a large tract of land south side Buffalo Bayou, upon which Magnolia Park is now situated, and had chartered and built a railroad reaching Long Reach, the present head of navigation, which road is now owned by the Missouri Pacific, with visions of maintaining a permanent commerce on the bayou. I understand that Colonel Brady lost a fortune in this venture which did so much to foster Houston's ambition for a deep waterway to the sea.
Prior to the projection and completion of the only deep water harbor upon 400 miles of Gulf coast in Texas, at Galveston the construction of railroads had reduced light draft navigation upon all Texas waterways to a minimum, and caused the abandonment upon many Texas streams.

MORGAN'S CUT UNCHAINED

This brief chronicle of the early use of Buffalo Bayou by small craft ends with an amusing incident which happened some years before the deep water project was surveyed.

After Commodore Morgan abandoned its use, heavy chains were placed across the cut made by him through Morgan's Point, which he had dug to accommodate his own vessels.

This obstruction aroused the ire of those who used the bayou for their barges. Among others who protested was that bluff Scotchman Andrew Dow, who announced his purpose to sever the chains and send his tugs and barges through the cut.

An indignation meeting was held and John H. Kirby, then in the East with capitalists who were interested with him in buying large tracts of pine lands, was wired the situation. He went to Washington and took up the matter with the secretary of war, who ordered the obstructions removed. Mr. Kirby's wire, telling of his successful efforts, was joyfully received.

The government afterward acquired Morgan's cut.

DEEP WATER AT GALVESTON

Galveston, the chief Texas port, had long worked for adequate deep water from the gulf to its natural harbor inland, without success.

The establishment of any deep water port on the gulf coast of Texas would have been a long drawn out fight but for the fact that the entire Trans-Mississippi section was organized and clamoring for a deep water port thereon which could be reached by its products with a downhill haul, some 500 miles nearer than the Atlantic seaboard, over a region requiring much more expensive railroad building and operation.

Eads' success in giving New Orleans deep water, and building the great Mississippi bridge to reach St. Louis, and his offer to give Galveston deep water to a depth of 25 feet, the then prevailing depth for such projects, at a cost of $6,250,000-no water no pay-greatly aided in getting the national government to undertake such a plan.
A board of government engineers was appointed to examine all Texas ports and select the most available place, and after examination of all other applicants for recognition, Galveston was favored at the same cost as the Eads project.

A national government plan was adopted and successfully completed about the year 1896.

Upon its completion, railroad rates upon grain to the seaboard were reduced from 21 cents to 15 cents, both to the Atlantic Ocean and to the gulf. Within a year from its opening, the Trans-Mississippi region saved over $10,000,000 in grain rate reductions or more than one third of the cost of the Galveston project.

DEEP WATERWAY PROJECTED

When Galveston became a deep water port, accommodating vessels drawing 25 feet of water, the draft of practically all of the largest vessels, some of Houston's farseeing citizens visioned the possibility of bringing a like depth of water across the bay and through Buffalo Bayou to Houston. Quietly they perfected an organization to effectuate such purpose.

Congressman J. C. Hutcheson, in the 54th congress, without undue publicity, had passed in the house a provision for a survey of Buffalo Bayou, with the view of obtaining a channel 25 feet deep, the depth of the Galveston channel. With the aid of his good friend, Senator Roger Q. Mills, his house bill was made effective by approval of the senate.

The survey being authorized, a board of eminent army engineers, consisting of Col. H. M. Roberts, afterward chief of engineers; Major Derby, in charge of New Orleans and Mississippi River projects, and Major A. M. Miller, district engineer at Galveston, were appointed to make the survey.

At the time of the government survey, "King Cotton" was on the throne, and the Houston Cotton Exchange was the "power house" of the city. For years before, and thereafter until now, it has had its important activities.

STATISTICS GATHERED

H. W. Garrow was its president, serving five terms, from 1897 to 1902 inclusive. Through the Cotton Exchange statistics were gathered to support the project and were presented to the board by W. D. Cleveland, chairman of the deep water committee, and others, Mr. Cleveland being then the foremost advocate and supporter of Houston's ambitious plans for building a great city.
The board of engineers made a highly favorable report for a 25-foot project from Galveston to the foot of Main Street, which was not filed until December 1, 1897.

So quietly was the survey made, and arguments and statistics presented to the board of engineers, that many citizens in Houston were not familiar with the movement, and few of us upstate knew what was going on.

The writer, then a citizen of Huntsville and fairly familiar with state and regional affairs, only learned of the proposition after becoming a candidate for congress early in 1896 to succeed Captain Hutcheson, who voluntarily retired at the end of his second term.

I presume that undue publicity was not courted by the supporters of the project, who were anxious to get started and obtain "a place in the sun" before other places on Texas' 400 miles of gulf coast, which, like Houston had been compelled to stand aside when national government appropriations were concentrated on Galveston, had begun to "sit up and take notice."

Perhaps they may have thought, too, that "cold water" might be thrown upon Houston's plans if attention were attracted to the survey of the Ship Channel.

Let me say, in passing, that no other state in the Union was ever required to abate its plans and ambitions for recognition of projects in which it was interested, in order to get the national government to concentrate upon a single deep-water port practically all appropriations for its harbors and water-ways upon its 400 miles of coast. In fairness to Galveston it must be stated that she made no such demand.

BOARDED DEEP WATER TRAIN

In 1896 I became a candidate for congress to succeed Captain Hutcheson in the then First District, composed of nine counties, from Harris to Freestone. I came to Houston with a platform for publication outlining my views upon public questions, and carried it to my friend, the late Col. R. M. Johnston, managing editor of the Post. He looked over the manuscript and said he did not agree with all my views, but would be glad to publish the platform.

He suggested that a few of the foremost citizens of Houston were seeking a deep waterway for Houston and that I make favorable mention of it.
I told him that I did not care to put in my platform any plank promising aid for any local demand, and would not bid for the support of Houston, any more than I would promise to get post-offices at Huntsville, Navasota or other places in my district, to enlist their support.

In our conference Colonel Johnston advised me to consult with Captain Hutcheson, Mr. Cleveland, Baldwin Rice, Mr. Read of the firm of Inman, Read & Co. H. W. Garrow, C. H. Milby, T. W. House, Ed Sewall and especially with Maj. E. W. Cave, who he said wanted to talk about nothing else than a ship channel to Houston that would eventually be greater than the Manchester Canal in England.

My conferences with them awakened me to the great possibilities of such a waterway.

My candidacy was approved by so great a number of the counties of the district, including Harris, that my only opponent for the nomination, a warm personal friend, Senator McComb of Montgomery County, withdrew in my favor.

**LEGISLATURE VISITS**

In February, 1897, Judge Norman G. Kittrell, then a member of the legislature, invited that body to inspect Houston's waterway and incidentally, the historic battlefield of San Jacinto.

A meeting of citizens was held at the Cotton Exchange to make preparations for the visiting legislature. They arranged to hold the meeting in one of the annex rooms of the exchange, but so large was the attendance that it became necessary to use the floor of the building. Among those present were Mayor H. B. Rice, former Mayor John T. Browne, Gus C. Street, Aldermen Adair, Latham, Aubertin, Heiser, Matthews, Cronan, Geiseiman, Kohlhauff and Burke; City Assessor and Collector Justin White; County Judge Shaw and Commissioners Hirsch, Erhardt, McKinney and Becker; H. W. Garrow, president of the Cotton Exchange; G. W. Kidd, R. D. Gribble, Tom Richardson, Capt. Fred Allien, George L. Porter, E. Raphael, J. S. Garrat, Judge Norman G. Kittrell, Capt. F. A. Reichardt, Capt. James Hunter, William Williams and others. Judge Kittrell reported the expected attendance of the entire body of 159 in both houses. Captain Allien offered his steamer, accommodating 100 passengers, other transportation to be provided by use of barges.

The members of the legislature were cordially welcomed and taken down the bayou to the battlefield, thence to Galveston, where the battleship Texas was in the harbor to receive the silver service provided by Galveston. This battleship was at Santiago, commanded by Admiral Phillips, during the great sea fight which freed Cuba and avenged the Spanish destruction of the Maine.
The account of this legislative visit, taken from the files of the Houston Post, is here referred to because of its importance in evoking a statewide consideration of our Houston project, which was then little known.

U. S. COMMITTEE VISITS

Before Congress adjourned in June, 1896, Congressman Hutcheson made friends with the rivers and harbors committee in the house, which had no Texas member, and arranged for a visit to Houston of the entire committee to inspect Buffalo Bayou and acquaint themselves with its possibilities. In that year, Judge W. B. Hooker, chairman of the committee, brought its members to make good their promise to the captain. As congressman-to-be, I was invited to join the committee at Houston, and did so. I recall how careful the reception committee was in "sparing them the time" to go from the foot of Main Street to Harrisburg, where C. H. Milby lived—a fine citizen and enthusiastic advocate of deep water.

On the boat provided, we embarked at Harrisburg and went down Buffalo Bayou, which got better looking as we went along, and I noticed that our courteous entertainers did not begin to call attention to Buffalo Bayou until we had reached the better stretches thereof. We disembarked at San Jacinto Battleground where they could get a magnificent view, drink in some of the "glories of the Battle of San Jacinto" which had made possible a republic thereafter to become the future empire state of the nation, and enjoy a sumptuous feast.

GIVEN RECEPTION.

Returning to Houston, the committee and myself found that we were expected to attend a reception at the home of Captain Hutcheson, given to his fellow congressmen. Many privileged to attend still recall the welcome which the rivers and harbors committee and the throng of guests received upon their arrival at the brilliantly illuminated mansion of our host, Captain Hutcheson, and his accomplished wife, whom he always affectionately called "Miss Betty."

Assisting Mrs. Hutcheson were many representatives of the beautiful womanhood of Houston. I recall many of their faces and names, but will not take a chance by mentioning some, for fear of losing the good will of others deserving of note but not recorded as present.

I am not afraid of the men, and take the liberty of saying that among them were Captain Hutcheson, Mayor Baldwin Rice, W. D. Cleveland, John T. Scott, former Mayor John T. Browne, Major John F. Dickson, Captain J. A. Baker, Joe S. Rice, E. W. Sewail, George L. Porter, Dr. S. C. Red, O. T. Holt, Frank Andrews, William A. Reed, A. L. Neims, Justin C. White, Howard F. Smith, Sinclair Taliaferro, and others of Houston's outstanding citizens. The visiting guests were profuse in their expressions of appreciation for what they called "typical Southern hospitality," and afterward often expressed themselves to me as regarding this reception the least formal and the most gracious of any gathering which they had ever attended.
Incidentally, I will say that this non-political affair did not hurt us when the long struggle for adoption of our deep water project was begun.

MEMBER OF COMMITTEE

Friends in Houston, following my election to congress, urged me to seek membership upon the rivers and harbors committee, and Captain Hutzson stoutly maintained that we could not land the Houston project unless I obtained such place, as river and harbor appropriations were not so popular as now, and many Texas projects were clamoring for help.

Congressman S. B. Cooper, chairman of the Texas delegation, called a caucus of its members to consider committee assignments. I declined to attend on the grounds that my constituents wished me to seek a place on the rivers and harbors committee; that I could explain my failure to get the place upon the grounds that such important assignments did not usually go to new members; but they would not be satisfied to know that I had attended a caucus to compose rival claims, with the result of having one of my Texas colleagues favored because of seniority or merit.

Fortunately for me and the district, the Republican administration decided that the speaker should appoint no committee in the house, except that of ways and means, with the power to pass a tariff bill. After the Dingley tariff bill was passed the house of representatives recessed from time to time for three days, and transacted no business except by unanimous consent, while the senate was considering the tariff bill.

I was not embarrassed in seeking Republican support for my non-political ambition, an influence of value, as the Republicans had the presidency, the house and the senate.

Speaker Thomas B. Reed had been an unsuccessful opponent of President McKinley for the nomination; George W. Burkett, a Republican candidate for governor; Wilbur F. Crawford, the Reed Texas manager, and R. B. Hawley, newly elected congressman from Galveston, had all been ardent Reed supporters. Through friends, all were induced to write the speaker letters in my behalf.

Col. C. P. Dillingham, H. F. MacGregor, R. B. Morris and Judge Waller T. Burns, all good Republican friends of mine in Houston, also wrote letters to Speaker Reed in my behalf.

Congressman Bronson Cooper, as my senior in congress, might have obtained the position I sought; but Congressman Bailey, Democratic minority leader, procured a place upon the ways and means committee for Mr. Cooper, and both gave me their indorsement. Major J. D. Sayers, ranking Democratic member of the delegation, who had served with President McKinley and Speaker Reed for many years, also indorsed me. With such backing I was hopeful.
I secured an appointment with Speaker Reed, without taking any letters along, as I had requested all to be sent direct to him.

Upon entering his office, I was impressed with the bigness of the speaker in every way; but I "went to bat" and told him that I had come to seek a place upon an important committee.

"What committeeship have you in mind?" asked the speaker in his usual drawl, "The rivers and harbor committee," I replied. "A pretty big committee for a young man in his first term," the speaker rather dryly remarked. "What other committees have you in mind?"

"None," I said, "if you can not please me by appointing me on the rivers and harbors committee, upon which Texas has no member, then place me where you can and you will be pleased. Should I mention some other committee or committees as second or third choice. I would not be likely to get the one I want."

The speaker then stated: "I have received a large number of personally written indorsements of you, including one from General Weld. "Do you know him?"

I replied that I did not, but that I had told Mr. Reed of Houston if he knew any strong friend of the speaker, he might write in my behalf. "He told me," I said, "that General Weld had managed your campaign in Massachusetts for president and that he would write him. I guess that's how you got the letter."

The speaker then asked in his dry way if I had any particular steal in view for Texas. I told him "No!" but that I wanted to represent a great state that had 400 miles of gulf coast and only one great harbor. Many places wanted help, and my district, a channel that would cost around $4,000,000.

"If you appoint me, I hope to serve my state and get the recognition which she has been so long denied," I said. That ended the interview.

While congress was idle the Republicans, who had increased their membership in congress, decided to add one Republican to each major committee and omit one Democrat. This apparently left me "out of the picture," as there were seven Democrats and 10 Republicans on the previous committee, and only one Democratic vacancy existed.

At the night session, which closed the first session of the Fifty-Fifth Congress, Speaker Reed announced his committee appointments. When they reached rivers and harbors Republican members were first named, followed by six Democrats, beginning with General Catchings of Mississippi. I caught my breath when the clerk read out Thomas H. Ball of Texas.
The speaker had given the Republicans 11 members upon every major committee, to six Democrats, except on the rivers and harbors committee, and had to leave off one Republican to give us seven Democrats.

I did not foresee how important the place was until many unexpected obstacles came as barriers to the success of our deep water-way.

* * *

Next Sunday Colonel Ball will continue his narrative, touching upon the further steps taken in creating Port Houston.
IMPRESSIONED SOLONS WITH HOUSTON'S PROSPECTS

Termed by members of the rivers and harbors committee of the Fifty-fifth congress as "the largest and most representative committee from the Southland" that ever appeared before them, a distinguished group of Houstonians constituted the first delegation sent to Washington to present Port Houston's case. Members of this group are shown above. In the pictures are: Top row, left to right: Former Mayor John T. Browne, John T. Scott, banker; H. F. MacGregor and G. C. Street. Bottom row, left to right: Frank Andrews, Judge Waller T. Burns, F. A. Heitmann and Horace Booth.
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FOREWORD

Editor's Note -- The Chronicle today publishes the second installment of the absorbing story of the Port of Houston and its Ship Channel, how it came to be and how it developed through the long tedious years, written by Col. Thomas H. Ball, who had a leading part since its inception.

Last Sunday Colonel Ball told of the early history of Buffalo Bayou, of the shallow draft boats that plied its course since the Texas Revolution, of the coming of deep water to Galveston, plans for the Houston Ship Channel, and his election to Congress where he became a member of the rivers and harbors committee.

Today he resumes his narrative, telling of Houston sending its first "deep water committee" to Washington, of the problems that confronted and perplexed the pioneer workers for deep water, and of the rivers and harbors committee's second visit to Houston.

Each Sunday additional installments will be published in The Chronicle.

DEEP WATER COMMITTEE TO WASHINGTON

While the rivers and harbors committee was in Houston, Captain Hutcheson arranged with Chairman Hooker to have a Houston delegation come to Washington and present Houston's deep water project.

To the closing session of congress came such a delegation, which members of the rivers and harbors committee freely declared was the largest and most representative group ever to come before them from the Southland.

Carried Fight to Washington
Among the members of the first "Deep Water Committee" to go to Washington and lay before Congress the claims of Houston for a deep waterway to the gulf, were those Houstonians shown above.

Left to right they are, above: John T. Scott, Sr., H. F. McGregor, Horace Booth; center: G. C. Street, former Mayor John T. Browne, F. A. Heitmann; bottom: Judge Walter T. Burns, and Frank Andrews.

Once afterward, Chairman Burns, who was favorable to our channel, resigned to accept a judicial appointment in New York.

The Republican members of the committee considered and selected Congressman Theodore Burton of Ohio as chairman over Cooper, who regarded him. Cooper told me that such vote and his own friendship for Houston's waterway had cost him the chairmanship and had resulted in his removal to become chairman of the committee on marine affairs.

Had Cooper become chairman of our committee, much of our long struggle would have been ended. His support proved himself a relentless and resolute enemy of the adoption of the engineers' report favoring the establishment of the Ship Channel.

THE FIRST SOD TORN TO HOUSTON

When Congress met in special session in December, 1889, Chairman Burton, with great pride and from hand to hand transmitted control of the committee, each member being hungry for help.
The delegation was given more than the usual limited time to present Houston's claim, which was done by Captain Hutcheson, Mr. Cleveland and others, in a forceful and arresting manner. Thus, with a highly favorable report from the board of engineers on the splendid manner in which Houston had begun its campaign, all were hopeful of success, but many unexpected hurdles were yet to be surmounted.

When the deep water committee returned to Houston, Captain Hutcheson and his wife, and Colonel Dillingham and his accomplished daughter, Miss Pauline, remained in Washington to help work for the adoption of the government engineers' report and for an appropriation to begin work on the channel. They remained in Washington until they found out that the national administration had vetoed the report of any rivers and harbors bill by the congress then in session. Chairman Hooker had called our committee together, and to the disappointment of all its members, broke the news to us.

The committee had the right, as the privileged one, to disregard such decision, but of course the party in power had to subordinate its views and wishes in the matter. Chairman Hooker and Judge Reeves talked to the members personally, one at a time, and I was assured that it would be best for Texas and my district waterway to follow in line. I told them the responsibility rested upon the Republican majority and I could not be bound, even in executive session, to vote against reporting a rivers and harbors bill of such great importance to my state and district. Under pressure, the vote not to report was carried by 12 to 5; only one Republican, Congressman H. A. Cooper of Wisconsin, voting in the negative.

Soon afterward, Chairman Hooker, who was favorable to our channel, resigned to accept a judicial appointment in New York.

The Republican members of the committee caucused and selected Congressman Theodore Burton of Ohio as chairman, over Cooper, who ranked him. Cooper told me that such vote and his open friendliness for Houston's waterway had cost him the chairmanship and had resulted in his removal to become chairman of the committee on insular affairs.

Had Cooper become chairman of our committee, much of our long struggle would have been avoided, as Burton proved himself a relentless and resourceful enemy of the adoption of 'the engineers' report favoring the construction of the Ship Channel.

THE FIRST SOPE FED TO HOUSTON

When congress again convened, in December, 1898, Chairman Burton, with "velvet gloves and iron hand," assumed control of the committee, each member thereof being hungry for help.
The members severally were called upon by Mr. Burton to take up with him all appropriations for their states before requesting same from the full committee. I felt that it was inadvisable to rebel openly and therefore took up Texas matters with the chairman. I found it impossible to prevail upon him to adopt the report of the government engineers looking to the construction of the channel at a cost of $4,000,000, and to get a toehold, consented to accept an initial appropriation of only $300,000 to be expended on the channel from Morgans Cut to Galveston, being Section No. 1.

The bill went to the commerce committee of the senate, of which Senator Mills was a member. He was justly indignant. "The senate has not abdicated," he said and proceeded to secure an amendment to the house bill adopting the entire project and appropriating $4,000,000 for Texas construction.

Thus the bill went to conference. Becoming uneasy, I told Senator Mills to keep it on if he could, but that Mr. Burton would never allow the amendment to remain if he could help it. Senator Mills stated that Senator Elkin, chairman of the senate conferees, had promised not to yield on his amendment, which Senator Mills told him was the last thing he would have to ask, as he was retiring from the senate.

When the house conferees reported agreement upon the bill, with Senator Mills' amendment left off, I went over to the senator and told him the result. He was furious, refused to speak to Senator Elkin, who tried to explain, put on his man-sized "black stetson" and overcoat and walked off the floor of the senate, nursing his wrath.

My "feathers had already fallen" and I was prepared to meet the situation with the determination to carry on.

Upon my return to Houston, I found an understanding citizenship, gratified for a small beginning and ready, to a man, to go forward with the slogan, "We have just begun to fight."

**RIGHT OF WAY AND SPOIL GROUNDS**

The report of the board of engineers required that local interests furnish all right-of-way and lands convenient to the channel for the deposit of excavated soil.

Judge John G. Tod was made chairman of a committee to comply with this demand, the other members being C. H. Milby, Sam Allen, Justin C. White, and B. A. Riesner, with Capt. Sinclair Taliadoro to do the legal work, confer with government engineers, and otherwise aid the undertaking.

This committee did its work well and successfully.
The committee was greatly aided by the liberal co-operation of property owners upon both sides of the channel who gave rights-of-way and right to deposit spoil upon their lands, only a few making any charge therefor.

UNEXPECTED BLOW TO HOUSTON'S HOPES

In December 1898 congress convened for the short session. I found Mr. Burton still firmly opposed to specific adoption of our 25-foot project, but willing to appropriate a lump sum for dredging the channel, providing that a re-survey thereof be made by government engineers. I was prepared for such suggestion, as the secretary of the committee had told me in confidence that Mr. Burton had been talking with Major Miller, who had questioned the advisability, but not the feasibility, of the project. The latter had helped make the original survey, and was then on duty at Washington.

Mr. Burton told me he would like to have Major Miller come before the committee, that members might hear from him upon the subject. I told him it was all right to have Major Miller come, if he would have Colonel Roberts, the chairman, also summoned. He stated that Colonel Roberts was not in Washington, and a summons would involve some expense, as well as call him from his work. I told him that Colonel Roberts was in nearby New York, and said, "Only a week ago you had Major Kingman come all the way from Tennessee to give evidence on the Muscle Shoals project, which you are fighting." "All right," he said, "we'll have both Colonel Roberts and Major Miller come before the committee."

Major Miller came before the committee in Executive session, and was asked by Mr. Burton to give us some of the facts gone over with him. In an embarrassed and somewhat rambling manner, Major Miller detailed the proceedings of the board of engineers and the resulting favorable report. In answer to questions from Mr. Burton, he stated that the feasibility of bringing deep water to Houston was beyond doubt; but he had grave misgivings as to the substantial use of the channel by sea-going vessels which could load and discharge cargoes at Galveston, without coming up a somewhat difficult channel 57 miles inland, requiring additional time and incurring increased insurance.

Some members of the committee questioned him briefly, but I propounded only one inquiry: "Did you sign the report upon the survey made by Colonel Roberts, yourself, and Captain Derby?" To which he gave an affirmative reply in a low voice.

Major Miller retired, and Colonel Roberts, then in charge of the great harbor of New York improvements, came in. He was of smaller stature than Major Miller, but very erect. His testimony was given in a brilliant and earnest manner, without any of the embarrassment shown by Major Miller when he testified.
Like Moses, Colonel Roberts was a "stuttering man", and his mind worked faster than his tongue. With vigor and enthusiasm he reviewed the work of the committee and "saved the day" by declaring that they were so convinced of the desirability of the channel that all joined in its favor. "Although," said he, "the project might well have stopped at Harrisburg or the head of Long Reach, instead of at the foot of Main Street, at a saving of around $1,000,000."

He declared, however, that the board of engineers had no election in the matter. Congress had provided for the survey from Galveston to the foot of Main Street, and the board of engineers was compelled to report favorably or unfavorably.

Striking the table with his fist, Colonel Roberts declared with emphasis, and as rapidly as his impediment in speech would permit, "We thought so highly of the proposed channel that we believed the government could well afford to expend the additional million rather than have commerce suffer the loss of the channel, which would provide an inland harbor more secure from storms, and save more than 50 miles in railroad transportation."

When he left, I stated to the committee, "I regret that a government engineer should sign a report which he now discredits. Hereafter, let the committee strike Major Miller's name from the report, and I will rely upon the written and oral testimony of Colonel Roberts, and the written message contained in the report, signed by Captain Derby."

Mr. Burton thereafter told me that in view of Major Miller's testimony, which confirmed his own views, he could not agree to further appropriations for Buffalo Bayou, without accompanying the appropriation with a provision for a re-survey. I reluctantly consented to such re-survey, and accepted an appropriation of $600,000 to be expended only if such re-survey proved favorable, and thus the house bill went to the senate.

**UNEXPECTED OBSTACLES IN THE SENATE**

After the board of engineers had reported favorably upon the 25-foot waterway for Houston, capitalists in the East and West thought they saw an opportunity to build a city at La Porte and could locate same upon the proposed channel, half-way to Houston, at the upper end of section 1, the cost of which, as were sections 2 and 3 from Galveston Bay to Houston, having been separately estimated in the report. They bought a large tract of land fronting on the channel, laid out a townsite and had the government provide postoffice facilities.
Senator Burton, newly elected senator from Kansas, became interested in the venture. When the bill containing the $600,000 appropriation, conditioned upon a resurvey, reached the senate, Senator Burton went before the senate commerce committee with assurances that La Porte was not opposed to the project as a whole, but was heartily in favor of it; that the congestion existing at Galveston because of the tremendous grain shipments to that port was a matter of concern to Kansas and other grain-growing states west of the Mississippi. He plausibly argued that commerce could be greatly relieved by applying all funds to construction of section 1 of the channel, letting subsequent appropriations apply to sections 2 and 3. He talked to Judge Reeves of Illinois, who reported the matter to me, saying that he had told Senator Burton no provision would be accepted by the house without my approval, as I was the Texas member of the committee. I went with Senators Culberson and Chilton before the senate commerce committee and explained the situation, saying that if Senator Burton's proposition was favored, the Texas senators would oppose it, and if it came to the house, I would have the entire appropriation stricken from the bill rather than have outsiders profit by locating upon the waterway for which the citizens of Houston had obtained national recognition.

The $600,000 item was left in the bill as it had passed the house.

A STROKE OF GOOD FORTUNE

The rivers and harbors bill was still pending, when near the close of the session, ending March 5, 1900, the president and his advisors decided that no rivers and harbors bill should be passed. As both the house and senate were in favor of the bill, with power to pass it over the president's veto, as had been done over that of President Cleveland when the Democrats were in power, it was necessary to initiate dilatory tactics in the senate, without cloture, which could be exercised under the rules of the house.

So many senators were interested in waterways, that the aid of "dry land" senators having no waterway interests to serve, had to be enlisted.

Senator Carter of Montana, a staunch supporter of the president, a popular member of the senate and a fine speaker and debater, whose unfailing courtesy and touch of humor added weight to his utterances, led the filibuster, supported by a few other senators similarly situated, and the bill was "talked to death" when congress, under the law, had to quit.

This squared me with my constituency, who fully appreciated the progress made, and proved "a blessing in disguise," as will hereafter appear.
NUMEROUS PROBLEMS TO BE SOLVED

As the only Texas member of the rivers and harbors committee, it was my duty to look after the interests of all waterways and harbors of Texas. The broadminded citizenship of Houston appreciated the necessity of dealing fairly with all claimants for federal aid, and realized the difficulty of dividing appropriations which could be had for Texas among so many interests.

Congressmen Burleson, Cooper, Burke, Henry, Hawley, Kieberg and Slayden all had projects seeking national recognition, and I was fortunate enough to cooperate with all without inspiring jealousy on account of Houston's ambition to become a deep water port.

Prior to the national government's making Galveston a deep water port, Eastern capitalists had made large investments at Sabine Pass, as had Baltimore and Boston bankers at Aransas Pass, and a number of Chicago capitalists, under the leadership of members of the group that had built the Texas capitol, had begun the development of the "Mouth of the Brazos,"

When Galveston was chosen over other Texas prospective ports, it became evident that the plans of the syndicate who had acquired large holdings at the mouth of the Brazos and at Aransas Pass, with the right to charge for wharfage and toll ships, could not compete with the free harbor at Galveston.

These syndicates were further crippled by the great financial depression from 1890 to 1897.

They sent high-class and influential representatives to Washington to conduct a campaign to sell their jetties to the government at a low price, the government to complete their deep-water projects and allow them to recoup their losses from their lands, townsites, docks and wharfs.

As the Texas member of the rivers and harbors committee, I told them that no part of the appropriations for Texas should go to reimburse capitalists whose projects had fallen down. Chairman Burton strongly supported my stand in the matter.

However, Colonel Taylor, representing the Brazos syndicate, had the senate to amend the house bill by an appropriation of $600,000 to the syndicate, they to convey to the government two miles of water front. The records show that I moved to strike out the $600,000 item, giving my reasons therefor, which motion prevailed.
The representatives of the Aransas Pass syndicate gave up the fight for a government contribution upon my agreeing to advocate the government's giving Aransas Pass a 25-foot channel, the syndicate to convey without cost to the government its jetty and other harbor improvements. The Brazos syndicate made a like agreement and as a result the national government acquired the Brazos jetties, together with harbor frontage on the river, and the Aransas Pass jetties with harbor frontage, thereby giving each community a free deep water channel. The Aransas Pass improvement has since afforded opportunity for the creation of a fine harbor at Corpus Christi.

Later on, I took the same position with the owners of the Port Arthur canal, dock and terminal facilities when they sought reimbursement from the government for expenditures incurred in the construction of the canal. I insisted that they should either keep and maintain the canal themselves or convey it to the government and allow the government thereafter to maintain and further improve it. The result was that the government acquired the canal without cost, has since maintained and improved it, and Port Arthur is now an important port.

The foregoing matters are mentioned as being of interest and affording a picture of some of the many demands which made it harder to take care of the great projects in my own district. I felt then, and know now, that the use I made of my membership upon the rivers and harbors committee strengthened me to finally whip Chairman Burton and get full recognition for the Houston Ship Channel.

DISCOVERY OF OIL AT SPINDLE TOP

In 1901 the Lucas gusher came in at Spindletop, with a capacity of 75,000 barrels daily and the oil fever spread like wildfire over East Texas, as well as Brazoria, Wharton and other South Texas counties. Beaumont became the first oil center, which more than compensated that progressive city for the loss of its lumber mills, and together with Port Arthur, Beaumont still enjoys the benefit of great plants refining and shipping oil.

President McKinley, soon after the discovery of oil at Spindletop, passed through Texas en route to California. Governor Joseph D. Sayers arranged to have him stop off at Houston, where he was met by the governor, his staff, and a group of distinguished Texas officials.

The President was accompanied by Secretary of State John Hay, who had been private secretary to President Lincoln, and by other cabinet members and Washington officials.
The representatives of the Aransas Pass syndicate gave up the fight for a government contribution upon my agreeing to advocate the government's giving Aransas Pass a 25-foot channel, the syndicate to convey without cost to the government its jetty and other harbor improvements. The Brazos syndicate made a like agreement and as a result the national government acquired the Brazos jetties, together with harbor frontage on the river, and the Aransas Pass jetties with harbor frontage, thereby giving each community a free deep water channel. The Aransas Pass improvement has since afforded opportunity for the creation of a fine harbor at Corpus Christi.

Later on, I took the same position with the owners of the Port Arthur canal, dock and terminal facilities when they sought reimbursement from the government for expenditures incurred in the construction of the canal. I insisted that they should either keep and maintain the canal themselves or convey it to the government and allow the government thereafter to maintain and further improve it. The result was that the government acquired the canal without cost, has since maintained and improved it, and Port Arthur is now an important port.

The foregoing matters are mentioned as being of interest and affording a picture of some of the many demands which made it harder to take care of the great projects in my own district. I felt then, and know now, that the use I made of my membership upon the rivers and harbors committee strengthened me to finally whip Chairman Burton and get full recognition for the Houston Ship Channel.

DISCOVERY OF OIL AT SPINDLE TOP

In 1901 the Lucas gusher came in at Spindletop, with a capacity of 75,000 barrels daily and the oil fever spread like wildfire over East Texas, as well as Brazoria, Wharton and other South Texas counties. Beaumont became the first oil center, which more than compensated that progressive city for the loss of its lumber mills, and together with Port Arthur, Beaumont still enjoys the benefit of great plants refining and shipping oil.

President McKinley, soon after the discovery of oil at Spindletop, passed through Texas en route to California. Governor Joseph D. Sayers arranged to have him stop off at Houston, where he was met by the governor, his staff, and a group of distinguished Texas officials.

The President was accompanied by Secretary of State John Hay, who had been private secretary to President Lincoln, and by other cabinet members and Washington officials.
Houston gave him a wonderful reception and arranged an imposing parade from the railroad depot to the old frame auditorium at Main Street and McGowen Avenue. Governor Sayers was seated with the president in the first carriage, and being the congressman from this district, I was assigned a seat in the second carriage with Secretary Hay.

The president delivered an admirable address in which he paid tribute to Texas, its history and citizenship. He recalled his service in congress for many years with Governor Sayers, referring to him in terms of admiration and affection, and was gracious enough to mention my service in congress with special reference to Houston's plans for deep water.

He dwelt upon the recent discovery of oil and the marvelous gushers at Spindletop, saying "With oil added to the unparalleled resources of the Lone Star State, her affairs should go on even more smoothly."

**RIVERS AND HARBORS COMMITTEE AGAIN VISITS HOUSTON**

Before congress adjourned in March, 1901, the house rivers and harbors committee accepted an invitation from senators and members of the house interested in Southern and Western waterway improvements to visit such waterways and allow hearings in support of needed improvements.

Without cost to the government or members of the committee, a special train was provided to accommodate members and wives, clerical help, representatives of the state, war, army, navy, agriculture, postoffice and treasury departments, and representatives of the press. We came by Mobile and New Orleans, were entertained there, inspected their harbors, and made the first stop in Texas at Houston, where the train was met by a committee of representative men and women.

The train was 15 minutes late, and carriages containing the guests and committee drove hurriedly from the depot to Main Street. Upon reaching the Capitol Hotel, we found it laden with flowers and throughout their stay the visitors were entertained with Houston's accustomed hospitality.

The next day we went down the channel upon the government engineers' boat and other boats owned by Houston citizens, for inspection of the channel, under the auspices of Capt. C. S. Riche, district engineer and ardent friend of our waterway. Disembarking at Galveston, we were met by a large committee and went to the Beach Hotel as Galveston's guests. I will not describe Galveston's reception and entertainment of the committee. Suffice it to say that it was a credit to the Island City and to the state of Texas.

After inspecting Galveston's harbor the following day our train left for the Pacific coast, stopping at San Antonio and El Paso, where we were cordially received and the committee was given opportunity to see the Alamo, the great army post, Fort Sam Houston, and other points of interest in San Antonio; also the quaint and charming places which characterize El Paso, with a trip over the Rio Grande to Juarez, Mexico.
Resuming our trip we visited and inspected every harbor upon the Pacific Coast as far as Seattle, including interior waterways such as Puget Sound, the Columbia, Sacramento and Snake rivers, and from Seattle by boat made a trip through the inland passage to Skagway in Alaska.

FOREWORD

The chronicle covers the third installment of Col. Thomas H. Bell's history of the Port of Houston, in which he carries in detail the conception and gradual development of the channel and port.

In this installment Colonel Bell tells of the adoption of the 50-foot channel, Houston's development as a harbor city, the coming of the rail lines to the city and the operation of the navigation district.

Next week in the fourth installment of his narrative Colonel Bell takes up the part played by Houston businessmen in aiding to finance the channel and the coming of rail lines to the channel.

THE 50-FOOT CHANNEL ADOP TED

I had intended to write only three terms in Congress and had to attend my family and friends. However, in addition to college I gave full recognition of our deep-water project. Houston had no provision for a general court and postoffice building. Harris needed.

After I had secured the passage of a bill driven by the Merchant, Frank Andrews, creating the southern judicial district of Texas, and after the appointment of Judge Walter T. Burn, in the business of quittaries being used for his court, my friends insisted that I run for a fourth term in Congress in order to continue one of those two important interests of Houston. I deemed it my duty to attend to their wishes and was re-elected in 1902.

When Congress convened in December of that year, the harbor and harbors committee again to become a hot question therefor being again increased in failure of the last session to be the previous bill. I had written a friend, both Republicans and Democrats, that they would work with me on our Chairman Morgan's opposition was called upon, and the result thereof is that their own principal thing of the bill, with the exception of the innings passed when I was requested to present the clause.
FOREWORD

The Chronicle today publishes the third installment of Col. Thomas H. Ball's history of the Port of Houston, in which he writes in detail of the conception and gradual development of the channel and port.

In this installment Colonel Ball tells of the adoption of the 25-foot channel, Houston's development as a lumber center, the coming of new rail lines to the city, and the creation of the navigation district.

Next week in the fourth installment of his narrative, Colonel Ball takes up the part played by Houston bankers in aiding to finance the channel and the coming of King Oil to the channel.

PLAN FOR 25-FOOT CHANNEL
ADOPTED

I had intended to serve only three terms in congress and had so advised my family and friends. However, in addition to failure to get full recognition of our deep-water project, Houston had no provision for a federal court and postoffice building, badly needed.

After I had secured the passage of a bill drawn by the Honorable Frank Andrews, creating the southern judicial district of Texas, and after the appointment of Judge Walter T. Burns to the bench, rented quarters being used for his court, my friends insisted that I run for a fourth term in congress in order to take care of these two important interests of Houston. I deemed it my duty to accede to their wishes and was re-elected in 1902.

When congress convened in December of that year, the rivers and harbors committee began to frame a bill, pressure therefore being greatly increased by failure of the last congress to pass the previous bill. I had assurance from friends, both Republicans and Democrats, that they would back me up over Chairman Burton's opposition when called upon. I did not want them to hurt their own principal projects by a clash with the chairman, and had Texas passed when I was requested to present its claims.
URGED SHIP CHANNEL BONDS

Among the ardent campagners for the original $1,250,000 bond issue with which the Harris county navigation district matched dollars with the government in bringing deep water to Houston were the four Houston civic leaders shown above. They are: Top left, Chester H. Bryan; top right, Colonel Jacob F. Wolters; lower left, A. S. Cleveland, and lower right, W. D. Cleveland Jr.
Houston's revolutionary proposal to create a navigation district and "match dollars" with the United States government in order to obtain completion of the original 25-foot ship channel project, set a precedent for co-operation between government and local interests that has been followed in every subsequent deep water project. Led by Mayor H. B. Rice, top left, three ardent advocates of the creation of the Houston navigation district were R. S. Sterling, top right; Charles Dillingham, lower left, and C. G. Pilot, lower right.
After Page Morris of Minnesota had taken care of his principal project at Duluth; George Lawrence of Massachusetts, the Port of Boston; Judge Reeves of Illinois, the Port at Chicago; Mr. Burton his Cleveland project, and other members their principal demands, the interests of Texas were still unprovided for, but the other members of our committee were in better shape to vote upon Texas' needs, as their own projects had "run the gauntlet" of possible opposition by Mr. Burton.

Judge Reeves, the ranking Republican member, and I had become warm friends, and boarded at the same hotel. Knowing that he always went to his office at the Capitol on Sundays, I made an appointment to meet him there. I told him that I could satisfy my constituents and the state by accepting appropriations for Texas, which Mr. Burton grudgingly allowed; that I had supported national projects worthy of aid, regardless of where situated, and that I would resign from the committee and retire from Congress rather than submit to further injustice to Texas and my home project.

Without hesitation, Judge Reeves said: "You have not been fairly treated and you can count upon me to support full recognition of your Houston project."

I knew from assurances given by members of the committee that I could override the chairman. Before the committee met on Monday morning I went to Mr. Burton and told him practically what I had told Judge Reeves, saying, "It will be unfortunate to have the committee turn you down for the first time, as your arduous services and great knowledge of all waterways makes it important for you to retain your prestige. However, I cannot refrain from obtaining recognition over your opposition." I said to him, "Judge Reeves and other members are with me. Suppose you speak to him." Mr. Burton said, "Ball, your word is good with me. Please state your wants." Adequate appropriations for Texas," I answered, "including sufficient funds to place the Port of Galveston where it was before the storm of 1900, an unconditional recognition of Houston's proposed 25-foot channel, without re-survey thereof, and an appropriation of $1,000,000 to begin work from Houston to the gulf."

Mr. Burton asked me what I thought he ought to do. I said, "When the committee meets, and Buffalo Bayou is reached, you might state that this project has been up more often than any other port or waterway for consideration; that you still believe it unwise to construct a channel as recommended by the engineers, but that it is up to the committee, as you are only one of 17 members charged with the responsibility of spending government money."

When the committee met that morning, Mr. Burton made the statement substantially as I had suggested. I moved the adoption of the government engineers' report in favor of the 25-foot channel, and the appropriation of $1,000,000 to begin work thereon, with no re-survey thereof. Upon vote, every member of the committee voted with me. Chairman Burton stated, without feeling, that it was hardly necessary for him to vote, and declared the motion unanimously carried.
After Houston's project was thus provided for, I presented the demand of Galveston for the repair of the jetties which the government engineers estimated at $1,500,000.

Mr. Burton expressed his sympathy, but opposed the appropriation of the entire sum in one lump, saying that congress would meet again before the sum appropriated could be expended.

I replied, "Immediately after the storm, Collis P. Huntington wired to Galveston his intention to expend around $4,000,000 in restoring his railroad terminals. Congress cannot afford to do less for a stricken city than a railway executive is willing to do. It is not a matter of the amount appropriated, but a declaration that the government will restore its project, and carry on, and thus give hope to a brave people staggered by a great calamity."

Thereupon an appropriation was voted and contract authorized for the entire sum reported by the United States engineers to be necessary.

Before congress adjourned, I had secured an appropriation to provide for procuring a site for the erection of our federal building, and announced that I would not be a candidate for another term, as the material interests of my district were apparently provided for.

HONORED BY HOUSTON

Shortly after reaching home, I was invited by the Deepwater committee to come to Houston and bring Mrs. Ball with me, as their guests, to attend a reception planned in my honor.

Upon the morning after our arrival, we were taken by friends to the old Cotton Exchange Building, where we met a large and representative gathering of the manhood and womanhood of Houston.

After gracious greetings, Mr. Cleveland called upon Captain Hutcheson to express appreciation of my work in congress, which the Captain did in his usual eloquent way, picturing the value of my services in such glowing terms as to make my wife wonder if he were talking about me. In conclusion, he said, "Houston has won, and we owe it all to Tom Ball." I understood, of course, that the broadness of his statement was attributable to oratorical or poetic license, yet I did not lack a proper appreciation of the earnestness and sincerity of my good friend.

Ed Sewall was then called forward, and unveiled the covering from a magnificent chest of silver, which he presented, saying that all contributors were glad to honor me and regretted my retirement; that the gift was a tribute from appreciative citizens of Houston; and that all participating therein felt it a privilege to do so.
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I responded gratefully, expressing heartfelt appreciation of their kindness, which was unmarred by any resemblance to the saying of a gifted speaker that "gratitude is the lively expectation of favors to come."

An evening reception was given Mrs. Ball at the Capitol Hotel by a large number of Houston's representative women, Mrs. O. T. Holt, who was as beautiful as her husband was handsome, heading the assemblage.

A profusion of flowers and bounteous refreshments were in evidence, and when the formality of introductions was ended, Mrs. Ball was presented with an attractive cut glass set of numerous pieces, Presley K. Ewing making the speech of presentation in his brilliant way. Naturally, both of us were delighted by the lovely gifts, the value of which did not mean so much to us as the spirit which prompted their offering.

MAKING HOUSTON MY HOME

Before leaving Washington, Mr. and Mrs. Frank Andrews had dinner with us at our hotel apartment. While our wives were chatting in the reception room, Mr. Andrews and myself repaired to the smoking room. While there, he told me, that he was considering taking a law partner, and offered me a partnership upon equal terms. My knowledge of his ability and our warm personal friendship induced me to accept his generous offer, without hesitation.

I told Mr. Andrews that I undoubtedly would be expected to continue to work in the interest of the Ship Channel, as large appropriations would be required to complete it. He replied: "We'll both be permanently located in Houston, and expected to 'do our bit' in helping to build the city. I want you to do whatever you deem necessary, giving the required time thereto, as a contribution from the firm."

I arranged with Mr. Burton, at the desire of Congressman George Burgess of Gonzales, representative of the Galveston District, to have him appointed upon the rivers and harbors committee, to succeed me as the Texas member thereon.

After our return to Huntsville, our native city, we disposed of our home and moved to Houston, where a desirable residence had been rented.

This may be of interest to our readers; it was to me: Soon after my arrival in Houston, a tall, imposing-looking gentleman, with the appearance of a bishop of either the Episcopal or Catholic Church, whom I recalled having met only once before, came into my office. The visitor was Mr. Mark Wiess of Beaumont, who had sold out his great lumber interests in Beaumont and East Texas to John H. Kirby.
The meeting referred to was before I had secured final adoption of the 25-foot project and $1,000,000 appropriation therefor. Mr. Wiess, then thinking of making large investments in Houston, asked me whether or not Houston would get its port. I replied, "If I live."

"You look like a good insurance risk," he said. "I'll take a chance on you."

Thereafter he bought many valuable holdings in Houston, including the Lombardi, Porter and M. T. Jones former home, all "close in" properties.

Mr. Wiess, upon this second meeting, showed me maps and lists of all his purchases and said: "Relying in part upon your assurance of success in getting recognition for the Houston Ship Channel, I bought these properties, which have largely increased in value. I want you to take your choice, at the cost thereof to me upon such terms as you desire." I asked what he considered his best investment. He told me the M. T. Jones homestead, fronting 150 feet on Main in front of the present Humble Building, with a depth of 125 feet, bought for $25,500, a sum less than it would cost to replace the well built improvements thereon.

Had I made the investment and used the property as a homestead until reached by the business district, a profit sufficient to provide for the future could have been realized.

I thanked him for his offer, which was gratefully declined, due to the fact that at Huntsville we had a very large homesite and thought this property too "close in", with insufficient grounds.

Mr. Wiess was the father of Ray Wiess, one of Houston's best citizens, and uncle of Harry Wiess, one of the founders of the great Humble Company and now one of its high officials.

HOUSTON A LUMBER CAPITAL

Confidence in the ship channel becoming ultimately a seagoing waterway, with Houston, at the head of navigation, thus to become a deep-water port as well as a great railroad center, began to attract capitalists and industrialists to locate in Houston.

In 1902, John H. Kirby had succeeded in forming the Kirby Lumber Company, which absorbed great sawmills in Beaumont, Orange and other East Texas points, purchasing or acquiring large bodies of pine lands, or the control of timber thereon; and had established headquarters in Houston.

B. F. Bonner, who was then manager of an oil plant and refinery in Houston, became assistant to the president, Mr. Kirby, whose time was being spent principally in the East with capitalists interested in financing the Kirby Lumber Company and the Houston Oil Company. The latter had acquired lands with around six billion feet of pine timber thereon to be used by the Kirby Lumber Company; the oil company retaining the lands for oil development.
LUMBER KINGS HELPED MAKE PORT

Here is another group of the donors who played a major part, both in lending their own efforts and in furnishing encouragement to development of the Port of Houston. Top, left to right: J. W. Rockwell, Eugene Bender and B. F. Ionner. Below, John Henry Kirby, S. F. Carter, and William M. Rice.
Some lumbermen, who had sold out their holdings, moved to Houston and made large investments therein. 

Among them was S. F. Carter, who founded the Lumberman's Bank, now the Second National. He had acquired an uptown site and built thereon the largest office building in the city, reserving quarters, including the ground floor for his bank, the upper floors to be rented for offices. 


The M. T. Jones Lumber Company, the Bender Brothers, J. M. Rockwell & Company, George A. Arnold, were here to greet the newcomers. 

All lumbermen and ex-lumbermen coming to Houston not only made large investments here, but became active participants in commercial and industrial affairs, and freely gave their time and influence in support of the Houston Ship Channel. 

Many subsidiaries of lumber manufacturers and wholesale dealers, as well as firms and corporations dealing in lumber, maintained offices and yards with a great number of employees, all of whom contributed not only to the growth of Houston, but constituted an important part of its citizenship. 

While the lumber business did not require plants and channel frontage as much as did the cotton and oil interests, it vied with both in helping to develop the port. 

"King Cotton" was not dethroned, but "King Lumber" became his first principal rival. 

NEW RAIL LINES TO HOUSTON 

In 1901, Col. E. M. House, a native son of Houston, had become a resident of New York, although maintaining his Texas citizenship. Through business ventures and investments, he had established friendly relations with many Eastern capitalists, and had at heart the purpose of doing something for his native state. While a resident of Austin, he and Col. R. H. Baker, then Texas representative of the Equitable Life Insurance Company, had become warm friends and both became attached to the Hon. Frank Andrews, then serving as first assistant attorney general under Governor Culberson.
Colonel House, concluding that new railroad construction would be a good thing for Texas, found Eastern capitalists willing to back such venture; and, together with Colonel Baker and Mr. Andrews, decided to charter the T. and B. V. Railway Company and construct same first from Mexia to Cleburne and Waxahachie, from which two cities connection could be made by railway construction or trackage arrangements with both Dallas and Fort Worth. While its charter authorized the building of the railway to Houston, through a sparsely settled section, they deemed it best to build as above stated, through a section heavily peopled, which would provide passengers and tonnage to help pay for operations in the beginning.

Colonel Baker was a great believer in a greater Houston, and so believing acquired about eighty-five acres of land adjoining the north side of the Turning Basin, at a price considered very high by long or lifetime residents of Houston.

The T. & B. V. Railroad was partially constructed and in operation from Mexia, as far as a station named Malone in honor of William Malone, who had been manager of Colonel House's large ranch in Texas and who was chosen as field representative of the railway company by Colonel Baker, who became the first president of the T. and B. V.

**B. F. YOAKUM BECOMES INTERESTED**

Frank Yoakum, a native Texan, had become an outstanding railroad builder, with St. Louis-New York headquarters. He was a firm believer in Texas, which was greatly in need of railroads in sections not adequately served thereby. The Rio Grande Valley was attracting attention, and its leading citizens were interested in its development. Mr. Yoakum visited that section, where he had many warm friends, including Robert Kieberg, James B. Wells and John Kennedy. He was a land lover by choice and inheritance, and for himself and associates acquired large land holdings.

Having brought the Frisco Railway to a system of more than 6000 miles, reaching Texas through Oklahoma, he visioned extending that system from North Texas to Houston, thence to Brownsville, ultimately reaching the City of Mexico.

He concluded to charter the S. L., B. and M. Railway, build from Houston to Brownsville, and thereafter connect with the Frisco in North Texas.

The T. and B. V. road was begun and partially completed when he made contact with Colonel House and Colonel Baker, with the view of acquiring the T. and B. V. as the connecting line between Dallas, Fort Worth and Houston. Its acquisition was completed, and thereafter it was extended to Houston. To get access to the great timber tonnage of East Texas and Louisiana, he subsequently took over the B. S. L. and W., and O. and N. E. short lines and later on built the N. O., T. and M. line to New Orleans.
Mr. Yoakum and officials of the Santa Fe, which desired better facilities in Houston, decided to charter the Houston Belt and Terminal Railway, to be owned by the T. and B. V., Brownsville line, B. S. L. and W. and Santa Fe railway, one-fourth interest to each line.

Baldwin Rice was then mayor, and his law firm, as attorneys for the railway, presented and had passed by the City Council, an ordinance giving the H. B. and T. Railway the right to establish and maintain a terminal railway company in Houston for 30 years, and acquire needed lands and property. The railway bought about 40 city blocks, upon which hundreds of homes were situated, including that of the mayor, all at a satisfactory price from owners thereof. Only three condemnation suits were necessary.

Upon the property a splendid depot and office building were erected, known as the Union Station, with terminal facilities to accommodate all railway lines reaching Houston. The general offices of the Yoakum line were brought to Houston, and three stories were added to the original office building, which now accommodates several railway lines.

Mr. Yoakum's career as a great railroad builder and real developer has ended, but as his lifelong friend, I am putting into this story of the Ship Channel facts to show that he was a great contributor to the development of Texas, the Port and the City of Houston.

I have no doubt that the construction of the Houston Ship Channel and municipal facilities, was a large factor in inspiring his part in the development of the section tributary to Houston.

SLOW PROGRESS IN CHANNEL DEVELOPMENT

With all appropriations made by congress from 1899 to 1903, when the 25-foot project was specifically adopted, the government engineers were unable to do much work upon the channel of lasting value. With the help of the million-dollar appropriation made during my last term in congress, Col. C. S. Riche, a warm friend of the project, and a great engineer, had been able to develop a channel about 18-1/2 feet in depth and one-half the approved width, through Galveston Bay to Morgans Point, and provide a fine brush mattress rising above the high water mark, from near Morgans Point and along the north side of the channel for quite a distance through Galveston Bay, at the low cost of $65,000. This brush mattress was soon covered by sand and has been a great advantage in protecting the channel from the flow of sand which usually follows in the wake of winds from the north. Located as it was, it also has helped to show that the channel can be maintained by dredging, without the expensive jetties upon both sides thereof that many predicted would become necessary.
When the original survey was made it contemplated the use of ships only 350 feet long, about the maximum length of vessels using Galveston harbor at that time. Colonel Riche advised the deep water committee that modification of the original project to accommodate vessels of greater length would be necessary, and that a number of bends, such as Irish Bend, Clinton, Fidelity and Harrisburg, must be eased to provide a straighter channel for longer ships.

Funds were not available to cover cost of such requirements, which included a cut through Irish Bend, leaving a considerable island. C. H. Milby, Maj. E. W. Cave, T. W. House, W. D. Cleveland, Colonel Dillingham, Andrew Dow and Charles Clarke put up some $20,000 to buy the 65-acre Irish Bend Island. They deeded the government the required right of way and carried the remainder for many years, finally turning it over to the Navigation District at cost, with 6 per cent interest, when it was worth many times that price.

**MAYOR RICE TO THE FRONT**

In 1905, Baldwin Rice, an ardent supporter of our Ship Channel, again was elected mayor. In addition to helping take Houston "out of the mud", buying a large building site and erecting thereon the imposing San Jacinto High School and other buildings, including the City Auditorium, constructing the Main Street viaduct across the bayou and other important facilities, he gave much of his time to Ship Channel affairs.

Congressmen Pinckney, Moore and Eagle, who successively, from 1904 to 1910, inclusive, represented the Houston district, were able to obtain appropriations hardly more than sufficient to maintain the channel. Their efforts were handicapped by the demands of many projects in Texas and other states for waterway appropriations, and the cost of the Spanish-American war, which necessitated economy in government appropriations generally.

Baldwin Rice was a man of action; ready to initiate and command. Because of slow progress in the development of the Ship Channel, due to inadequate appropriations by congress, he concluded, after the initial million-dollar appropriation had been spent, to have Houston take charge and complete the channel rather than submit to a possible delay of many years incident to retarded governmental action.

After conference with a number of channel enthusiasts, he called for a public meeting to be held at the office of the Houston Business League, which was attended by a large crowd. Among those whom I recall as being present were W. D. Cleveland, T. W. House, John T. Scott, Col. R. M. Johnston, E. F. Bonner, B. B. Gilmer, C. H. Milby, Joseph F. Meyer, G. C. Street, F. A. Heitmann, W. C. Munn, S. F. Carter, H. F. MacGregor, Justin White, T. H. Stone, Sam Swinford and George P. Browne, business manager of the league.

Mayor Rice made a strong statement to the assembly, in which he outlined his plan to have Houston take over the Ship Channel project and speedily complete it. His program was evidently approved by the gathering and was endorsed by a number of speakers who followed the mayor.
I saw that objections to his plan would not appeal to those present, unless an objector was prepared to meet the war cry of the populist party. "Give us our demands or something better." However, I felt it my duty to tell the assembly of some of the difficulties which would confront Houston, due in part to lack of corporate power beyond its limits, and to present the more serious question of the great cost of maintaining the channel should Houston desire to bear the burden of construction, and closed with the statement that if the suggested course was not controlled, I would fall in line and follow the decision of those who had the great undertaking at heart.

Mayor Rice called for a vote upon his proposal and received practically a unanimous response in its favor. Mr. Scott laughingly suggested, "You can, if you will, find a way to show how the objects which the meeting has in mind can be accomplished," and moved my appointment, as counsel without pay, to help work out a plan, which motion carried and the meeting adjourned with everybody in a good humor.

CREATION OF NAVIGATION DISTRICT SUGGESTED

Mayor Rice invited me to attend a conference participated in by a number of his advisers. I told them that, under a provision of the Texas constitution, the legislature was authorized to create drainage, conservation and other municipal districts, including navigation districts; that laws had been passed by the legislature authorizing districts other than navigation districts, to undertake improvements and issue bonds therefor with the approval of the qualified voters therein; but that no law had been passed, although one could be, for the creation of navigation districts, with authority to improve any waterways therein and issue bonds for such improvements if the voters so willed.

Thereupon, Mayor Rice appointed a committee with S. F. Carter, chairman, A. S. Cleveland, F. A. Heitmann, Frank Bonner, C. H. Milby, C. G. Pillot, J. F. Wolters, T. H. Stone, Col. R. M. Johnston, B. A. Reisner, myself and perhaps others whose names I do not recall, as members, and active plans were set on foot for the creation of the proposed navigation district.

A division occurred in the ranks of the committee as to whether or not the district should embrace all of Harris County, for fear the voters therein would vote against the proposed district and necessary bond issues.

This question caused considerable delay and November came without harmonious action.

PLAN TO AID NATIONAL GOVERNMENT ADOPTED

In talking over the matter with Mayor Rice, Mr. Carter, Captain Hutcheson, Mr. Cleveland, Mr. Milby, Mr. Garrow, Colonel Dillingham, Col. R. M. Johnston,
Frank Bonner, and others, I stated that if a representative committee was appointed to go with me to Washington, when congress convened in December, I felt sure that should we propose to create a navigation district composed of the entire county, with power to issue bonds for one-half the amount necessary to complete the 25-foot project, congress would jump at the offer, authorize the contract for its completion, and appropriate the balance of necessary funds.

To the objection that with no district created, we were not ready to make such proposition, I made answer: "There will be no difficulty in getting legislative authority, and we will add weight to the proposition by assurance that the state will respond to Houston's demand and the legislature will pass a bill during its session in January giving statewide recognition to the importance of our waterway."

I further urged that such state recognition, coupled with local contributions through bonds voted for by the people, would be conclusive evidence that ours was not a "pork barrel" proposition; and that, should congress accept our offer and the government engineers be authorized to complete the channel, the district would not be required to provide a large annual sum to maintain it.

If we failed when the legislature convened in January we could still secure the passage of a bill authorizing navigation districts; and submit the matter to the voters of Harris County.

By unanimous vote, the committee decided to send a delegation to Washington.

CONGRESS FALLS IN LINE

When congress met in December, Mayor Rice headed a large delegation including, as I recall, John T. Scott, S. F. Carter, W. D. Cleveland, J. S. Rice, Col. R. M. Johnston, H. W. Garrow, B. F. Bonner, Captain Sinclair Tallaferro, H. F. MacGregor, Justin White, F. A. Heitmann, John H. Kirby, T. H. Stone, Tom Lucas, Horace Booth, myself, and others not now remembered. The delegation appeared before the house rivers and harbors committee, and at Mayor Rice's request I presented Houston's proposition and was backed by other members of the committee.

We explained that work need not commence until we had created a navigation district, voted for and sold bonds; and placed with the secretary of war one-half the amount necessary to complete the 25-foot project.

Alexander of New York had succeeded Burton as chairman. He and other members of the committee expressed their amazement at our unprecedented proposal, plied us with questions, and were given assurances that no railroads or private industries would be permitted to monopolize our waterfront, although given welcome access thereto.

The rivers and harbors committee, by unanimous vote in open session, accepted our proposal, and heartily congratulated the delegation upon its generous offer to "match dollars" with the government.
Prior to Houston's offer, no substantial contribution had ever been made by local interests to secure the adoption of their projects, and no project has since been adopted by the national government without promise of local contributions and assurances that waterfront would not be privately controlled.

We left Washington jubilant over the result, and received warm welcome upon our return home.

NAVIGATION DISTRICT CREATED

Mayor Rice requested Judge W. H. Wilson, city attorney; T. H. Stone, former city attorney, and myself, to prepare a bill authorizing the creation of navigation districts.

Beaumont, inspired by Houston's example, concluded to seek a navigation district to bring deep-water to that city, and sent Leon Sonfield to consult with us and aid in shaping the bill and securing its passage by the legislature.

My associates did the major portion of the work upon the proposed bill, which authorized the creation of navigation districts, the employment of engineers to make surveys of waterways therein, to undertake improvements thereof, and to pay therefor by bond issues when authorized by a direct vote of the people. Provisions for appointment of a board of three navigation and canal commissioners, by commissioners courts, were embraced in the bill, which was general in its nature.

My chief work in connection with the bill was the insertion of provisions (1) conferring power upon the navigation and canal commissioners to adopt any approved survey made by United States government engineers; and (2) enter into contracts with the secretary of war for the completion of such projects, upon such terms and with such contributions as congress might require.

The bill was passed by the legislature in 1910, by practically a unanimous vote, and was promptly signed by the governor.

Under the bill, as passed with subsequent amendments, numerous harbors, such as Beaumont, Orange, Freeport, Corpus Christi and Point Isabel, have been provided with ports.

I am glad to say that the broad-minded citizens of Houston have always favored the improvement of other harbors and rivers in Texas and have accorded sympathetic support in the help I have been able to give in aid of the creation of other navigation districts, when called upon by their advocates for advice or information.

Our city, confident of ultimate supremacy, has always believed there is "room enough for all."
FOREWORD

Today The Chronicle publishes the fourth installment in the history of the Port of Houston and the Houston Ship Channel, written by Col. Thomas H. Ball, out of his remarkably complete store of first-hand information, gained through his personal participation in the conception and creation of the port and channel.

In this installment, Colonel Ball reviews the bond issue campaign, the unselfish service of Houston bankers in making possible the financing of the work, and the gradual establishment of the mighty oil empire which has come to the channel.

CAMPAIGN FOR BOND ISSUE

Our county judge and county commissioners passed the necessary orders to make the whole of Harris County a navigation district with power to issue bonds, voted by its citizens, to an extent which a tax not exceeding 25 cents on taxable values, would retire; and called an election to authorize initial bonds to the extent of $1,250,000 to pay Harris County's part of the cost of completing the 25-foot project.

A large campaign committee was appointed, with A. S. Cleveland, president of the Chamber of Commerce, as its chairman. In response to his call, a rally was held and attended by a large and enthusiastic crowd.

The files of the Houston Chronicle disclose that Mr. Cleveland, Mayor Rice, Captain Hutcheson, Capt. Sinclair Taliaferro, Col. J. F. Wolters and myself addressed the assemblage, and assurance was given of a campaign to be carried to all precincts in the county.

Col. J. F. Wolters was made chairman of the speakers' bureau to conduct the campaign. He found no difficulty in providing speakers to visit every precinct in the county, successfully conducted as to win the favor of our voters by a majority of sixteen to one.

Colonel Wolters insisted upon representative business men coming to the front and making speeches in favor of the bonds, as what they said would be weighty with taxpayers. I recall an amusing incident in a precinct in a northwestern portion of the county, usually opposing bond issues, where, in addition
BANKERS COME TO PORT'S RESCUE

These six Houstonians played a prominent part as bankers in coming to the rescue when the financial emergency of the Port of Houston hung in the balance, as related by Col. Thomas H. Ball, in the accompanying installment of his history of the port and Ship Channel.

Above, left to right: Paul R. Timpson, Joseph F. Meyer, Sr., Jesse H. Jones; below, left to right: J. E. McAslan, T. C. Dunn and J. S. Rice.
to talks by Colonel Wolters and myself, Joseph F. Meyer and F. A. Heitmann were called upon to speak. Mr. Heitmann was practical and enthusiastic in his address. Striking the table, and vigorously addressing a non-receptive audience, he shouted, "What are you menfolk going to do about it? Are you not willing to help Houston, which pays 85 per cent of our county taxes to build your roads and improvements, become a great city and market for your products? I am going to appeal to the women here, and say to them that the average increased taxes paid by property owners in this precinct will not be more than the cost of a "pair of pullets." If you men are unwilling to pay that price, I am going to ask all the ladies to stand up and agree, if necessary, to bring the pullets to market." The women stood, and the precinct was carried.

It will be interesting to note that after our navigation bonds were prepared, burdened with the title "Harris County, Houston Ship Channel Navigation District Bonds," so denominated as to appeal to voters, a market therefor could not be had. The buying public had never heard of a navigation bond issue, and bankers and brokers hesitated to handle them on the small commission received, as the law provided they could not be sold for less than par and accrued interest. When Frank Vanderlip, former United States treasury assistant, to Mr. Gates, came to Houston on a trip to the Freeport sulphur mines in which he was interested, Jesse H. Jones and I took up the matter with him without success.

HOUSTON BANKERS TO THE RESCUE

J. S. Rice was president of the Union National Bank; J. T. Scott, of the First National; Colonel Dillingham, of the South Texas, W. B. Chew of the Commercial National, and S. F. Carter of the Lumberman's National. At a conference, including Mr. Rice, W. T. Carter, Sr. T. C. Dunn, C. G. Pilot, Jesse H. Jones and myself, it was decided that the bonds must be taken by all the banks in proportion to their capital and surplus, and Mr. Jones was requested to see the bankers, including T. W. House, private banker.

The next morning Mr. Jones reported that every bank in the city would buy its share of the bonds, which they did, and this "trouble knot" was cut.

BOARD OF CANAL COMMISSIONERS

The navigation law provided for the appointment of three canal commissioners as the governing body of district waterways.

County Judge Amerman, Mayor Rice and other waterway friends readily agreed upon Colonel Dillingham and Camille Pilot to fill two of the places. Mr. Pilot thought we ought to have a man from the county, and suggested R. S. Sterling, then of Humble, as a third member. Their names were presented to the county judge and commissioners, were favorably acted upon, and Colonel Dillingham was made chairman of the board with the understanding that I should act as counsel, none of us to receive pay for our services.
The duties of the board were onerous and required frequent meetings. Being without a secretary, Mr. Pillot suggested that Stuart A. Giraud, a very competent accountant might serve as secretary without pay. Mr. Giraud readily assented, and was a great aid to the board.

Colonel Dillingham, who had given much of his valuable time and wise counsel in securing adoption of Houston's project, and in the discharge of the duties of chairman of the navigation board, resigned on account of ill-health, and I became a member.

When the new board met, Mr. Pillot nominated Mr. Sterling as chairman of the board to succeed Colonel Dillingham, and requested that Mr. Giraud continue to serve as secretary and that I should, in addition to my duties as a member, continue as counsel, which motion prevailed.

LOCATION OF TURNING BASIN CHANGED

When in Washington attending a session of the rivers and harbors committee, I told Congressman Burgess of the house rivers and harbors committee and Senator Culberson of the senate committee that our project might fail if we sought to bring it to the foot of Main Street. I recounted General Roberts' testimony as to why the engineers could not favor stopping at Harrisburg, or the head of Long Reach. We arranged to have a board of engineers come to Houston and make the necessary examination.

Before the board reached Houston, I conferred with Mr. Cleveland and others who were insistent upon bringing the channel to the foot of Main Street, and with Mr. Milby and some members who thought it might be well to stop at Harrisburg. I told them in confidence that we could not complete the project to Main Street at the original estimated cost of $4,000,000, on account of increased cost of labor, material and dredging and difficulties to be encountered in straightening the channel and acquiring rights of way in its upper reaches.

With some reluctance all agreed to the suggestion that the terminus might well be made at Turkey Bend, or head of Long Reach.

The Board of engineers, with unanimity, decided that all commercial interests could be served by a turning basin at the head of Long Reach, and the project was modified accordingly.

CONTROL OF "HEAD OF NAVIGATION"

The government engineers originally constructed a much smaller turning basin than we now have. Mayor Rice and the city commissioners, to aid such development, had the city purchase a good dipper dredge which the council named "Tom Ball." It was used and around $300,000 was expended in improving the Turning Basin. This was an advantage to us when we presented our demand for a complete channel.
The Mayor was determined to control, as far as possible, lands fronting upon the turning basin, so as to avoid monopoly of the water front provided by the government and navigation district. The city purchased a valuable tract of land west of the Turning Basin, upon which the cottonshed wharves were thereafter erected, and 60 acres north thereof for future use.

He induced Col. R. H. Baker to convey to the city his half of the 85-acre tract fronting upon the Turning Basin on the north side of SSBB, at cost, with 6 per cent interest and taxes, when the land had increased in value to at least three times the price which he had paid for it. Subsequently the city bought the remaining half from the Houston Belt and Terminal Railway, acquired by it from Colonel Baker for terminal purposes, at the price paid Colonel Baker, plus interest and taxes. The H. B. & T., having become a member of the railroad association, operated the municipal belt system.

A syndicate had purchased substantial land holdings in Magnolia Park, with considerable frontage upon the south side of the Turning Basin, and thence down the channel, laying out proposed slips and lots for industries and residences.

The mayor determined to acquire the frontage and after instituting condemnation proceedings, had the city pay the owners a fair price for the desired frontage.

Portions of the present city docks and wharves and part of the public belt system, are now located thereon.

GOVERNMENT ENGINEER CHANGES

Under the national policy as to tenure, Colonel Riche was given another important district, but we were consoled by the naming of Major Edgar Jadwin to take charge of the Galveston district, which included our channel.

We were further aided by the fact that Captain Charles Crotty, a civil engineer, who was in the employ of the government, with headquarters at Galveston, was favorably familiar with our waterway.

The 25-foot project was still uncompleted when Major Jadwin was given another assignment, and Captain Oakes was appointed to succeed him.

Unlike his predecessors, Captain Oakes was doubtful of the wisdom of trying to bring deep water to Houston, and was of the opinion that commerce would not construct the necessary docks and wharves; and ship-owners would not largely use the channel when they could stop at Galveston.

Imagine our consternation when we were told that Horace Booth, representing the I. & G. N. Railroad, which owned a large tract of land fronting the channel, was discouraged by Captain Oakes when he presented plans for a comparatively small dock!
I gave a sharp statement to the papers with regard to Captain Oakes, which Captain Taliaferro undertook to answer, saying that he was in frequent contact with Captain Oakes and was sure he was friendly to the channel. I replied in the Post and Chronicle that if Captain Oakes would deny my statement, I would accept his word but would not support my word by other testimony in the absence of such denial, and the matter ended.

This disclosure proved another "blessing in disguise," as Captain Taliaferro got busy with Captain Oakes and reported to us that he would favor a lump sum appropriation to complete the 25-foot project, which he estimated could be done for $2,000,000, one-half to be paid by the navigation district.

**FUNDS TO COMPLETE 25-FOOT PROJECT OBTAINED**

A meeting of the Deep Water committee was called to consider the suggestion of Captain Oakes that the 25-foot project could be completed with a lump sum appropriation of $2,000.

Among others attending, whose presence I recall, were Captain Hutcheson, Mr. Cleveland, Mayor Rice, Mr. Scott, Joe Rice, Colonel Dillingham, Mr. Garlow, C. H. Milby, H. F. MacGregor, Frank Andrews, and Frank Bonner.

My experience upon the rivers and harbors committee had made me cautious and fearing that a contract could not be successfully let for the sum suggested by Captain Oakes on account of increased cost of labor and excavation. I gave the deep water committee a "horse-back opinion" that it would require around $2,500,000 to finish the project. I was requested to go to Washington to get action, taking with me sufficient help.

I told them I was all right with the Democrats in both the house and senate, and had numerous friends among those whom my dear old friend, George M. Bailey, used to term, in his mellow way, "the depraved Republican Party;" that I did not deem it necessary to incur the expense of a large delegation but would like to have Colonel Dillingham, who had a brother in the United States Senate, and H. F. MacGregor, join me in Washington and thereby be in touch with fellow Republicans. We were successful in our mission and secured congressional authority for the expenditure of $2,500,000, one-half to be provided by the navigation district, with which to complete the 25-foot project.

**GUESS OF $2,500,000 TO COMPLETE CHANNEL CORRECT**

After congress had authorized the appropriation of $1,250,000 to complete the channel at a cost not to exceed $2,500,000, of which the navigation district was to pay one-half, John S. Bonner, Camille Pillot, C. H. Milby and other active workers for deep water, came with Col. H. B. Moore, representing Texas City terminals, for a conference to consider bringing the channel to Houston via the Texas City channel, and along the coastline of Galveston and Harris Counties, to Morgans Point.
I told them the original project called for a channel across Galveston Bay to Morgans Cut, and we would have to see the government engineer about such change. The engineer concluded, when seen, that the channel could be constructed either by the old or the suggested route, and bids were invited upon both.

When the bids were opened, the lowest was $2,367,000 using the original route, and around $2,600,000 using the route via Texas City.

Had our deepwater committee asked for only $2,000,000, contracts could not have been let and indefinite delays would have intervened.

Contracts were let, work was promptly begun, and continued until the completion of the project.

DREDGES SAM HOUSTON AND SAN JACINTO CONSTRUCTED

When the 25-foot project was nearing completion, it was evident that large sums would be required to keep the channel open by dredging, and that dredging companies could not be relied upon to furnish dredges when needed, especially to remove shoaling, at a moderate cost.

I was in Washington when Col. C. S. Riche, still actively interested in the success of the channel, called my attention to the problem. He suggested the building of two powerful dredges by the government, to cost around $500,000, one-half to be paid by the navigation district and to be used in maintenance of the channel. We made a hurried trip to the senate, where the rivers and harbors bill was still pending, and had Senator Culberson provide for it by a senate amendment. Early contract was let, the two dredges speedily constructed, and the navigation district, by popular vote, received authority to issue bonds in the sum of $250,000 with which to pay its contribution, with title to the dredges in the national government.

The value of the use of these dredges has greatly exceeded their cost, and their importance to the channel is beyond estimate.

KING OIL EMBARKS UPON SHIP CHANNEL

In order to record in chronological order matters incident to Houston's successful effort to provide a sea-going Ship Channel, mention has not been made of one of the greatest contributors to its commerce and success, to which attention will now be directed.

Before Galveston became a deep-water port, incoming vessels drawing around 25 feet of water had served that port by having its incoming and outgoing commerce lightered to and from the inner harbor, across the bar, which was only about 14 feet below the water line; and cotton from Houston was carried to Galveston for shipment upon barges. While Galveston was then a great cotton port, Houston being favorably situated, had built up a good cotton business in
which a large number of prominent citizens were engaged as commission firms, brokers and shippers.

Cotton, therefore, at the time this story begins, was easily enthroned as "King". Mention has herein been made of the arrival in Houston of "King Lumber", which entry was soon followed by great oil developments in Texas. Soon after the Lucas well came in at Spindle Top, as a 7500-barrel-a-day producer, a forest of derricks went up on that oil field with sub-divisions as small as one-sixteenth of an acre.

J. S. Cullinan and associates organized the Texas Company, which acquired and developed large oil fields in the vicinity of Spindle Top.

The J. M. Guffey Oil Company of Pennsylvania acquired large oil interests in that vicinity, and Beaumont became the great oil center of Texas.

The Texas Company built a large refinery and improvements at Port Arthur, to which an island canal had been constructed, and the Gulf and other oil companies established refineries and other facilities. The bringing in of great oil fields at Humble and West Columbia, near Houston and other prospective oil fields in the coast country, and the adoption by congress of Houston's Ship Channel which here connected with 17 railroads, placed Houston in line as one of the foremost cities in Texas.

SINCLAIR OIL COMPANY COMES TO HOUSTON

The Sinclair Oil Company was the first large oil company to acquire channel frontage, together with a large tract of land on the south side which it bought from Sam Allen.

Upon this location it afterwards built its refinery and facilities, which have been extended to become a really great plant and have contributed largely to the program of the city and the success of the port.

TEXAS COMPANY FALLS IN LINE

In 1908, Mr. Cullinan established in Houston the headquarters of the Texas Company, which had grown to great proportions.

In 1912, the Texas Company acquired property with channel frontage, on the north side and established a plant, and in 1914 this company purchased a site facing the Federal Building, and built a splendid and imposing office building, which does not suffer by comparison with a large number of sky-scrappers since erected by others.

As a lessor of the Sour Lake, Batson and West Columbia oil fields, the Texas Company enjoyed a marvelous growth, extending its activities nationally and internationally, and made many of its stockholders, including a number of Houston citizens, comfortable fortunes.
When Mr. Cullinan resigned as president of The Texas Company, many of the officials and employees of the company also resigned to continue as his associates in oil development.

T. J. Donahue became president; R. A. John, general attorney for Texas, and Amos L. Beaty, of Sherman, general counsel with offices in New York. Judge R. E. Brooks continued as treasurer; George Noble, who had held important positions with the I. & G. N. continued with the Texas Company in an important position; Colonel Wolters succeeded Judge John as general attorney.

Active support has always been given, by the officials and employees of the company, to the development of the Ship Channel.

FARMERS PETROLEUM COMPANY
ORGANIZED

Mr. Cullinan, with a number of his former associates, including W. B. Sharp, a genius in the development and production of oil, and James L. Autrey, general counsel, organized the Farmers Petroleum Company, and began operations upon leased lands in and near the Humble field.

E. F. Woodward and T. P. Lee then or soon afterward associated themselves with this company, which developed oil in great quantities at a much greater depth than the comparatively shallow wells in that field had gone.

The market broke, and to store oil for the new company, Mr. Cullinan bought a large tract of land on the north side of the channel, and placed there a forest of large storage tanks in which to store oil, afterward sold at a greatly increased price.

Upon the lands thus acquired, a refinery was constructed, terminals and wharves were provided at Norsworthy Bend, and the balance of the tract was laid out for industrial development, upon which an office building and a number of company houses were constructed. Subsequently, Mr. Cullinan and his associates constructed the lofty and ornate Petroleum Building on Texas Avenue, where companies he is associated with maintain their general offices.

The three important corporations of the group are the American Republic Corporation, J. S. Cullinan, president; American Petroleum Company, of which his son, Craig Cullinan is president; and Republic Production Company, of which his brother, Frank Cullinan is president.

The Houston Oil Company, which had maintained its general offices for years in Houston with A. W. Standing general manager, (the firm being headed by Judge Kennerly, now federal judge) as general attorneys, and Senator McDonald Machum as special counsel, moved to the Petroleum Building, Mr. Cullinan having bought one-half its mineral rights under large bodies of lands in East Texas.
THE HUMBLE OIL COMPANY
TO FOREFRONT

R. S. Sterling, in 1911, with W. W. Fondren, Clint Wood and other associates organized the Humble Oil Company, with a capital of $150,000. Its operations were confined, chiefly, to the Humble field, where oil was reached at a comparatively shallow depth, before the deeper strata were discovered.

In 1912 its needs required an increase of capital to $300,000. Its operations were so successful as to give promise of a bright future.

Will Farish, R. L. Blaffer and H. C. Weiss were the owners of large oil interests, and they and Mr. Sterling and his associates decided to consolidate their holdings with that of the Humble and increase the capital stock thereof to $4,000,000.

The Goose Creek Oil Field was situated on the north side of the channel, and the Humble, deeming it wise, acquired a valuable site now known as Baytown. A railroad was built to Dayton for railroad connections; a great refinery plant and other improvements were constructed, and to obtain an outlet to deep water, the Humble, at its own cost, built docks and wharves and dug a channel therefrom, 30 feet in depth, to the Ship Channel, which in 1919 had been deepened under the 30-foot project, as far only as Baytown.

Thereby the Humble was able to accommodate vessels with a draft of 30 feet or more before the oil companies upon the upper reaches of the channel could make use of such vessels. Mr. Sterling then was president of the Humble and an original member of the navigation canal commission. To his credit and that of all the Humble officials, let me record the fact that they have co-operated fully with other citizens in securing a channel depth of 30 feet, and the greater depth now being provided for the channel from Galveston to the Turning Basin.

The general offices of the company were established at Houston, and here the company has built one of the largest and most imposing buildings at Main and Polk streets. The original building was constructed before the retirement of Mr. Sterling as president, and to it has been added a recent structure at a cost of more than $1,000,000. The payroll of the Humble is a great contributor to the welfare of Houston, and it gives employment to more than 20,000 people.

The officials and employes of the Humble, notwithstanding that company constructed its own docks and wharves and channel to meet the government channel and is one of the largest taxpayers in Harris County, have uniformly supported all bond issues by the Navigation District to give deeper water and municipal facilities to serve commerce generally, including its competitors.
THE GULF OIL COMPANY FOLLOWS

In 1917, the Gulf Oil Company wisely concluded to come to Houston, and as an inducement Jesse H. Jones agreed to erect a building on Main Street for its headquarters, to be known as the Gulf Building, and improve its upper stories as the Gulf desired for its use.

Upon its completion the Gulf occupied the quarters needed for its offices. The National Bank of Commerce, of which R. M. Farrar was president and Mr. Jones the largest stockholder, moved from the Mason Building to the ground floor thereof. When Mr. Jones erected the magnificent building on the corner of Main Street and Rusk Avenue, it was named the Gulf Building, and the oil company removed its general offices thereto, the National Bank of Commerce having quarters therein upon the ground floor.

The Gulf Company acquired channel holdings and has a plant thereon.

Its coming to Houston brought many valuable citizens, among them Judge D. E. Greer, an accomplished lawyer, and a dear friend of mine. His death was a great blow to his family and his hosts of friends throughout Texas.

John E. Green, his assistant, succeeded Judge Greer as general attorney.

Underwood Nazro, chief official of the Gulf, cultured gentleman and independent thinker, built his home here and took a quiet but effective interest in civic affairs. His unexpected death brought W. B. Pyron back to Houston from the company's Pacific Coast headquarters, as his successor. Mr. Pyron's friends welcomed his return, as his ability and unassuming manners had endeared him to many.

The Ship Channel and City of Houston owe much to the Gulf Company, due in part to its investments and large payroll; but more to its officials and employees, who have co-operated with us in many phases of human activity.

DEEPWATER REFINERY ESTABLISHED

In 1919 a number of Houston's citizens, headed by John T. Scott, E. A. Peden and others, saw the need of further oil refineries for Houston, and for that purpose established a refinery with access to the Ship Channel, under the name of Deepwater Refinery. It served a useful purpose, its local ownership being maintained until sold to the Stanolind Company, a major company in need of channel frontage, which will no doubt greatly add to its use and value.

Mention will hereafter be made of the location of important oil companies upon the Ship Channel.
FOREWORD

The Chronicle today publishes further chapters in Col. Thomas H. Ball's interesting and authentic history of the Port of Houston. In this installment Colonel Ball, who has had a prominent part in the port's development, tells of the creation of the Houston Harbor Board, the inauguration of the Philadelphia-Houston steamship service by the Southern Steamship Company, the city's rise in national prominence, the winning of the 30-foot project securing the Federal Land Bank for Houston.

Next Sunday the narrative will continue, covering the administrations of Mayors Pastoriza, Hutcherson and Amerman.

MAYOR RICE SUCCEEDED BY
BEN CAMPBELL

Mayor Rice, who had served one term, and who again became mayor in 1905 and served four terms, to April, 1913, was succeeded by Mr. Campbell. During his years in office Baldwin Rice had served with great credit and contributed much to the growth of Houston. He had rendered conspicuous service in helping to make Houston a deep water port in many ways, including the purchase of the large yacht Zeeland, which was principally used in showing the channel to visitors of note, national and state officials. It is well known that he used the larger part of his private fortune in promoting the interests of the city and the Ship Channel.

After his retirement he made his home at Morgans Point, where he was privileged to see the Ship Channel become a great highway for sea commerce.

MAYOR BEN CAMPBELL
AT THE HELM

Mayor Campbell took hold of the duties of his important office with great energy and ability and soon demonstrated that Houston would go forward in its march to become the chief city in Texas, and that he regarded the Ship Channel as the cornerstone in building a metropolis. As many problems were pending, he changed, among other things, the legal department so as to have a city attorney and city solicitor, to which latter office he appointed Joe C. Hutcherson, Jr., now a federal circuit judge. One of his first acts was to bring to Houston an eminent civil engineer, E. E. Sands of Cleveland, Ohio, who prepared a plan for city improvements upon a large scale, at a probable outlay of around $10,000,000, which improvements were begun and completed under Mayor Campbell's administration.
Here is presented another group of Houstonians who played a prominent part in the development of the Ship Channel and the Port of Houston. Above, left to right: A. L. Blaffer of the Humble Oil and Refining Company; Mayor Ben Campbell, under whose administration great strides were made; J. S. Cullinan, then of the Texas Company. Below: Judge D. E. Greer of the Gulf Company; R. M. Farrar, member of the first harbor board, and Underwood Narro of the Gulf Company.
Progress upon our 25-foot project was rapidly made, and it became evident that the channel would be completed with no harbor facilities to enable the use thereof, as the railroads and private industries were apparently unwilling to take a chance in providing docks, wharves and other improvements upon a venture that the Ship Channel would justify large investments based upon its being largely used. The necessity of providing initial docks and wharves was apparent and, after consultation with a number of us who had every confidence in the future of the channel, Mayor Campbell decided to call a city election to authorize a bond issue of $3,000,000 to provide such needed facilities forthwith; the proposition was authorized by an overwhelming majority of qualified voters.

When Mayor Campbell decided to build the city docks, B. B. Gilmer, one of Houston's leading business men, was president of the Chamber of Commerce. Mr. Gilmer, with his associates, F. Carter, W. C. Buschardt, J. W. Lester, Mr. Stone and other representative citizens, had organized and made a great success of the Southern Drug Company.

A. L. Nelms, head of the former firm of Inman, Nelms & Co., was president of the Houston Cotton Exchange. These and all other business organizations threw their potent influence behind the mayor in his efforts to provide our waterway with essential facilities.

Mayor Campbell had City Engineer Sands provide plans for construction of city docks to face the Turning Basin, which plans were approved and construction hereof authorized.

Mr. Sands' plans were excellent and when construction thereunder was finished the wharves and docks designed by him constituted a splendid nucleus for the city and navigation district's subsequently constructed wharves, which were supplemented by a large number of non-municipal docks and wharves upon both sides of the channel as far down as Baytown.

Municipal docks and wharves were never intended to monopolize the use of the channel. On the contrary, the port authorities have always encouraged corporations and individuals to provide their own facilities and aided them, without contributing thereto, to provide sites, with the assurance that the municipal belt service would be extended to give them service for their plants.

HARBOR BOARD CREATED

When Mayor Campbell decided to construct city wharves and docks the City Council passed an ordinance creating a harbor board of five members, to be appointed by the mayor.

The mayor named as the first harbor board Jesse H. Jones, chairman, with R. M. Farrar, John T. Scott, Dan Ripley, and myself as other members. Upon qualification, all members of the harbor board, together with Mayor Campbell and City Engineer Sands, went to New Orleans, Mobile and other gulf ports, to see their improvements and to get ideas and information therefrom. We were cordially received and entertained by officials of Mobile and New Orleans.
While in New Orleans, J. M. Coleman, an eminent engineer, who had successfully designed wharves and docks there, as well as at other gulf ports, was among our entertainers. Mayor Campbell and the harbor board were so much impressed by Mr. Coleman’s evident ability that we invited him to visit our city and inspect plans of Mr. Sands for proposed city docks, which he agreed to do without compensation. Upon request, he consented to become consulting engineer for construction thereof, and for other improvements should plans be desired for extension of city facilities upon the channel, which connection he has since maintained.

Mayor Campbell, with the aid of Mr. Milby, the harbor board and navigation and canal commissioners, in 1913 acquired a tract of land from James Cheek and associates, with valuable water frontage of 1500 feet, with no cost to the city; conditioned that a city dock should be constructed at Manchester and the balance of frontage improved when the city could afford it.

Mr. Milby and others had given lands and right-of-way from Harrisburg to the Ship Channel for use by the city or railroads, without discrimination, to a point near where the Portland Cement Company now has its great plant; and the Southern Pacific Railway had laid a track thereon, with the understanding that it would be available for the city and navigation district at cost thereof.

To carry out the contract with Mr. Cheek it became necessary to build a dock occupying 500 feet of the water frontage donated by him, and the matter of issuing $300,000 in bonds to pay therefor was submitted to the people. There was so much heat in the city campaign and unjust criticism by opponents, who either opposed all bond issues or believed the city should not go down stream to build a dock outside its limits, that while the election went largely for the bonds two members of the harbor board resigned.

John T. Scott was made chairman of the board and the two vacancies thereon filled by the appointment of Joe S. Rice and William D. Cleveland, Jr., son and namesake of William D. Cleveland, Sr., chairman of the original deep water committee.

PHILADELPHIA-HOUSTON SERVICE
SOUTHERN STEAMSHIP COMPANY

Houston’s 25-foot project being practically completed, and Mayor Campbell having begun the construction of city docks to insure use of the Ship Channel, the business and industrial interests became alive to the necessity of securing a regular "coastwise" service. Houston, with great commercial interests and facilities for handling tonnage, especially cotton, could expect use of the Channel by tramps and regular liners reaching foreign ports; but without a coastwise service Houston could not enjoy a proper standing as a port, and obtain satisfactory water freight rates to gulf and Atlantic ports, a service vitally important to its wholesale, retail and industrial interests.
HELPED LAND TWO BIG PROJECTS

Much credit for helping obtain Houston's first steamship line and the Federal Land Bank goes to these six men. Top row, left to right: Guy M. Bryan, Thomas H. Ball and K. W. Weir. Bottom row, left to right: Adolph Boldt, R. H. Spencer and Burke Baker. Mr. Bryan conceived the idea of obtaining a Federal Land Bank for Houston in 1916 and was assisted in presenting Houston's case by Mr. Weir, then president of the Chamber of Commerce; Mr. Boldt, then secretary of the Chamber of Commerce, and Colonel Ball. Burke Baker and Mr. Spencer were instrumental in obtaining the city's first steamship line.
Col. R. H. Baker, an ardent supporter of the Ship Channel, whose railway connections had brought him into contact with owners and operators of steamship lines, after conference with Jesse H. Jones and others in regard to obtaining a coastwise service for Houston, took up the matter with Mr. Raymond, president of the A. G. W. I. Lines, which included the Southern Steamship Company then operating a fleet from New York to Florida and Texas ports.

A promise was had to send a representative to Houston to look into the matter of giving Houston a New York and Philadelphia service, and to determine what size ships could safely negotiate Houston's waterway.

Burke Baker, at the instance of his father, Colonel Baker, made a trip to New York in order to help expedite the matter after that and was promised that Mr. Clements, special representative, would be sent to Houston with one of the steamship company's ablest captains to make the trip from Galveston to the Turning Basin and report upon the advisability of giving Houston a coastwise service.

On May 13, 1915, Mr. Clements reached Galveston, where Burke Baker and a small committee met him and without unnecessary publicity brought him to Houston upon former Mayor Rice's yacht, Zeeland.

Upon reaching Houston, Mr. Clements met with H. C. Schumacher, president of the Chamber of Commerce, and a few others in executive session. Houston's claim for a coastwise service was ably presented and assurances given that all commercial organizations in Houston, as well as in a number of other Texas cities, would get behind any steamship line which would first occupy the field.

Mr. Clements was greatly interested, and after looking over matters fully, declared he would make a very favorable report upon the proposition and was advised that A. S. Cleveland, R. H. Spencer, D. D. Peden, C. J. Desel and Burke Baker, as a committee, would conduct further negotiations in the matter.

In June, the Chamber of Commerce became uneasy, and H. C. Schumacher, its president, wired Mr. Kirby, who was then in the East, to ascertain why action had not been taken upon Mr. Clements' report.

Frank Bonner, assistant to President Kirby, and an ardent supporter of Houston's waterway, also thoroughly familiar therewith, was in New York, and Mr. Kirby arranged to have him try to get action. Mr. Bonner reported that Mr. Clements would be called to New York for a report and conference.

In order to insure as prompt action as possible, A. S. Cleveland and R. H. Spencer were sent to New York to clinch the matter. They carried with them a bond signed by the president of the Chamber of Commerce and 100 citizens, guaranteeing $1000 each to be paid the steamship line for any losses sustained in giving Houston the desired service.
The steamship owners, after conferences with the committee and among
themselves, in which Harvey Miller, now president of the Southern Steamship
Line, and G. W. De Lancy, now vice president and traffic manager, partici-
cipated, assured the committee that the Southern Steamship Line would arrange
to begin a monthly service between New York and Houston, at the same time
advising that the offered bond would not be required. The good news was fired
home and enthusiastically received.

Arrangements were made for the Satilla, one of the Southern Steamship Line
boats, to sail for Houston, reaching here about the middle of August. Mayor
Campbell decided to give the boat a royal reception and great preparations were
made to celebrate the arrival of the first coastwise steamship in Houston, Au-
gust 16.

I was appointed by Mayor Campbell chairman of a large committee on ar-
rangements. We secured prominent speakers for the occasion. By reference
to The Houston Chronicle of date August 15, I find upon the program Mayor
Campbell, address of welcome; Judge N. W. Phillips, chief justice Supreme
Court, subject: "Historic Recollections Suggested by Houston and Her Ship Chan-
nel;" Lieutenant Governor W. P. Hobby, "Beaumont heartily Welcomes the
Houston Ship Channel;" Hon. H. D. Lindsey, mayor of Dallas, "Greetings From
the North Texas Metropolis to Houston Upon Completion of Her Highway to the
Sea;" Hon. L. J. Wortham, Fort Worth, "The Interest of All Texas in Houston
as a Port;" Hon. W. W. Pope, president of the Farmers Union, "Interest of
Agriculture in the Houston Ship Channel."

Arrangements were made for a great watermelon feast, with more substan-
tial refreshments, and a gala day was expected. All plans were disarranged by
the great storm of 1915, which brought destruction in its wake, as well as great
loss of life. The Satilla rode the storm safety but was unable to reach Houston
until about the 20th of August, when she negotiated the Ship Channel and tied
up to Dock No. 1, where she was welcomed by a great many of our citizens.
Soundings of the channel were taken as she came up under her own power, and
all Houston rejoiced when they found that instead of the channel filling up as
some pessimistic prophets had claimed it would when any great storm came,
the channel actually had been deepened from a depth of one to three feet for
practically its whole distance.

The Southern Steamship Company immediately placed in effect a tariff simi-
lar to that in effect to Galveston and thus placed Houston merchants on an
equal competitive basis.

The institution of these low rates has proved one of the largest factors in
the development of Houston and the surrounding territory, and cities and towns
in interior Texas materially benefited by reduced rates to and from their com-
munities.
The owners of the Southern Steamship Company sustained severe losses incident to operating from New York to Houston, but instead of discontinuing the service, the northern terminus of the line was transferred in 1917 from New York to Philadelphia. The change afforded the opportunity to further reduce ocean rates in comparison with rates from New York on steamers of the Mallory and Morgan lines, which did not come to Houston.

In 1923 the Southern Steamship Company purchased two large steel steamships to give added service to its largely increased commerce to and from Houston, which were named City of Houston and City of Philadelphia.

The City of Houston was christened here on May 9, 1923, and Houston presented the steamer bearing its name with a beautiful silver service.

In 1924 two steamships were added to the Southern Steamship fleet and named City of Dallas and City of Fort Worth. Since that time other vessels have been placed in service bearing the names of San Antonio and West Texas. All of these boats, upon reaching Houston, were welcomed by large delegations from the cities and sections honored with a namesake.

Although the Southern Steamship Company maintained its service for a long time at a serious loss, it has kept faith with Houston and from bi-monthly sailings it now operates seven ships with a bi-weekly service to and from Houston.

When the world war came on the boats coming here could have been disposed of at three times what they were worth, but were kept in the service.

I recall having to go to Washington during the world war, when the government was thinking of commandeering the boats servicing Houston. J. S. Cullinan was then in Washington as transportation advisor. I conferred with him, Harvey Miller, president, and G. W. De Lancy, vice president and traffic manager, in regard to the matter, and we succeeded in inducing those in authority not to interfere with the Houston Line.

Unusual space is given this steamship line because it was the "pioneer" in a service helping to make Houston one of the great world ports.

HOUSTON GETS ON NATIONAL MAP

Prior to the adoption of the successful plan to bring deep water to Houston, many citizens of other states knew that Dallas, Galveston and San Antonio were in Texas, but had never heard of Houston.

When publicity was given to the fact that Houston was the greatest railway center in Texas, and had not only matched dollars with the national government in constructing a ship channel bringing ocean-going vessels 56 miles inland, but had built a municipal dock system at a cost of millions of dollars to accommodate ships using the channel, and paid-one-half the cost of two great dredges to maintain the waterway, national and international attention was thereby attracted.
Cleveland, Ohio, was then the outstanding example of the growth of cities situated upon the Great Lakes.

As I write this article I find, from the files of The Chronicle, of date two years ago, that Houston had challenged the interest of the business men of Cleveland.

R. W. Weir, President of the Chamber of Commerce, and Adolph Bolt, business manager, were joined by Sam Butler, a prominent railroad man in Houston, who had many friends in Cleveland, in an invitation requesting the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce to send a delegation down to "look Houston over".

In response thereto 100 business men from Cleveland came to see Houston, its industries, business establishments and homes.

Upon their arrival a committee from the Chamber of Commerce, headed by President Weir, took the visitors to the Rice Hotel for breakfast, and the Rotary Club entertained them at luncheon, at which Elijah Coles, club president presided. At his request the writer was made toastmaster and, with Mayor Campbell, addressed the group. In the afternoon 30 automobiles took them through the city and then to the Ship Channel, where they boarded boats for a visit to the San Jacinto Battleground. The visitors, through officials of the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce, said their party was all but overwhelmed with the warmth of Houston's greeting, and that as to her growth and achievements, the "half had never been told."

HOUSTON PLANS THIRTY-FOOT PROJECT

Before my retirement from congress, a national organization was perfected under the name of the Rivers and Harbors Congress.

Its members consisted of delegates from all sections, with the understanding that no individual projects would be indorsed, but the influences of all would be used to impress upon congress and the country the necessity of annual appropriations of not less than $50,000,000 for rivers and harbors. This organization has since met in Washington during each December session of congress.

In 1915 I was invited to deliver an address at their annual meeting and went to Washington with a representative delegation headed by J. S. Cullinan, an enthusiastic friend of the Ship Channel and an advocate of waterways generally.

While there I took up with Congressman Burgess, Texas member of the rivers and harbors committee; Senator Sheppard, Texas member of the senate commerce committee, and Joe H. Eagle, congressman from the Houston district, the matter of a survey for a 30-foot project for the channel. The house rivers and harbors committee was disinclined to authorize surveys for new projects, and it was decided to have Senator Sheppard provide the desired survey by amendment to the house bill when it reached the senate. I prepared a
form of the desired amendment authorizing "a survey to determine the advisability of further improvement of the Houston Ship Channel by an increase in depth, width or otherwise."

Thereby the United States engineers were authorized to favor its further improvement to such extent as they might see fit, and thus prevent the possibility of a turn-down which we could not afford. The amendment was adopted and concurred in by the house of representatives, and a quiet campaign was begun to get results.

Galveston had already secured the adoption and partial completion of a 30-foot depth for Galveston harbor, and Houston desired a channel of like depth.

Major Sneed was the government engineer in charge of the Galveston-Houston district and arrangements were made with him for a hearing to be held at the San Jacinto Inn.

Mayor Campbell headed a delegation, with John T. Scott as chairman, Camille Pillot, R. S. Sterling of the navigation and canal commissioners, C. H. Milby, A. S. Cleveland, E. A. Peden, R. M. Farrar, myself, and possibly others, to meet with Major Sneed. Mr. Scott requested me to prepare a memorandum of our demands and wishes in the matter, which was presented to Major Sneed, and the merits of which were strongly impressed upon him; the provisions thereof were substantially: (1) That the progress already made, facilities provided by the city, navigation district, private corporations and industries, and the development of commerce, had demonstrated the wisdom of providing a great inland waterway and harbor, worthy of further development by necessary funds provided by the national government and local contributors; (2) that an adequate channel would require a depth of not less than 35 feet and a width of 500 feet from Galveston to Morgans Point, and a like depth with 400 feet width to the Turning Basin; (3) that the minimum requirement for the present would be a depth of 30 feet, and width of 400 feet across the bay, with a width of 250 feet from Morgans Point to the terminus of Section 2, and from there a width of 200 feet to the Turning Basin.

The committee strongly urged Major Sneed not to require the navigation district to continue paying one-half the cost of further improvement, as well as to furnish rights-of-way and spoil grounds, a burden which no other project in the United States was required to bear.

Major Sneed appeared to be impressed, but gave no expression of opinion in the matter. Imagine Houston's delight when we were advised that Major Sneed had reported in favor of a 30-foot project all the way, with the minimum width which we had requested, at a cost of around $4,000,000, three-fourths of which should be borne by the national government and one-fourth by the navigation district.
FEDERAL LAND BANK SECURED FOR HOUSTON

One of the outstanding achievements of President Woodrow Wilson's administration was the passage of laws by congress creating the national system of Federal Reserve banks for general banking, and the Federal Land Bank system with the purpose of making loans to farmers, thereby enabling them to secure much lower interest rates for acquiring farms and ranches, as well as retiring previous loans thereon.

Dallas had secured one of the reserve banks, by reason of density of population in a radius of 150 miles therefrom in Texas, Oklahoma and parts of Arkansas and Louisiana, in which a far greater number of banks, national and state, were situated, as compared with other commercial centers in Texas, as well as Louisiana and Oklahoma. Houston bankers and commercial interests were disappointed because Houston had not been selected, although they joined Dallas and all other Texas aspirants therefor in a demand that Texas be given one of said banks.

In 1916, when the location of Federal Land banks was being considered, and it was given out that Hon. W. G. McAdoo, secretary of the treasury, heading a location board, was to visit Louisiana, Oklahoma and Texas to determine a location, Houston bankers and business men generally felt that New Orleans, which had failed to get a reserve bank, (as had Oklahoma, where lived Senator Owens, one of the authors of the laws creating the system) would have the edge in getting a Federal Land Bank.

Guy M. Bryan, active vice president of the then Lumbermen's National Bank, a kinsman of Stephen F. Austin, and other noted pioneers, was about the only banker in Houston with the hope and enthusiasm to plan a campaign to get a land bank here.

Knowing that I was a close friend of Secretary McAdoo and a good friend of two or three other members of the locating board, he took the matter up with me and vigorously urged that action be taken which would require a considerable sum for a successful campaign. Neither he nor I knew how we could get the money.

R. W. Wier, a citizen of high standing and large business interests, was fortunately president of the Houston Chamber of Commerce. We took the matter up with him and he was greatly impressed by Mr. Bryan's enthusiasm, and our belief in the possibility of landing the bank. He asked Mr. Bryan, "How much will it take?" Mr. Bryan replied, "Not less than $5000." Mr. Wier said, "We are short of funds, but if you think the bank can be had, the Chamber of Commerce will get the amount named."

Time was short, as the locating board was to be in New Orleans in a few days. We concluded it would be a good idea to go to New Orleans and attend the hearing, profit by the presentation of New Orleans' claim, and avoid mistakes which they might make.
President Weir took Mr. Bryan, Adolph Bolt, Chamber of Commerce business manager, and myself to the New Orleans hearing.

When the committee reached Houston we were "good and ready" for them. Mr. Weir appointed Frank Andrews chairman of a large and representative committee, which detailed Mr. Bryan, Mr. Bolt and myself to arrange for presentation of Houston's claim.

Maps were prepared showing:

(1) Density of population in North Texas and high prices of land, both gradually decreasing as they reached Houston.

(2) The large territory and acreage embraced in East Texas as far as Marshall; and Central Texas as far as Mexia.

(3) The territory in Southwest Texas as far as Brownsville and towards El Paso.

These maps showed a much less dense population and lower cost of land in use and vacant. Further, that citizens of this state and home seekers from other states could here acquire homes at less cost, and be aided by lower interest rates upon future mortgages - those held by money lenders - and amortize loans from the Federal Land Bank to acquire homes and improve them, at low interest rates with long time annual payments.

The committee arranged to have representatives of the Farmers Union, stock raisers and interested citizens, come to Houston from all parts of the territory mentioned and attend the hearing.

When Secretary McAdoo and his locating board called the meeting to order in the Federal Court Building, the crowd there gathered filled the courtroom and the corridors and reached through its doors.

Mr. Andrews, chairman of the committee, with preliminary, remarks introduced Mr. Bolt and myself as spokesmen for the committee. When our arguments and exhibits had been presented, we were thereafter quietly advised, not for publication, that Houston had made out its case and landed the bank.

One of our strong points was the fact that Houston had brought deep water 56 miles inland, where the sea met the 17 railways which maintained their general or local offices here.

No excuse is needed for bringing into the story of the Houston Ship Channel the location in 1917 of the Federal Land Bank, now one of the most outstanding in the system, which has greatly aided in rounding out Houston's development and activities.

But for the initiative of Guy M. Bryan, Jr., now deceased, the staunch backing of Bob Weir, as president of the Chamber of Commerce, and intelligent aid of Mr. Bolt, Houston may not have had the Federal Land Bank.
FOREWORD

The Chronicle continues publication today of Col. Thomas H. Ball's interesting history of the Port of Houston, its inception and development.

In today's installment, Colonel Ball pays high tribute to Capt. Charles Crotty, assistant port director, and tells of the shipment of the first bale of cotton to Manchester, England, Mayor Holcombe's first administration, and the creation of the new navigation board headed by the late E. A. Peden.

SUCCESSORS TO MAYOR CAMPBELL

Mayor Campbell, having ably served the city for two terms, declined nomination for a third term.

In addition to making the channel usable by the construction of city docks and wharves, he had entered upon and largely completed city improvements upon an unprecedented scale and his service to the city had involved great financial sacrifices to himself.

JOE PASTORIZA, MAYOR

In 1917 Joe Pastoriza was elected to succeed Mr. Campbell. To the great sorrow of a multitude of friends and admirers he died after serving a very short time.

J. C. HUTCHESON, JR., MAYOR

Judge J. C. Hutcheson succeeded Mayor Pastoriza and served until he resigned to accept appointment as federal district judge. Judge Hutcheson was thoroughly acquainted with city affairs as well as channel matters, having been city solicitor during Mayor Campbell's term and capably looked after the interests of the channel.

J. S. Cullinan had been elected president of the Chamber of Commerce and took a broad view as to all civic matters, with special interest in the development of the Ship Channel.
Together with the harbor board and navigation and canal commissioners, he laid plans for acquiring the necessary right of way for a deeper and wider channel, and Mayor Hutcheson cordially cooperated in the movement which afterward proved so timely.

EARL AMERMAN SUCCEEDS
MAYOR HUTCHESON

Judge Amerman, who had been county judge when the navigation district was created, and handled with the commissioners court all matters in connection therewith, was elected Mayor in 1918. Major Sneed's favorable report upon our 30-foot project had gone through regular channels to the chief of engineers in Washington and had been by him transmitted to the board of United States army engineers located in Washington.

I was sent to Washington to urge action upon the report and went before the board, together with Senator Sheppard and others. We secured favorable action thereon and it went to congress with approval of the chief of engineers and said board.

When such report came in, it was too late for the rivers and harbors committee to act thereon, so Congressman Eagle and myself took the matter up with Senator Sheppard. The senator and I went to Senator Jones of Washington, who had served with me in the house on the rivers and harbors committee and had become chairman of the senate commerce committee. We induced him to accept an amendment to the house bill offered by Senator Sheppard adopting the 30-foot project upon the terms embraced in Major Sneed's report, which amendment was accepted and became a part of the bill.

Contracts were promptly let by the district engineer, Maj. L. M. Adams, to the amount of the initial appropriation, but the 30-foot channel had only reached Baytown when available funds had been expended.

The city harbor board, upon the completion of city facilities, functioned only in an advisory capacity, and the navigation and canal commissioners were largely confined to active compliance with obligations of the navigation district to meet national government requirements.

Capt. B. C. Allin, who had had extensive experience as a railroad engineer, and had seen service in the Philippines during the Spanish-American war, came to Houston and sought a position with the Humble Oil Company, of which R. S. Sterling was president, and also chairman of the navigation and canal commission.

Mr. Sterling introduced Captain Allin to Mayor Amerman and recommended his employment as port director, his services to be paid for by the city and navigation district, which proposition was agreed to.
Mayor Campbell, before his retirement, had visioned a municipal belt service for the port, and tracks therefor had been laid to a limited extent. Mayor Amerman made additions thereto and at the time Captain Allin was selected port director the municipal belt tracks were under lease to the then I. and G. N. Railroad Company.

After Captain Allin's employment, he prepared plans for the further development of the belt system, as well as for construction of municipal docks and wharves.

PAGE CAPTAIN CHARLES CROTTY

Before continuing this narrative, let me bring into the picture Capt. Charles Crotty, whose name has been mentioned, but whose activities in channel matters are so interwoven with its development that he merits a chapter to himself.

He first began work on the Ship Channel April 20, 1904, under Capt. Edgar Jadwin, United States district engineer, in charge of surveys, and became superintendent in 1912, in charge of the operation of government dredges.

He was commissioned captain of engineers in April, 1917, was on engineering recruiting duty to September, and in active service during the world war, both in the United States and France, reaching France in February, 1916. He worked on roads in St. Mihiel sector to July 1 of that year and was in charge of dredges in operation and harbor work to July 12, 1919, reporting on conditions and facilities of various harbors in France and England.

He returned to the United States in August, 1919, and resumed connection with the Galveston engineer's office, being placed in charge of floating plant, dredges, derricks and tugs.

In April, 1920, after Port Director Allin's duties had become too great for one man, Captain Allin asked him if he would consider resigning his government position to accept the position of assistant director of the Port of Houston. Captain Crotty consented, provided the navigation board desired his services, defined his duties and responsibilities, and was willing to pay an adequate salary. The navigation board complied with his terms, and he accepted the position, which he has since held.

His knowledge of the channel from its inception, his acquaintance and standing with the corps of United States Engineers, coupled with his great ability, pleasing personality and "hankering" for work, have made his services invaluable, and his connection with the Houston waterway has been longer than that of anyone else except the writer. All officials have leaned upon him heavily and when time could not be spared by officials serving without compensation, or matters came up with which they were not thoroughly familiar, it became the habit to say, "See Crotty," or "Ask Crotty."
THIRTY-FOOT PROJECT ADOPTED

When Major Sneed's report, through regular channels, went to the chief of engineers at Washington, it became his duty to submit same to the board of United States army engineers located in Washington.

This board had been created under a law passed while I was a member of Congress, framed by Chairman Burton, Judge Reeves of Illinois, Judge Page Morris of Minnesota, and myself. The object thereof was to safeguard government expenditures upon rivers and harbors and answer the charge of "pork barrel" appropriations urged by metropolitan journals which usually favored only major projects upon the Great Lakes, Atlantic and Pacific seaboards and Gulf of Mexico; also to forestall criticism from representatives of states having no waterways.

Mayor Campbell and the navigation board requested me to go to Washington and appear before the board of engineers, which I did.

Mr. Burgess, Texas member of the rivers and harbors committee; Senator Sheppard of the senate commerce committee, Congressman Eagle from the Houston district, and one or two others, joined me in advocating the adoption of Major Sneed's report.

After the hearing upon our 30-foot project, it was sent to Congress, with the approval of the chief of engineers and said board.

When their report came in it was too late for the rivers and harbors committee to act upon it, so Mr. Burgess, Congressman Eagle and myself took the matter up with Senator Sheppard. The senator and I went to Senator Jones of Washington, who had served with me on the rivers and harbors committee of the house, and had become the chairman of the senate commerce committee. We induced him to accept an amendment to the house bill, to be offered by Senator Sheppard, carrying an authorized appropriation of around $4,000,000 for the construction of the 30-foot project upon the terms embraced in Major Sneed's report. Said amendment was accepted by the house of representatives and became a part of the bill.

Since that time the navigation district has not been required to contribute to the cost of channel improvements or maintenance. However, to comply with government requirements, a heavy burden has continued to be borne by the navigation district, to meet the increasing expenses of providing rights-of-way and spoil grounds, as and when required for further improvements.

Contracts were promptly let by the district engineer for the Galveston-Houston district and the 30-foot channel was under way, but had only reached Baytown.
Funds to Complete
30-Foot Project

Sufficient funds not being available to complete the 30-foot project, and the Humble Company having dug its own 30-foot channel to intercept it, and constructed its own system of dock and wharves, all industries and other oil companies situated on the upper reaches of the Channel and around the Turning Basin were greatly handicapped. The City and Navigation and Canal Commissioners were importuned to take steps to relieve the situation.

First Direct Cotton Shipments Abroad.

During Mayor Campbell's administration, the city had constructed on the north side of the Ship Channel, at the head of navigation, cotton sheds and warehouse facilities with long wharves in front thereof to accommodate shipments of cotton, which was the principal product using the port.

W. C. Hunt, agent for foreign steamship lines, induced the Leyman-Harrison British Line to establish a regular service between Port Houston, Great Britain and England and was given a preferential assignment for the vessels thereof at the cotton docks and wharves. As Captain Henry of Show Boat fame says, "This was only the beginning."

Daniel Ripley, an original member of the City Harbor Board and who in connection with his steamship agency had acquired the use of a number of United States shipping board vessels, in November, 1919, loaded the Merry Mount with a cargo containing over 23,000 bales of cotton for direct shipment to Liverpool. Not long thereafter, one of the Leyland-Harrison boats went out from Port Houston with a cargo containing over 24,000 bales. From that time until now, in addition to coastwise business, an increasingly large number of vessels engaged in foreign commerce, as well as tramp steamers, have plied between Houston and all world ports.

Mayor Holcombe in Charge

Mayor Amerman having resigned, O. F. Holcombe was elected to succeed him, and his administration included some of the most important epochs in the development of the Houston Ship Channel since the adoption of the original 25-foot project.

After his inauguration, Mayor Holcombe appointed a new City Harbor Board.

I was made chairman, R. M. Farrar, vice chairman, and Brady Steele, R. J. Cummins and D. S. Cage, members thereof, and we were given to understand that we would be expected to give necessary time and attention to the matter of considering important improvements which the mayor had in mind.
Funds to Complete
30-Foot Project

Mayor Holcombe for the city, Mr. Sterling for the Navigation and Canal
Commission, and I for the City Harbor Board, concluded to send a committee
to Washington to secure funds to complete the 30-foot project from Baytown
to the Turning Basin. The mayor, F. M. Law, R. C. Fulbright, Mr. Becker,
H. H. Haines, business manager of the Chamber of Commerce; Captain Allin
and myself made the trip to Washington and on January 23, 1922, with Senator
Sheppard, Congressman Garrett and Senator Mayfield, presented to the rivers
and harbors committee convincing arguments in support of adequate funds to
bring the 30-foot project to the Turning Basin. Congress appropriated the amount
necessary to complete the project, and again another hurdle was surmounted and
another fight won for an adequate waterway to accommodate deep draft vessels
ready and willing to come more than fifty miles inland to care for the great com-
merce desiring to use our port.

First Bale of Cotton
To Manchester

To me, and no doubt to thousands of others, one of the most thrilling ex-
periences in connection with the creation and development of the Houston Ship
Channel was the loading of the first bale of Texas cotton at Houston upon a ves-
sel directly bound to Manchester, England. This bale was grown in the lower
Rio Grande Valley and on June 7, 1922, was consigned to "H. W. Garrow & Co.,"
Houston cotton factors.

The senior member of this firm was H. W. Garrow, who was president
of the Houston Cotton Exchange in 1897 when the original government survey
was made of the channel. Mr. Garrow also was a member of the original deep
water committee and was especially active in matters affecting the channel dur-
ing the five successive years of his presidency from 1897 to 1902 inclusive.
Upon its arrival, the bale of cotton was auctioned off on the floor of the Cotton
Exchange, was bought by the Garrow firm for $1200 and by that firm was
shipped as a present to the Manchester Cotton Association to be resold for
charitable purposes.

Upon reaching Manchester, a large number of the members of the Manches-
ter Royal Exchange attended the auction of the bale, the Lord Mayor of Manches-
ter acting as auctioneer. In introducing the mayor, Sir Arthur Howorth expressed
the belief and hope that the common interests of Manchester and Houston would
be promoted by commerce between the ports. The bale was sold for 331 pounds,
about $1655, and the proceeds were distributed among the Lancashire medical in-
stitutions for the purposes announced.
MORE PORT PIONEERS

Left to right, above: Capt. Charles Crockett, Mayor Oscar F. Holcombe and D. S. Cage, member of the new navigation board created with E. A. Peden as chairman. At lower left is shown the first bale of cotton to be shipped from Port Houston to Manchester, England, and lower right is the late Mr. Peden.
Four Houstonians prominent in the development of the Houston Ship Channel and a photographic record of an historic event are shown.

Top row, left to right, are shown the late E. A. Peden, the late D. S. Cage, Captain Charles Crotty, assistant director of the port at the time, and Mayor Oscar F. Holcombe. The lower photograph shows a scene aboard the steamship Steadfast, June 7, 1922, when the first cotton shipped from Houston to a kindred port—Manchester, England—was loaded for export.
The president of the Manchester Cotton Association, in turn acquired the bale and it was sold for the benefit of the Yorkshire Medical Institutions. Pictures of the bale were taken at Houston showing names of the consignors and consignees and the Manchester Guardian published a glowing account of the reception and sale of the bale with a picture of the assembly attending the sale thereof.

I have before me a clipping from the Houston Post, in which was produced a picture of the first bale, the assemblage present, and an account of the auction on the Royal Exchange at Manchester. The clipping quotes me as saying: "When I first became connected officially with the development of the Houston Ship Channel, I recall that the late Maj. E. W. Cave always compared its possibilities to that of the Manchester canal, upon which about $100,000,000 had been expended for development. It is also noteworthy that Captain Chambers, the government terminal expert, who recently visited Houston and approved the Port Commission's plans for additional wharves, docks and facilities, stated in a public address that the Manchester canal was more typical of our channel than any other project within his knowledge, but that we had the advantage of having a sea level canal instead of the lock and dam system necessary at Manchester.

"Is it not a speedy consummation of the hopes of early advocates of the Houston Ship Channel, considering the difficulties to be overcome, that the first bale of cotton for 1922 was shipped direct from the Port of Houston to Manchester? Could anything be more noteworthy as marking the great success of the enterprise?"

H. W. Garrow during his lifetime never ceased his interest in the Ship Channel. His sons have continued the business of cotton factors under the firm name of Garrow & Garrow, J. W. Garrow having been president of the Cotton Exchange in 1929-30.

FOUR MILLION DOLLAR BOND ISSUE REQUESTED

An election was called for December 30, 1922, to authorize the issuance by the navigation district of a $4,000,000 bond issue to construct wharves, grain elevators, municipal belt improvements and other facilities upon the Ship Channel.

E. A. Peden, chairman; R. S. Sterling, vice president; R. M. Farrar, D. S. Cage, commissioners, and I as counsel, addressed an appeal to the voters of Harris County to authorize such bond issue.

The address recited at length the appropriations made by the national government and the navigation district for improvements of the Ship Channel from its adoption, including the expenditure by the city of more than $3,000,000 to construct the initial dock facilities and beginning of municipal belt construction.
The people were advised that such public improvements were fast becoming self-sustaining and that the port was unable to give commerce adequate accommodation; that when the "Satilla" reached Houston in August, 1915, the imports and exports of commodities using the channel represented a tonnage of 106,941, of the value of $5,000,000; whereas, from January 1, 1921, to September 30, a period of nine months, a tonnage of 724,137, value $45,750,534, had been reached; and from January 1, 1922 to September 30, 1922, the tonnage was 1,238,739 tons, value $67,313,726, which increase was but a sign-post pointing to a growth which challenged the optimism of our widest-visioned citizens. The fact was pointed out that a great number of privately owned facilities had been constructed, in addition to public facilities, and that 18 oil refineries or storage plants were using the channel, paying large taxes to the district and either furnishing their own wharves or paying regular prices where municipal wharves were used, it being estimated that around $75,000,000 had been invested in manufacturing and industrial plants located upon or adjacent to the channel since 1915; and that the port's ability to take care of them and other industries seeking locations, would largely depend upon the action of voters.

Mention was made that as of date August 10, 1922, 14 named steamship lines were using the channel, of which only two were confined to coastwise service; the others reaching all foreign ports. The voters were advised that its defeat would be a public calamity and arrest the development of the city, county and port.

Emphasis was given to the fact that the last legislature had authorized the creation of Port Houston, comprising all of Harris County and the taking over of the City of Houston's docks, wharves and other facilities at a rental equal only to the net revenues thereof after paying cost of maintenance, under a 30-year lease, upon terms provided by the law.

The voters of Harris County responded to the appeal by a majority much larger than was required, and vigorous steps were taken to carry out the will of the people.

**CONSOLIDATION HARBOR BOARD AND CANAL COMMISSION**

Soon after his inauguration, Mayor Holcombe, after consultation with Mr. Sterling, chairman of the navigation and canal commission, myself as chairman of the city harbor board and others, reached the conclusion that development upon the channel below the city limits made it advisable to consolidate the harbor board and canal commission and have one governing body in control of channel matters. He requested Sewall Myer, city attorney, and myself to prepare a bill for presentation to the Texas legislature to carry out the proposition and enlarge the functions of the new board so as to cover anticipated future needs. It was agreed that the new county body should be further authorized to take over all city facilities and thereby avoid duplication and unnecessary expense.
As always happens when a status quo in regard to duties and responsibilities is to be changed, the rumor started and began to spread that the city was preparing to unload its facilities and the payment of the bonds issued for their construction upon the county as a whole.

Ed Harrell, a kinsman of the mayor, and a live wire taxpayer, associated himself with Farmer Brown, one of our best citizens, who had property upon the channel; Mr. Bains representing the cattlemen of Harris County, and a number of others to block what they believed to be a plan to put a burden upon the taxpayers of the county and relieve the city of a portion of the tax burdens which it had voluntarily assumed.

They notified our legislative representatives of their wish to be heard upon the proposed bill, and the county authorities of their objections. County Judge Chester Bryan and J. W. Hall, a member of the legislature from Harris County, advised me that while they looked with favor upon the general idea of consolidation, it was their duty to see that the interests of the county were conserved under any plan adopted.

I told them that some of the fears expressed were reasonable, and arranged a conference in my office with Judge Bryan, Mr. Hall, Mr. Harrell, Mr. Bains and Farmer Brown, on Sunday, that day being chosen for "ox in the ditch work," because Mr. Hall had to return to his legislative duties Monday. When the contestants assembled, I told them we were willing to go the limit in promoting harmony among Harris County Taxpayers without regard to the fact that Houston paid 85 per cent of all county taxes; that the bill presented would be drawn so as to satisfy them and contain provisions that would render possible developments on both sides of the channel, without regard to city limits, secure economy by consolidation of the two boards, and give assurance against exorbitant tax burdens.

They invited a definite proposition which I submitted in substance as follows:

1. That while the navigation law then in force limited bond issues for channel propositions to an amount which could be retired upon a basis of 25 per cent tax upon property, such limitation would be reduced to 10 per cent.

2. That the new navigation board would be authorized to acquire lands by condemnation or otherwise for channel purposes, with the right to build further improvements anywhere on each side of the channel.

3. That authority would be given to lease or buy lands or other facilities except those belonging to the city of Houston.

4. The new board would be given authority to lease all city improvements, including its belt line, and pay for the use thereof an annual rental not to exceed the revenues derived therefrom after deducting the expenses of maintaining and improving same, with the option to buy all city unimproved lands adjacent to the channel at a value to be agreed upon or fixed by arbitration.
5. That the governing board be known as the Navigation and Canal Commission, and to consist of two members appointed by the city and two members by the county; the chairman to be named by joint action of the county judge and commissioners and the mayor and City Council, each of which bodies consisted of five members.

Such provisions would give the county a fifty-fifty break with the city in all matters and the new board would start out with a nucleus of valuable improvements, reduced overhead, and would relieve further improvements from the jurisdiction of separate boards.

Without a dissenting voice, the plan was wholeheartedly agreed upon and Mr. Harrell, Mr. Bains and Mr. Brown agreed to go to Austin that night with Mr. Myer and myself and actively support the bill, Mr. Hall to introduce it and have it joined in by the other representatives from Harris County. Mr. Myer and myself framed the bill as agreed upon and were joined by the contestants in securing its passage by the legislature during the closing week of its regular session.

The bill, as passed, carried with it the right of a navigation district containing a city of more than 100,000 population to have certain rights and privileges, and was submitted to the voters of Harris County. It was carried by a larger majority than did the original bill to create a navigation district.

This consolidation was one of the outstanding achievements of city and county authorities. It promoted harmonious co-operation, greater efficiency and economy in operations, and avoided the necessity of railways, industries, land owners and others interested in commerce, rate making, locations, future improvements and port activities, having to deal with the city and county through separate boards.

NEW NAVIGATION BOARD CREATED

When the new law went into effect, R. S. Sterling was chairman of the Board of Navigation and canal commissioners, of which I was a member and counsel therefor, as well as chairman of the City Harbor Board.

For a long time there had been a rivalry between the Commissioners Court and the City Council, each jealous in a way of possible intrusions into their respective spheres, which had been a factor in local politics.

The board of canal commissioners and the City Harbor Board were functioning together, and usually held joint sessions for consideration of all matters.

To eliminate, as far as possible, either county or city obtaining advantage in the direction of affairs, and the probability of politics marring the usefulness of the new board, it was deemed best to select a chairman not actively identified with city-county politics.
E. A. Peden, who had built up a large business, always co-operating in measures to push Houston and Harris County to the front, and who had served with credit and distinction as federal food administrator for Texas during the world war, was being considered for the chairmanship of the new board, which he was reluctant to take, although acceptable to both the city and county.

Upon the invitation of the board I had a conference with Mr. Peden and Mr. Scott in regard to the chairmanship.

Mr. Peden declared that the pressing demands of his own business would not permit him to accept the position unless I became counsel for the board to whom he could refer matters of detail for consideration and report thereon to him. They suggested my acceptance of a salary of $5000 per annum, which they considered inadequate for the tax upon my time, as the work would have to be given preferred attention. I agreed to accept this salary, stating that neither myself nor my firm would represent clients seeking location on the Ship Channel or take cases against the Navigation District, although a part of such business would naturally come to us because of identification with the Ship Channel from its inception.

Mr. Peden was unanimously elected the first chairman of the new board; Mr. Sterling and Mr. Farrar were appointed county representatives, and D. S. Cage and R. J. Cummins city members.

The new board convened and elected Mr. Sterling vice chairman, and myself counsel, at the suggested salary, and I went on the payroll for the first time.

CONTRACT FOR LEASE OF CITY FACILITIES

To carry out the provisions of the new navigation law I was directed by the board to prepare lease of all city facilities, with option to buy any city lands desired by the board, in accordance with legislative restrictions.

H. A. Halverton was elected city commissioner in 1913, when Mayor Campbell was first elected. From the date of such election Mr. Halverton always ran upon his own merits, without going upon any slate, and when elected worked in harmony with the mayor and other commissioners. When Mayor Campbell undertook to build the city dock and wharf system, Commissioner Halverton was named chairman of a committee to look after city Ship Channel matters, J. H. B. House being appointed as the other member.

Mr. Halverton made an intensive study of city plans and channel development and co-operated with the City Harbor Board and Mayor Campbell during his two terms, and his successors from 1919 until 1929, in helping to solve problems when they arose. When I had the lease of city facilities prepared, it
was submitted to Mr. Myer, city attorney, and Commissioners Halverton and House for consideration. When approved by them, the lease was adopted by the City Council practically without change. It is still in force and its provisions have proven satisfactory to the city and Port Commission.

Mr. Halverton has told me more than once that it was fair, understandable and workable.

When the new board took over the city facilities, practically all of them were either at the head of the Turning Basin or upon the south side of the channel, including the Manchester Dock, outside the city limits.
FOREWORD

The Chronicle today continues the publication of Col. Thomas H. Ball's history of the Port of Houston, telling of the creation of the pilot board, arranging the operation of the municipal belt railroad, the acquisition of the state's submerged lands, and R. S. Sterling's appointment as chairman of the port commission.

POLICY ADOPTED AS TO INSURANCE FOR NAVIGATION AND CITY PROPERTIES

Soon after E. A. Peden qualified as chairman of the Port Commission, Houstoun & Tyler, one of the leading Houston insurance agencies, came before the port commission and presented a plan which they claimed would be highly advantageous in insuring city and Navigation District properties.

They proposed at their own expense to make a thorough survey of such properties and submit a general plan that would result in large savings and other advantages, without charge for services if their plan was not adopted.

When the survey was made it appeared that city properties were insured upon the basis of their costs, which included foundations and sub-structures not necessarily insurable. They offered to prepare a standard form of insurance to be approved by me as counsel, to be used in all policies expiring at stated intervals, instead of on different dates.

The adoption of the plan they suggested resulted in a large saving in insurance premiums.

As city insurance policies were being issued by a minority of the qualified agencies, it was decided that, without disturbing insurance in force, future insurance be given to all reputable agents until placed upon an equality, with due consideration to the number of companies represented, number of offices used, and number of employees connected with such agencies.

It was necessary to have someone represent the port, to look after keeping up insurance, claims arising thereunder, and the placing and distribution of policies.
It was decided to appoint Houston & Tyler insurance representatives, and in lieu of other compensation, to give them a larger proportion of insurance, the premiums of which would justify them in employing additional help.

Captain Crotty, Mr. Archer and myself were authorized to look after distribution of insurance among Houston agencies, and to so place future insurance upon city and Navigation District properties as to equitably cut down the percentage of the selected agents.

We recommended that all insurance be placed with agencies maintaining an office and place of business in Harris County, and as far as practicable, in companies represented by general agencies maintaining offices in Houston.

Under direction of the Port Commission, this plan was carried out in a way to reasonably satisfy all insurance agencies in Houston. I think only two exceptions to the plan have been made.

Rates for fire insurance being fixed by the state insurance board, no competition could be had among bidders but rates for tornado insurance were not so fixed.

After hurricanes had caused great losses upon the Atlantic and Gulf Coast, tornado rates were considerably increased and were made applicable to points within a 50-mile radius from the storm area, which included Houston, where storm losses were far below those upon the coast. The grain elevator, and a large number of docks and wharves upon the Ship Channel were thereby subject to outrageous rates. John R. Young and A. D. Langham, representing many companies, proposed a rate much less than one-half the prevailing rate, if given all storm insurance, which proposition was accepted. Because of the "hot water" they thereby got into, such rates could not thereafter be made. Since expiration of their policies, the Port Commission has carried very little storm insurance, and has suffered losses much less than the premiums which they would have paid therefor. The only exception was in the matter of marine insurance, which became necessary after the Houston fire boat was constructed.

Adams and Porter, who conducted a large marine insurance business, offered a very reasonable rate, provided they were given the port's marine insurance, and agreed to look after all claims arising thereunder, which proposition was accepted.

The port, city and other owners of public buildings could only insure their property for one year under the policy adopted by insurance companies and followed by the state board, after it was created; while the owners of all privately owned buildings, including residences, could obtain three-year policies at a great saving.
By direction of the Port Commission, I went before the state board with facts showing conclusively that fire losses upon public buildings were less in proportion than upon privately owned buildings, and there was no good sense in denying them three-year policies.

The attorney for a large number of foreign insurance companies doing business in Texas made formal objections to the proposition, but at the conclusion of the argument W. A. Tarver, chairman of the board, publicly stated that, speaking for himself, he saw no merit in the objections, but the board would consider the matter and take action. Within a few days the board acted favorably upon our application, which resulted in large savings to the port, the city and many municipally-owned structures.

In all matters connected with port insurance, I consulted freely with John L. Wortham, a former member of the railroad commission, who had established a large insurance agency in Houston and had become one of its best citizens, and more especially with the firm of Cravens, Dargan & Co., which firm maintained the largest independent insurance management in the South, having their general offices here, with the companies which they represented distributed among practically all of the local companies. They placed no policies directly, but equitably through such agencies, and freely gave counsel in regard to the best manner in which to secure reduced rates and advantages to the port commission in effecting its insurance.

Mention of all the excellent insurance agencies in Houston cannot be made, but such agencies and their employes have been an important factor in the development of the city and port.

PILOT BOARD CREATED

Prior to January 18, 1923, by the general laws of Texas, pilots and branch pilots for Texas harbors and waterways were appointed by the governor of Texas, and, of course, as in other like matters, politics constituted a factor in such appointments.

Galveston, the great harbor, had pilots so appointed, while Houston and practically all other waterways had branch pilots only. Upon the creation of the navigation district in 1911, Governor Colquitt appointed E. A. Peden, Pat Foley, John S. Bonner, W. S. Cochran and Jack O'Neal pilot commissioners, who dealt with the branch pilots operating upon the channel, with such limited authority as they had naturally, when complaints came to the port commission of accidents, conduct of pilots, and charges for pilotage, and they undertook to adjust complaints or controversies, only polite attention was paid the port commission by the branch pilots, as it was without jurisdiction over them. Under conditions then existing, branch pilots upon the Houston ship channel were practically subject to the jurisdiction of the pilots at Galveston and could not carry a boat to sea or bring one from the gulf to Houston, except by agreement with Galveston pilots, and at a charge practically fixed by them. I knew them all and was the contact man with them.
Four insurance men who helped to Houston port commission cut costs on port properties are shown in the top row. They are, left to right, James Cravens, John R. Hang, George A. Tyler and John J. Wortham. In the bottom row are shown three of the principal figures in the movement which resulted in the navigation district obtaining title to all submerged lands and islands within the ship channel area from the state. They are, left to right: Then-Port Director B. C. Mallin, who originated the movement; J. W. Hall, then state senator, who introduced such a bill at Lansing; and former State Land Commissioner J. T. Robison who co-operated in the project.
Learning that the Houston branch pilots had a bill pending in the legislature in charge of Representative J. P. Rogers, which would give them some relief, I invited Capt. Joseph Weikerth, the oldest pilot on the channel, and who commanded the relief boats to Galveston after the great storm, and Capt. James Birch (both of whom have since passed away), and Capt. Charlie O'Brien, to meet with Mr. Cage and myself. I told them of the great disadvantages under which they and the port commission labored in matters affecting branch pilot service upon the channel, and that if they were willing to give the port commission control of their appointments, with power to discipline or remove them or their subordinates and fix charges of pilotage, I would prepare and have put through the legislature a bill making them full pilots with right to choose deputies and pilot vessels from Houston to the gulf or to bring ships for the gulf to the Turning Basin. I stated that but for the creation of the navigation district and expenditures by it of large sums of money, there would be no ship channel and no pilots to use it; that the port commission was serving without pay; the director of the port and all employees, including myself, were subject to control of the port commission and required to obey its orders and rules; and I knew of no reason why they should not cast their lots with others upon the public payroll. Mr. Cage, in his modest, but informed and intelligent way, backed me up, and they agreed to consider the proposed bill. The bill was drawn so as to affect only our navigation district, by carrying the usual provision making it applicable only to districts containing 100,000 or more population. In substance, it provides:

1. That the navigation and canal commissioners of such navigation district should constitute a pilot board with exclusive jurisdiction over the pilotage of boats from the Gulf of Mexico and their respective ports;

2. To fix rates of pilotage between the Gulf of Mexico and such ports, and intermediate stops upon navigable streams within such districts;

3. To determine the qualifications of applicants for position of branch pilots or deputies, and approve same; and,

4. Branch pilots, upon filing a certificate of such approval, accompanied by a five thousand dollar ($5000) Bond, approved by the navigation and canal commissioners, and with usual oath of office, were thereupon appointed by the governor, for a term of two years, unless dismissed from service by the navigation and canal commissioners.

The managers of the local Branch Pilots Association gave the bill approval, and Captain O'Brien and Charles Baether accompanied me to Austin and had Representative Rogers substitute it for his bill and go with us before the proper committee to ask that it be favorably reported; which was done on the same day.
The bill passed the house by 117 yeas, two nays, was signed by R. E. Seagler, speaker, now a prominent attorney in Houston; was passed in the senate by 29 yeas, no nays, and was signed by T. W. Davidson, president of the senate, recently appointed federal district judge. On February 22, 1923, the bill was signed by Pat M. Neff, governor and became effective at once, as it carried the emergency clause.

I know of no precedent for such bill, in any other state, and its workings have resulted in having this port served by branch pilots and deputies, constituting as fine a body of men as can be found anywhere. They have acted in close co-operation with the Galveston board of pilots and by proper interchange of service and division of fees, the Houston pilots have been able to meet or deliver boats at Galveston, and give the Ship Channel a speedier, more efficient and satisfactory service.

RAILROAD OPERATION
MUNICIPAL BELT ARRANGED

The Municipal Belt Railway was giving valuable service and had aided in securing locations of industries upon the channel.

It had extended its service on the south side, through Harrisburg, to a point opposite Cotton Patch Bayou, where Horton & Horton had their shell plant, said concern having built their own industrial spur track to connect with the belt, and contracted to pay 7 per cent interest on the cost of the belt extension for a period of years.

When constructed, such extension went under the lease to the international Great Northern Railway, then operating the belt, with a sub-lease to the Yoakum lines. Ability to promise its service to new industries was impaired by reason of the lease and lack of funds; also by the unwillingness of the I.G.N., the owner of valuable lands and channel frontage on the south side, and the Southern Pacific Lines, owners of lands and frontage on the north side, to have industries served by them accorded Municipal Belt service.

These problems were partially solved by agreement, but their existence inspired the city and port commission with the determination to provide a Municipal Belt service which would give all industries upon both sides of the channel uniform switching rates, without discrimination.

Houston was rapidly growing, and large corporations and industries were being attracted by the phenomenal development of the port. The Gulf, Colorado and Santa Fe, the Yoakum lines and the Katy lines, as well as the Houston Belt and Terminal Railroad Company, owned by the Trinity and Brazos Valley Railroad, the Rock Island lines and Santa Fe Railroad, were at a great disadvantage in seeking to serve industries already located and those seeking location.
General Pettibone, vice president and general manager of the Santa Fe, was determined to get access to channel tonnage, as was the Missouri-Kansas-Texas and lines other than the Southern Pacific and International-Great Northern. He talked with the mayor, Mr. Sterling and Mr. Farrar, and confidentially assured them that he would provide funds for necessary municipal belt construction to be repaid when convenient. This assurance gave opportunity for a bold stroke.

An invitation was extended to all operating officials of the several railroads in Houston to meet in the library of my former firm, which Frank Andrews had tendered because of its convenience. The invitation was accepted and the meeting was attended by the railway officials. Mayor Holcombe and the chairman and members of the port commission, with myself as counsel.

Mayor Holcombe and Chairman Peden requested me to state the purpose of the meeting. Upon their authority, I stated that it was the determination of the port authorities to provide a belt system to serve all industries, public or private, upon both sides of the Ship Channel, within the switching limits, at the existing rate of $8.10 per carload.

That this purpose could best be realized by turning over to the railways reaching Houston all existing Municipal Belt facilities for operation under a satisfactory contract, the Navigation District to bear the cost of providing rights of way and all Municipal Belt extensions to serve industries to be hereafter located upon the Ship Channel.

That if the railways would not agree thereto, the port authorities would equip and operate a Municipal Belt Railway regardless of profit or loss, in the belief that the city and Navigation District would benefit thereby in the way of increased population, a larger commerce, the coming of new industries, and increased taxable values of property in the district.

General Pettibone of the Santa Fe expressed himself vigorously and tersely in favor of the proposition, and declared the willingness of the Santa Fe to join the other railways in providing necessary funds to enable the Navigation District to make proper improvements upon its belt system, should the railways take it over under an operating contract.

W. R. Scott, an outstanding railroad operator, who had recently come to Houston from California to take charge of the Southern Pacific lines, stated that the proposition was a novel one, to which he had not given consideration, but that he felt sure his lines might go along, if such arrangement could be satisfactorily worked out.

After discussion, it was decided to appoint a committee to consider the matter, consisting of Mr. Scott as chairman; Mr. Hershey, traffic manager of the Santa Fe; Captain Allin, port director; and myself to report back to the meeting. The committee met in Mr. Scott's office for further discussion. He requested a statement of what we had in mind; whereupon I told him that under the proposed plan the Municipal Belt would be expected to serve industries on the north side of the channel, then served only by his railway, as
well as the south side, where many industries were partially served by his and other railways. He stated that while the matter had been mentioned to him, nothing had been said about North Side Municipal Belt construction. I replied that the port authorities expected to build extensive facilities upon the north side, and would not consider the service of present or future industries being monopolized by a single railway; and that his Clinton branch could well be used as a part of the Municipal Belt, upon an agreed basis. He stated further that it would not suit his company to have the Clinton branch so used, as they had other plans in mind (no doubt referring to the fact that they contemplated extensive improvements, which have since been made at Clinton). He disarmed us, however, by the suggestion that if an agreement could be reached his road would bear its proper part of the cost of constructing the proposed Municipal Belt. We reported to the conference in favor of the proposition; and the port authorities were requested to prepare a contract for consideration by the railway companies.

The port commission appointed a committee to prepare plans and specifications for proposed Municipal Belt construction, as well as for future constructions, and the form of contract with the railroads to operate same. Mr. Farrar who had had extensive experience in a business way as a banker and lumberman, Captain Allin and I were made members of the committee. Captain Allin had maps prepared showing location of all Municipal Belt terminals and tracks, as well as plans for railroad yards and terminals upon the north side, and proposed belt constructions to be made, with future lines extending upon the north side to Lynchburg and the south side to Morgan's Point.

Mr. Scott and J. S. Pyeatt, vice president and general manager of the Yoakum lines, were the principal consultants for the railroad officials.

Naturally Mr. Scott and Mr. Hamilton, who had recently come to Houston as president of the I. & G. N., desired to retain as much as possible the advantages then enjoyed by their respective lines as owners of lands adjacent to the Channel and industries served by them. The port representatives were determined to have the Municipal Belt system to serve all industries and obtain as free access as possible to the Channel for all other railways. Mr. Scott expressed the view that the Clinton terminals, as well as industries then or thereafter to be located upon lands belonging to the Southern Pacific on the north side, should be exempted from the plan. Mr. Hamilton and Horace Booth, traffic manager of the I. & G. N., insisted that industries located upon land sold them by the I. and G. N. should likewise be exempted from the plan.

After arguments pro and con, it was agreed that the Clinton terminals, which could not be condemned for use by any railway, should be exempted, and that the Southern Railway might continue to serve industries located upon its lands and being served by it; with the right of the Municipal Belt to have access thereto, Mr. Hamilton agreed to except from the proposed Belt service only the large and expensively constructed docks and wharves of Anderson, Clayton & Co., to whom the railway had sold the lands occupied thereby, and other industries then served exclusively by the I. & G. N; the owners thereof to have belt service if they so desired. The other railway lines consented there to as being the best terms to be had.
The ability of the port commission to command the co-operation of these great railway systems, by creation of the Port Terminal Railroad Association, has proven a great factor in the development of Port Houston.

Soon after the operating contract became effective, in July 1924, railroad yards, buildings and terminals were provided for the Municipal Belt, and all railway lines assigned separate tracks in the belt yards.

**OPERATING CONTRACT**
**PREPARED AND EXECUTED**

With the aid of designated counsel for the railways, I prepared a contract embracing the terms and conditions upon which the member railways would take over and operate all Municipal Belt Lines and maintain them. Under provisions thereof, the Navigation District obliged itself to provide lands needed for rights-of-way, and construct railroad tracks thereon to serve industries then or thereafter located upon the Ship Channel. The contract was approved by the port commission, the railways and their counsel, with one exception.

It provided a uniform switching rate of $8.10 per loaded car, to and from industries, docks and wharves, with a lesser rate for empty cars, which rate was then in force by authority of the railroad commission.

The member railroads insisted that the switching service they would render would include increased mileage and justify a switching charge of $12.00 per loaded car or a minimum of $10.00. The Port Commission was astonished by this demand for an increase above existing switching rates, and felt that the lesser rate which the Navigation District would receive, as compared with what the I. & G. N. and Yoakum lines had been paying, should be given consideration; and proved that between points upon the Municipal Belt, the distance was not greater than between some points being served by some of the railways at the existing rates. The Port Commission further expressed the opinion that the railways had not taken into consideration the amount they would save upon switching rates theretofore absorbed in their long hauls. They were advised that the Port Commission would abandon the proposition rather than confront Houston industries with the news that the Port Commission had done a big thing, but shippers would have to pay $1.90 per car more for switching service.

This impasse was overcome by an agreement that after reasonable time the railroads might apply to the railroad commission for increased switching charges, the port commission to have an opportunity to contest such increase.

The operating contract was signed, effective July, 1924, and operations thereunder are still in force, with some recent modifications thereof, which include a substantial increase per car payments, to the port by the railways.
Chairman Sterling became the Navigation District member of the Port Terminal Railroad Association, which elected him as chairman, and Port Director Allin as secretary.
R. M. Farrar who had been a member of the original city harbor board and had served with me when I became chairman thereof, and from '22 to '25 as vice chairman of the Port Commission, tendered his resignation. Mr. Farrar had given much of his time and ability to such public service, and his resignation was accepted with regret.

W. T. Carter, Jr. was selected by the county to succeed him on June 1, 1925. Mr. Carter was then manager of the W. T. Carter Lumber Company, of which he had made a great success. The company was founded by his father, W. T. Carter, Sr., a wealthy lumberman who became a citizen of Houston, made large investments here, and with J. S. Rice, Frank Andrews and myself, secured subscriptions to the capital stock and organized the Union Bank and Trust Company, with Mr. Rice as president. This bank was afterward nationalized as the Union National Bank.

Mr. Carter was made a vice chairman of the Port Commission, and throughout a very important period in the port's history, became a conspicuous example of what a good citizen with large business interests can do in the public service, without pay.

STATE'S SUBMERGED LANDS
AND ISLANDS ACQUIRED

In 1919, Col. B. C. Allin, port director, learned that a large grant of submerged lands had been made by California to the Los Angeles Navigation District. He thereupon presented to State Land Commissioner J. T. Robison, who had served Texas with great ability for many years, the suggestion that submerged lands, islands, lakes, bays and rivers in Harris County be ceded to the Navigation District.

At first Mr. Robison did not think well of the proposition, and nothing was done. However, Commissioner Robison thereafter made many visits to Houston and vicinity, in connection with his duties, and was greatly impressed with the successful development of the Port of Houston, finally coming to the conclusion that such submerged lands were of little value to the state, except for mineral rights, and that if owned by the Navigation District might become of great commercial value, properly improved.

In 1926 Captain Crotty had a conference with Mr. Robison and was advised that if the Navigation District would offer a bill acceptable to him he would give it his wholehearted support.

Upon Captain Crotty's return to Houston the Navigation Board requested me to draft the proposed bill and submit same to the state land commissioner. I secured a copy of the California act, which I found an unconditional conveyance of submerged lands and islands, with no rights reserved to the State of California.
The bill, as prepared by me, carefully guarded the interests of the state in that it reserved to the state (1) all mineral rights, (2) the use or occupancy of any part thereof which the state might desire for its purposes, and (3) that if navigation charges upon commerce using improvements made by the Navigation District were unsatisfactory the railroad commission of Texas should have the authority to fix rates and charges.

Captain Crotty and I took the bill to Austin. Mr. Robison approved it, with a few minor changes, and early in January, 1927, Senator J. W. Hall introduced it. Shortly after its presentation, some opposition developed at Baytown and Goose Creek, due to a misunderstanding of some of the bill's provisions and the belief upon the part of the Humble Oil Company that submerged lands adjoining its wharves were in the act. Captain Crotty addressed a public meeting of the citizens of Goose Creek, explained the bill, and such opposition was promptly withdrawn.

Senate bill No. 222 passed the senate by a vote of 29 ayes and no nays on March 7, 1927, and went to the house, where some opposition developed. Mr. Robison, Senator Hall, Captain Crotty and myself presented convincing arguments in support of the bill to the house committee on state affairs, and the bill was favorably reported and passed the house March 10, 1927, by a vote of 99 ayes and 21 nays. It was sent to the governor for his approval or rejection on March 11, 1927, and was signed by the governor and secretary of state on April 5, 1927. Senator Hall was very active in the matter and his efforts were well seconded by the members of the house from Harris County.

Commissioner Robison, in answer to a letter from Captain Allin, in which he asked particularly to be remembered to Captain Crotty, stated in substance that nothing in the development of commercial Texas had given him more pleasure than the passage of the bill; that he felt like it was a real Texas enterprise, from which the state would reap large benefits. The grant included about 1200 acres of islands and something over 9000 acres of submerged lands.

Since the passage of the bill, under provisions thereof, the Navigation District has exercised jurisdiction for commercial purposes over these various submerged lands, and among other things, leased to the Barbour Terminals, Inc., a tract of about 400 acres on the south side of San Jacinto Bay.

The Ship Channel has been further benefited, in that the submerged lands and islands can be used as spoil grounds upon which to deposit excavations from the channel, which excavations will bring portions of the ceded lands and islands above high water level and make them available for lease to industries, or improvement by the Navigation District. Can it be denied that the cession of these lands upon the terms thereof afford a fine example of the benefits of state and municipal co-operation, in securing to the public possibilities and advantages that could not otherwise be had?
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FOREWORD

Steady growth of the port is traced in this installment of Col. Thomas H. Ball's history of the port. It tells of the expansion of facilities and of new industrial developments on the Houston Ship Channel.

FURTHER IMPROVEMENTS OF MUNICIPAL BELT

While operating the Municipal Belt, the railroads naturally desired many improvements which the Navigation District was not bound to make under the operating contract, which might be terminated by the railroads or the Navigation District upon due notice. If either party desired to give such notice, it became highly important that a well equipped belt system should be ready for successful operation by the Navigation District.

Chairman Sterling and his associates upon the board, Ben Campbell, W. T. Carter, Jr., R. J. Cummins and D. S. Cage, as well as myself, were convinced that it would be best for the Navigation District to provide lands for rights of way, changes in or enlargement of the Belt Railroad beds, which would better prepare the belt to function, should the Navigation Board take it over for operations.

The belt line, as originally laid out through Harrisburg to Cotton Patch Bayou, met with dangerous congestion and high grades, which required the uncoupling of trains and double movement of engines at great cost and danger.

The Navigation District desired to change the route and alignment of the belt, which necessitated the acquirements of a new right of way through a much settled portion of Harrisburg, upon which stood houses of more or less value, two churches, one fraternal order building and the residence of Mayor Deady.

Upon application Mayor Deady and the city council of Harrisburg gave the belt the necessary franchise for crossing and use of streets, Captains Allin and Crotty together with the railroad engineers, laid out a right of way, and W. T. Carter, Jr., Captain Crotty and myself were authorized to purchase all property and rights of way needed, subject to the approval of the board, and where we could not agree with the owners of property, the writer was directed to file condemnation proceedings. Fortunately, many of the unimproved lots, and some improved, were owned by Mrs. Tod, the widow of Judge John G. Tod, who had always been an earnest advocate of and worker for the Ship Channel. Miss Mary Tod handled the matter for her mother, with George Hamman as next friend, and Judge Lewis R. Bryan as legal adviser.

The committee bought all of Mrs. Tod's holdings it desired, Mayor Deady's property and several lots from M. D. Bennett at very reasonable prices, thereby
Top: The vision of the early workers for Port Houston has taken form in such tangible realities as this view of some of the port's facilities from the air.

Center: The fire boat, the Port Houston.
establishing a market value or more property owners. The two churches were moved upon some misunderstanding in an advertisement, and the declarations of property was made with the intention of sanctions whereby greatly increasing the cost of purchase or condemnation proceedings. The result was that without condemnation proceedings, the demolition became accomplished on the second property at less cost than anticipated.

I know that many readers of the article will appreciate the climate of the South toward private acquisition on the route of the way between the states will enjoy the situation and so we could not be during much of the way

Bottom: Another view of a portion of the port.
establishing a market value for other property desired. The two churches were moved upon some unimproved lots so purchased, and an interchange of property was made with the fraternal organization, thereby greatly lessening the cost of purchase or condemnation thereof. The result was that, without condemnation proceedings, the Navigation District acquired all the needed property at less cost than anticipated.

I know that many readers of this story who appreciate the attitude of the South toward the race emancipated as the result of the war between the states will enjoy the solution of some of the problems met in acquiring lands and right of way through the town of Harrisburg, which was established before Houston, and was the seat of government when the battle of San Jacinto was fought. Many of the lots and houses acquired were owned by negroes - homes which they or their ancestors had occupied from the time when they were freed. The churches, one Baptist, the other Methodist, and the fraternal order lodge building were the property of negro members. Any one who has ever had to deal with the colored race in buying property from them will know that they have practically no knowledge of market values, and appreciate their holdings as being worth more to them than the market value. The natural suspicion engendered by unfair dealings which have so often taken place in their transactions with the white race, created much difficulty in securing the property desired from colored citizens and organizations.

George Hamman, who lived at Harrisburg, the son-in-law of C. H. Milby and friend of Judge Tod, Mrs. Tod and Miss Mary, and who was perhaps trusted more by the colored people than any other white man they knew, was our "help in time of trouble." We took up with him first the purchase of Mrs. Tod's property, unimproved and improved, and largely through him made satisfactory purchase of her property. Thereafter, in dealing with the "darkies", he helped us in every instance, with the express understanding that we would pay them for their properties a price equal to that we had paid Mrs. Tod. The two churches were moved and located on other property acquired by the Port Commission, to the satisfaction of their governing boards, and set up upon new foundations, and in as good or better condition than they were before, and the same was done with the fraternal lodge. The lots upon which the Methodist Church was located were owned by Mr. Bennett, who had in mind a substantial improvement thereof, near Broadway, the main street in Harrisburg. He declined to sell until told that we needed the land for port development; whereupon he sold us a site at less than he could have sold it for to private parties. Without the co-operation of George Hamman, Mayor Deady and Mrs. Tod, the Port Commission probably would have had many condemnation suits and paid for property, including unusable improvements, a much higher price. Captain Crotty bore the greater part of the burden in bringing about amicable settlements and arranging for the removal of the churches and some other improvements, to location at interchanged values.

The belt line was taken off Harrisburg streets, including Broadway, and located upon the property thus acquired. The citizens of Harrisburg were highly pleased, the safety of the people was promoted, and the railways were greatly benefited. The Port Commission, however, should it take over belt operations, can do so with safety, economy and increased earning capacity.
FIREBOAT "PORT HOUSTON"
CONSTRUCTED

After consulting with the mayor and Allie Anderson, chief of the fire department, Mr. Sterling concluded that a municipally-owned fireboat, especially constructed, ought to be provided and berthed where it could give fire protection. This idea was consummated by arranging that the Navigation District pay around $300,000 for the fireboat, and turn it over to the city for operation as part of its fire department. Mr. Sterling visited New York and other Eastern ports, made contact with probable builders, of a boat and thereafter the Port Commission let a contract to an experienced firm, which constructed the fireboat at Wilmington, Del.

FIREBOAT LAUNCHED
AND CHRISTENED

Mr. Sterling offered a prize for a suitable name for the fireboat, and from a large number of names suggested, the Port Commission selected that of "Port Houston". The City Council and Port Commissioners, other than Mr. Sterling, appointed Miss Ruth Sterling to act as sponsor at its christening when ready for launching.

In 1925 a delegation from Houston, including Mr. and Mrs. Sterling, Captain Allin and others, made the trip with Miss Ruth to Wilmington, where they were joined by Congressman Garrett, and the boat was christened Port Houston, with the usual ceremonies appropriate for such occasions.

After the launching of the boat it came to Houston under its own power, was inspected, found to meet the contractor's guarantees, and a berthing place was provided therefor three miles below the Turning Basin, from which it has been able to give fire protection, as far down the channel as the plant of the Houston Lighting & Power Company and up the channel as far as the Turning Basin.

HARBOR LINES ESTABLISHED

Under a co-operating policy between port authorities and the United States engineering department, all industries desiring to locate a plant of any size upon the Ship Channel were required to get permits from the Navigation District and United States engineers before such location was made.

Captain Allin at an earlier date had prepared a map with lines drawn on each side of the channel sufficiently far therefrom to permit widening of the channel as and when required, without disturbing plants and improvements located too near the channel.

After large additional powers had been granted the Navigation District by the legislature, it was deemed best to adopt a permanent harbor line policy.
I was instructed to prepare, with the assistance of Captain Crotty, and Captain Allin, an appropriate measure for consideration.

A map was prepared with harbor lines drawn upon each side of the channel from the Turning Basin to Morgans Point, which embraced a distance between of 400 feet from the Turning Basin to Greens Bayou; 500 feet from that point to Lynchburg, and 600 feet from Lynchburg to Morgans Point.

In our formal report it was suggested that the harbor lines thus designated should be made permanent, and purpose of the Port Commission set out to thereafter exercise jurisdiction over Greens Bayou, Simms Bayou and other tributary streams in the matter of granting permits for the location of improvements thereon.

Our report was approved and resolution duly passed by the board in accordance therewith, which act and resolution was spread upon the minutes and made a part of the permanent records of the Navigation District.

The United States engineering department recognized the board's action, and since then all applicants for location of an improvement to use the channel have been required in their application to state in substance the nature thereof, where and how to be located, with such other information as might be proper or necessary. Such applications are filed with the Port Commission and, if approved, submitted to the United States engineers and, if not objected to, permits are granted, for which a reasonable fee is paid the Port Commission without additional charge by the United States engineers.

The policy has been of untold advantage in its operations; has proven fairly satisfactory to all parties at interest and resulted in a large saving to the Navigation District, where rights of way are required for widening the channel, when owners are unable or unwilling to donate same. When demands of owners for a price for such rights of way, based upon the market value of so-called channel frontage, is deemed too high, in all instances that I recall such owners have accepted without condemnation a sum much less than asked when brought to realize that so much of their property as lies within the harbor lines can not be used by them or their assigns, as all their property so included would have to be excavated and removed by the owners of the property at their cost, or by the United States engineers or Navigation District without cost to the owners. The Port Commission has always recognized the justice of paying owners more, where property left after right of way is required has been reduced to such extent as to be insufficient to accommodate a plant upon the channel.

In the fair application of such harbor line policy, complaints have been remarkably few, and the Port Commission met with the usual co-operation of property owners owning lands adjacent to the waterway.
M. K. & T. SEEKS BETTER CONNECTION

The Katy was anxious for a Municipal Belt connection from the Galveston-Houston & Henderson, which the latter and the I. & G. N. Railway were operating, by construction of a spur to the Municipal Belt at Brazos Street, which spur the M. K. & T. was willing to build at its own expense. The construction of such spur was viewed by the S. P. as out of line, and an interference with its own trackage and facilities, including interlocking plant owned by it. To settle the matter, by direction of the Navigation Board, I filed condemnation proceedings, commissioners were appointed, and an extensive hearing held. The S. P. raised objections with the railroad commission, and two members thereof came to Houston, and upon investigation expressed their belief that the Municipal Belt improvements as planned would be advantageous both to the railway lines and to the port. Without action upon the condemnation proceedings, or by the railroad commission, friendly negotiations were had with the S. P., with the result that the new route was satisfactorily arranged, and the M. K. & T. paid for the lands needed for such spur, the cost thereof, and for one-fourth interest in the S. P. interlocking plant. There was merit in the objections of the S. P., and mention of the controversy is not made as a criticism, but to evidence that honest differences of opinion can be satisfactorily settled in an amicable way.

PRIVATE IMPROVEMENTS ON SHIP CHANNEL

While the 25-foot and 30-foot projects were being completed, the United States engineers' department issued permits for the construction of industries upon the Ship Channel, which are mentioned below, as showing confidence in Houston's waterway and anticipation of its successful development.

1914 - Armour Fertilizing Works, Gulf Pipe Line Company wharf at Lynchburg.

1915 - Texas (now Lone Star) Cement Company.

1916 - Galena Signal Oil Refinery, now owned by the Texas Company.

1917 - Hoffman Oil and Refining Company, now owned by the Humble Company.

1918 - Sinclair Oil Refining Company, Humble Oil and Refining Company.

1919 - Deep Water Oil Refineries.

1920 - Crown Oil and Refining Company.

1921 - V. H. Borsodi, fuel wharf and plant.
1922 - American Maid Flour Mill and Elevator, Texas Chemical Company

1923 - Anderson-Clayton Company, wharf and cotton terminal; Clarion Oil Company, oil terminal; Houston Lighting and Power Company, new power plant on channel; Alexander-Sprunt & Sons Compress Company, Keen & Woolf Refinery.

1925 - Horton & Horton, shell plant and marine ways.

Other privately owned plants granted permits after completion of the 30-foot project will be hereinafter mentioned.

ADDITIONAL NAVIGATION DISTRICT
FACILITIES PROVIDED

Prior to 1927, from the proceeds of the $4,000,000 bond issue the Navigation District constructed wharves 10 to 13 inclusive, N. S. B. B; improved the Municipal Belt, and added additional units to its grain elevator with shipsdie loading facilities.

Thereby the capacity of the elevator was increased to around 3,500,000 bushels of grain, which improvements, together with the initial expenditure thereon of $1,000,000, brought the cost of the grain elevator, as it stands, around $3,500,000. The substructure thereof can sustain additional units which will give the elevator a capacity of over 6,000,000 bushels.

The Port Commission was fortunate in inducing George S. Colby who had had a broad experience in handling grain at New Orleans and elsewhere, and who had the confidence of all grain dealers in the grain belt, to take charge of its grain elevator.

His services in connection with improvements of the elevator and handling grain for storage and shipment have proven of great value. He still discharges the duty of superintendent to the satisfaction of port authorities and firms and associations having to do with the grain business at Port Houston.

MORGAN LINE COMES TO HOUSTON

After completion of the 25-foot project, which required the moving back of the Southern Pacific wharves at Clinton to straighten the channel, and after the Philadelphia Steamship Line had been induced to come here, the commercial interests of Houston were desirous of having another line which could touch at ports on the Gulf and Atlantic seaboard.

Harvey Haines, business manager of the Chamber of Commerce, approached me with the suggestion that the Morgan Line, which then stopped at Galveston, could be brought to Houston. That line, owned by the Southern Pacific, could not come under rules of the interstate commerce commission, where railroad and boat service were combined for rate purposes. The port commission was in sympathy with
A corporation was organized: called Manchester Terminal Corporation, which acquired channel between from the city to Manchester dock in East Bayou, arranged with various楸towns to secure extension of channel way and extend the canal for present to plant in through interior the Oklahoma cotton.

The construction of the present great Manchester docks has begun and completed in time, although it has been completed not only by the leading citizens, but also by the laborers who were employed in the project.

It was the Corporation which provided the funds to carry out its obligations, but a corporation was made by the Corporation of 1890, who lived up to the letter of the contract and met all obligations, as a result of its own success.
the proposition, but was advised by Southern Pacific officials of their disinclination to make application for the service, although willing to give it. The Port Commission and Chamber of Commerce authorized Mr. Morgan and myself to make application to the interstate commerce commission for approval of the service.

A Commissioner appointed by the interstate commerce commission held an open hearing at Houston upon the application, and after presentation of evidence, made a favorable report, which was approved, and the port was given the Morgan Line service.

CARNegie STEEL COMPANY COMES

In 1926 the Carnegie Steel Company decided to buy lands from the Southern Pacific and construct its own docks and warehouse facilities, adjoining the Southern Pacific terminals, at a cost of around $3,000,000.

C. L. Gillespie, general manager, expressed the desire to have Municipal Belt service if same could be promptly furnished. The navigation board undertook to extend its tracks and give the service within 60 days, and did so at a cost of $60,000, satisfactory arrangements being made with the Southern Pacific, which expected to serve the plant from its Clinton track.

MANCHESTER DOCKS AND WHY

In January, 1927, the Farmers' Association of Oklahoma decided to contract for storage and shipment of around 400,000 bales of cotton, and sent representatives to Galveston and Houston to secure guarantees of warehouse facilities for their cotton crop of 1927, with advances thereon.

The port commission, after a conference with Houston bankers, unhesitatingly agreed to comply with their requirements for the current year.

A corporation was organized, styled Manchester Terminal Corporation, which acquired channel frontage from the city's Manchester dock to Sims Bayou, arranged with the port commission to secure necessary rights-of-way and extend the Municipal Belt to its plant in time to handle the Oklahoma cotton.

The construction of the present great Manchester docks was begun and completed on time, although it became necessary for some of our leading citizens, including Mr. Sterling, to guarantee personally a bond issue thereon.

It cost the Navigation District around $168,000 to comply with its obligations, but accommodations were ready for the Oklahoma farmers, who lived up to their cotton shipment agreement. There may be a precedent for such a successful and important undertaking, involving so many angles and factors, being completed within such a time limit, but if so, none has come to my knowledge.
Increased revenues for its belt railway, increased taxable values, increased value of the city Manchester dock, the navigation Manchester docks and lands owned or controlled by the navigation district adjoining the Manchester Terminal Corporation property, as well as the creation of a very important facility on the Ship Channel, more than justified the costs incurred.

HOUSTON PLANS FOR DEEPER, WIDER CHANNEL

The national government having provided a minimum usable depth of 32 feet for Galveston Harbor, Houston began plans to secure a like depth and wider channel from Galveston to the Turning Basin, the 32-foot project having been completed in 1925.

The president of the Rivers and Harbors Congress, consisting of delegates from all over the United States, again invited me to be one of the speakers at its session in December, 1926.

The port commission, through Chairman Sterling; the City of Houston, through Mayor Holcombe, and the Chamber of Commerce through its chairman, Mr. Farrar, appointed me to present the claims of the Houston Ship Channel for national recognition.

These annual meetings were given nationwide publicity, and addresses delivered by high government officials and others had capacity audiences which included senators and congressmen.

The address which I delivered, under title, "The City and Port of Houston," was published in the official records and contains a summary of some of the important events connected with the Ship Channel.

Without quoting therefrom at length, will state that the address contained a review of events from the time when my predecessor in congress, Capt. J. C. Hutcheson, secured a survey which, if adopted, would provide a 25-foot channel from Galveston to Houston which was favorably reported upon by a board of eminent army engineers on December 1, 1927.

The struggle to have congress approve and make an initial appropriation with which to begin work, the slow progress made, due to inadequate appropriations, was mentioned, and attention was forcefully directed to the unprecedented proposition of Houston to create a navigation district with authority to issue bonds for the purpose of "matching dollars" with the national government to complete the 25-foot project at an estimated cost of $2,500,000;

"That congress was requested to authorize a continuing contract therefor and make an initial appropriation with which to begin work, only after the navigation district had placed with the secretary of war one-half the cost of the project;
"That after acceptance of Houston's proposition, and before the 25-foot project was completed, the City of Houston had expended around $3,500,000 for the construction of wharves, docks and other facilities and acquired lands upon the channel to insure compliance with its agreement;

"That the navigation district, to insure the maintenance of the channel, had paid $250,000, one-half the cost of two powerful dredges - the "Sam Houston" and "San Jacinto" - the title thereto being vested in the government;

"That the national government had authorized and completed a 30-foot project, at a cost of around $4,000,000, to which the navigation district contributed $1,365,000, in addition to procuring rights-of-way and spoil grounds, the cost of which had been largely added to by increased land values;

"That the navigation district had expended around $5,000,000 for additional wharves and docks, a grain elevator, a twin Diesel, electrically operated fireboat, and extension of its Municipal Belt System; and that a further Bond Issue for $1,500,000 was voted less than one week before, for wharves and railway terminal service;

"That the port commission had encouraged the building of privately owned docks and wharves by railroads and industries, seeking only to control dockage and wharf charges made by such interests, and that the banks of the Ship Channel were being lined with industries, docks and wharves from Main Street in Houston to a point below Clinton;

"That the Southern Steamship Company had provided a coastwise service from Houston to Philadelphia and New York, and the Southern Pacific Railway was just completing wharves and docks at Clinton for its Morgan Line at a cost of over $1,000,000;

"That the Carnegie Steel Company was letting a contract for a distributing plant to handle 200,000 tons of steel annually; Anderson-Clayton and other outstanding cotton firms had built extensive warehouses and docks; the great oil companies had provided their own facilities, with pipe lines from Louisiana, Texas and Oklahoma, reaching the Ship Channel; that such industries and terminals represented a capital outlay of approximately $130,000,000, and that the payroll of industries upon the Ship Channel approximated $40,000,000 daily;

"That when the use of the channel was begun it had an inbound and outbound tonnage of 402,447 tons, and although the 30-foot project had just been finished; in 1924 the channel carried over 7,000,000 tons of freight and handled 1,322,151 bales of cotton, the value of such tonnage exceeding $300,000,000;

"That in 1925, the tonnage reached 9,750,000 tons valued at $490,000,000. That in 1926 Port Houston ranked second in cotton exports, having handled nearly 2,000,000 bales in 1925; that private firms had provided facilities for handling cotton to the extent of 22 high density compresses with storage capacity of 1,100,000 bales and additional facilities were being rapidly constructed;
"That ship arrivals in 1920 were 165, in 1925, 1926 and during the first 10 months of 1926, 1104.

"That in addition to an apparently inexhaustible supply of fuel oil, two natural gas pipe lines with an investment of over $2,000,000 brought this necessary basic product at low rates to serve Houston, the Ship Channel and all industries; and that the lighting and power company had a plant upon the channel costing around $10,000,000, supplying electric power at reasonable rates;

"That the Municipal Belt System, with large classification yards and tracks upon both sides of the channel, had consummated an arrangement with the 17 railroads which met the sea at Houston, by which they organized the Port Terminal Railroad Association, which operated the Municipal Belt and gave unified switching service to all industries upon the channel, without discrimination, at a low rate;

"That the Port Commission now had control and co-ordination of transportation, facilities and terminal charges, both upon land and water;

NATIONAL EXAMPLE.

"That by its splendid co-operation and the expenditure of public funds, Houston and the navigation district had set an example which has had a far-reaching effect upon appropriations, as since the adoption of the Houston policy no great project has been undertaken by the national government without assurance of local co-operation and guarantees of non-monopolization, by individuals or corporations, of harbors or waterways improved by the government; and the chief and corps of United States engineers have freely used Houston as an example to be followed in approving projects."

When I had concluded my address, the chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Congress, a member of the house rivers and harbors committee, who had visited Houston, as well as other delegates, expressed their appreciation of the wonderful showing made by Houston in liberally co-operating with the government in providing an inland waterway and harbor.

After delivering my address, and thereby getting the merits of Houston's waterway before the public and congress, through the publicity given it, I remained over to get a survey of the channel with the view of improving it to a usable depth of 32 feet for its channel and harbor; Galveston having obtained such depth before the completion of Houston's 32-foot project.

With Congressman Garrett, I went before the rivers and harbors committee of the house and presented arguments in support of such survey. Congressman J. J Mansfield, the ranking Democratic member of the committee, gave the proposition his cordial support and the survey was authorized.
H. L. WASHBURN
MADE PORT AUDITOR

The Port Commission had gradually perfected an efficient organization, including a bookkeeping department in charge of Joe L. Archer, and an engineering department, with E. A. Tucker and E. T. Davis in charge; however, no one was equipped with necessary training as an expert accountant.

H. L. Washburn, who for many years had been county auditor under appointment of the district judges of Harris County, had set up an accounting system for Harris County which attracted state-wide attention. He had gained a knowledge of the law, and of necessary steps to be taken in connection with bond issues and making up records for approval by attorneys for bond purchases, superior to that of many good lawyers.

Mr. Sterling induced him to become auditor for the Port Commission, and thereby add to his onerous duties as county auditor and auditor for various subdivisions of the county.

In addition to keeping proper records of port affairs the expenditures of the Port Commission upon properties leased from the city required intricate bookkeeping and accounting with city authorities who had implicit confidence in Mr. Washburn.

Before his appointment, in addition to my other duties, which taxed my time and ability, I was charged with the preparation of all orders and instruments in connection with bond issues and with preparing a record thereof upon which to secure the opinion of a New York attorney for bond buyers, and was commissioned to go East in connection therewith.

By appointment of Mr. Washburn, I was given more relief than anyone else, and the Port Commission was relieved of the expense of my getting experienced accountants to help in bond matters.

Mr. Washburn's acquaintance with bond issues and bond buyers thereof enabled me to unload upon him the preparation of records in connection with bond matters, and only co-operate with him as counsel for the port.

JAMES L. CHARLTON,
TREASURER

The personnel of port officials cannot be considered as complete without mention of the late James Charlton, faithful and efficient county treasurer, who was given a small allowance for responsible duties discharged by him in connection with port affairs. As county treasurer all funds had to go through his hands, including large bond issues, and he was required to make for a time a bond for double the amount of every bond issue. The allowance made was small, compared with his responsibilities, and in doing this scant justice to him the Port Commission did not of course take into consideration the fact that from the beginning of development in cooperation with the national government, Mr. Charlton had been an enthusiastic and intelligent advocate of every bond issue and measure presented to the people.
An Englishman by birth, he was one of the few of our citizens who had personal knowledge of the Manchester Canal and it was always presented by him as an outstanding example of what could be done through the creation of an inland waterway.
RAIL CHIEFS AIDED PORT

Among the railway chiefs who submitted a convincing case to the United States government in connection with Port Houston's plea for an increase in ship channel depth to 32 feet were H. M. Lull, top left, executive vice president of the Southern Pacific lines in Texas and Louisiana, and H. R. Safford, top right, executive vice president of the Missouri Pacific lines, Captain James A. Baker, lower left, general counsel for the Southern Pacific lines, and General F. G. Pettibone, lower right, executive vice president of the Gulf, Colorado and Santa Fe railroad.
FOREWORD

The task of impressing the United States government with the importance of Port Houston is told in this installment of Colonel Thomas H. Ball's history of the port. It explains some of the problems with which the early workers for the port were confronted and how they fought for a solution.

COLONEL SCHLEY HOLDS
HEARING AT HOUSTON

After congress had authorized the requested survey, Lieut. Col. J. L. Schley, gave notice of a public hearing to be held at Houston July 14, 1927, to consider further improvement of the Houston Ship Channel.

Mr. Sterling directed Port Director Allin, Captain Crotty and myself to procure attendance of witnesses, and secure documentary evidence necessary for the hearing. J. W. Evans, president of the Chamber of Commerce, detailed R. J. Seaman, industrial manager, to aid in preparing for a comprehensive hearing.

Colonel Schley called the meeting to order in the assembly room of the Houston Chamber of Commerce, read a letter from me as counsel for the port commission which set out improvements desired, and requested presentation of our case.

Mr. Sterling having asked me to act for the port commission in presenting evidence, I briefly reviewed what had been done by the city and navigation district in aiding the government to construct the channel and provide facilities for its use, together with commercial developments attendant upon the venture from the adoption of the original project.

Mr. Sterling testified:

"I am chairman of the port commission and board of control of the Port Terminus Railway Association, and have been officially connected with the navigation district since its organization. I was one of the founders of the Humble Oil Company and its president when the Humble company made very large investments upon the channel, including the construction of its own wharves and docks. It has been the policy of the port commission to create facilities not provided by private capital and encourage private capital and corporations to build their own facilities subject to regulation of rates by the port commission."
These Men Helped "Sell" Port to U. S.

These men lent the weight of their influence to the early work of "selling" Port Houston to the United States government.


"The Humble, Sinclair, Texas, Gulf and Galena Signal Oil companies, Anderson-Clayton Cotton Company, Carnegie Steel Company and other large industries have constructed their own docks and wharves.

"To bunker ships, facilities have been provided for both coal and oil, and ships lying at wharves can be bunkered without being moved; franchises for bunkering ships provide they must not charge more than lowest competitors on the gulf coast. It has been our policy to make all charges reasonable, and as a rule they are less than those at other ports on account of the greater distance traveled.

"We have just sold bonds for a million and a half dollars for increasing docking facilities, building two new wharves, railroad terminal facilities, and enlargement of municipal grain elevator owned by the navigation district."

Mr. Sterling mentioned construction of a modern fire boat at a cost of over $300,000 for the protection of the port, which had been turned over to the city fire department for operation, to serve the public as well as city and navigation district improvements.

He further set forth:

"That all city and navigation district wharves and docks were operated by the port commission, and the municipal belt railway by the Port Terminal Railroad Association, composed of all railroads entering the city, the members thereof consisting of one representative of each railway line or system and one member of the port commission, which served all industries on the municipal belt at a uniform rate of $8.10 for switching; that under the operating contract the navigation district was obliged to extend the municipal belt on both sides of the Ship Channel to reach all industries desiring a location thereon."

E. A. Peden, president of the Peden Iron and Steel Company and first chairman of the port commission, testified:

"I was chairman of the port commission when the city and county boards were consolidated to take over the affairs of the navigation district. During my service, important improvements were provided; the city docks and wharves were leased to the navigation district for 30 years, and the municipal belt railway turned over to the Port Terminal Railroad Association for operation under a contract deemed mutually advantageous. I know of no other ports where all the railroad lines entering the city have a unified arrangement by which one terminal company serves all railroads and reaches all industries upon equal terms without discrimination." He deemed this accomplishment one of the most constructive measures put into effect in connection with our port development.

H. C. Schumacher, wholesale grocer and former president of the chamber of commerce, testified that he had taken an active interest in developments of the channel; that from a business standpoint his firm had made extensive investments and improvements in connection with its business. He gave a comprehensive statement of why the channel should be further improved.
Col. R. H. Baker, a staunch advocate of the Ship Channel, mentioned among other things his official connection with the Trinity and Brazos Valley Railway, which had been built largely with the view of reaching deep water at Houston, and the Houston Belt and Terminal Railway which had been begun with the intention of belting the entire city. This purpose had been in part abandoned because of inability to secure co-operation from all the railroads as the Port Commission had been able to do.

W. D. Cleveland, son of W. D. Cleveland, who was the chairman of the original deep water committee, testified that he was in the wholesale grocery business and cotton business, continuing with his brother, A. S. Cleveland, his father's business; that he was on the city harbor board for two or three years and had taken an active interest in aiding the development of the Ship Channel, and stressed the justice of Houston's demand for its further improvement by widening and deepening.

John T. Scott, president of the First National Bank, testified that he had for nearly forty years taken an interest in the development of the Ship Channel; was a member of the original harbor board, established in 1914; had served thereon eight or nine years, being chairman for the last two or three years of his service; had worked for both the 25 and 30-foot projects, and that for further proper development of the channel a depth of 32 feet now and of 35 feet in the future would be necessary.

To show the growth of the city, as evidenced by bank capital and deposits, he filed a statement showing that in the period from 1900 to 1926 bank capital, surplus and undivided profits had increased 900 per cent; bank deposits over 2000 per cent; and total resources nearly 2300 per cent.

R. D. Ernst, general manager of the Manchester Terminal Corporation, testified his company occupied a frontage of 1650 feet immediately upon the channel, all being in use; that the Manchester plant was established about a year before the hearing, primarily to serve the interests of farmers in Oklahoma, and by its creation took care of about a quarter of a million bales of cotton through the port this year in addition to other tonnage.

H. M. Hull, executive vice president Southern Pacific Lines in Texas and Louisiana, testified:

"Five independent competing railroad systems have entrance on their own lines to Houston, one of the greatest railway centers in the South from the standpoint of numbers, territory covered and tonnage handled. The general offices of our companies are maintained at Houston, where we have large developments, interests, shops and facilities. Our company has recently established a terminal at Clinton and built its own docks at a cost of approximately $1,200,000. The Morgan Line, owned by the Southern Pacific, operates into our Clinton terminal. The combined main trackage of the five systems which enter Houston on their own rails is about 43,000 miles, of which over 10,000 miles are in Texas. Total tonnage in and out of Houston in 1926 handled by these five systems was 6,908,546, which is yearly increasing; a very small proportion of this is low-grade stuff. In 1926 the payrolls of these lines in the City of Houston amounted to $15,476,795, with employees numbering approximately 9300."
H. R. Safford, executive vice president Missouri Pacific lines in Texas and Louisiana, testified:

"Our lines include the Missouri Pacific outlet to St. Louis, the New Orleans, Texas and Mexico to New Orleans and Brownsville, with branches into the valley, and the International-Great Northern.

The Missouri Pacific and associated lines have a mileage of about 10,000 miles. Houston has ever been recognized as the logical point for freight distribution and the principal railroads of the state have made investments and acquired properties therein. The Houston Belt and Terminal Railway is owned by the N.O.T. and M., the S. B. and M., the Santa Fe and the T. and B. V. The Burlington and Rock Island does not operate its own trains into Houston, but uses the T. and B. V. and enjoys H. B. and T. Railway terminal facilities. The Port Terminal Association is composed of all of the railways that operate into Houston, including the lines not mentioned heretofore; that is, the M. K. & T., the S. F., the various M. P. lines and the Santa Fe. Through this organization all of the lines in Houston have access upon like terms to handle the commerce of the channel in a satisfactory and efficient manner with more dispatch.

"The Port Terminal Association for the year ended June 30, 1925, handled 150,981 cars and for the year ended June 30, 1927, 218,677 cars."

R. C. Stone, chairman of the grain commission of the Merchants Exchange, testified:

"It was largely upon the urging of grain interests that the Port Commission provided the present grain elevator, with a capacity of over 1,000,000 bushels, and so constructed that it can be extended by units to a capacity of around 8,000,000 bushels. An additional conveyor is being constructed that will afford opportunity to load, at one time, two steamers instead of one.

"A privately owned elevator, the American Maid, with a capacity for export trade of about 750,000 bushels, is located upon the channel. The movement of grain through the Port of Houston for the first year amounted to 3,686,928 bushels. Foreign ship owners are not satisfied with conditions, due to the fact that there is a less depth of water than is available at Galveston or New Orleans. Our grain exporters contend they should have the same depth of water to Houston elevators that they have to the New Orleans and Galveston elevators. If Houston had an adopted project that would give the same depth it would greatly increase the movement of grain from Houston."

Colonel Schley questioned:

"If the government should provide a 32-foot depth at Galveston, then it should also go 50 miles inland and give Houston a 32-foot depth in order that it would not be at a disadvantage?"

Answer: "Yes, sir."
I stated: "Houston and Galveston will have no more facilities for commerce than are needed; and the national government is concerned in providing both ports with a requisite depth of water, to accommodate all vessels desiring to use either or both ports."

C. L. Gillespie, superintendent of the Carnegie Steel Company, told of the construction of the Carnegie Steel Company plant with the expectation of bringing direct shipments of their products from Pittsburgh to Houston; that the Carnegie company bought 100 acres next to the Southern Pacific docks upon which to locate its plant, and expended about $3,000,000 thereon and built its own wharf 300 feet long. "We hope to begin by handling 200,000 tons a year of the Carnegie Steel Company products," he said.

W. L. Clayton of the firm of Anderson-Clayton & Co. testified:

"My firm owns the Houston Compress Company, which built the Long Reach plant, with six loading berths and storage capacity for something over 200,000 bales of cotton. We have been adding every year, and during the past cotton season have added two berths.

"In 1919-20, Houston exported 69,000 bales, and during the present season, from the port, 2,523,000 bales, with about 15 days left to end the cotton season. Such exports were due entirely to the channel and the facilities provided. Houston has always been an outstanding interior cotton market, but while its net receipts in 1919-20 were over 1,000,000 bales, in the season of 1926-27 the receipts were over 3,500,000 bales, an increase of 230 per cent in eight seasons; although during this period the cotton crop of the United States increased only 57 per cent and the production of the territory known as Houston territory increased only 87 per cent. Warehouses and compresses in Houston have a total storage capacity at one time of about 1,250,000 bales, of which 590,000 bales are at the water, and the remainder back therefrom. Outside of the Manchester Corporation, Alexander Sprunt & Sons built a warehouse on the water with two leading berths and Weatherford-Crump & Co. leased facilities from the city which they are now using. Mr. Clayton stated that the officials of the Port Commission had always been encouraging and helpful to his concern in all operations, and extended the same policy toward everybody.

Edmond Pincoffs testified that his firm was operating a cotton seed cake and meal plant on the channel, maintaining their offices at Houston, and were exporters of the products handled; that every ship that carries cotton needs a certain amount of dead weight such as cotton seed cake and meal, which moved through here in very large volume, and therefore is the principal dead weight material shipped with cotton; and that in establishing and maintaining the business, he had had the encouragement of the port officials. That in the year 1921 cake and meal tonnage through the Port of Houston was approximately 5000 tons, with an increase every year until 1926, when the tonnage was 179,000 tons, and the bringing in of deeper vessels requiring dead weight cargo had been a contributing factor in his ability and that of his competitors to so increase the tonnage.
That cotton seed cake and meal being a low price product, could not stand heavy freight rates, and that material produced in this territory takes a rather low freight rate to Houston and a rather high freight rate to the New England states; that we have six cotton seed oil mills in Houston and 62 miles within a 265-mile radius.

Colonel Schley: "That is the radius over which Houston has during the last year enjoyed a preferential rate?"

Answer: "I really don't know."

I stated: "Without argument, I object to the term 'preferential' being applied to Houston.

"Houston has never had a preferential rate anywhere at any time and never had anything hauled a mile farther for less money. The preferential rate alluded to is what the railroads charge from here to Galveston, a distance of 50 miles."

Colonel Schley: "Is it a special Houston rate?"

Answer: "No. Long before the Railroad Commission was created Houston, being a railroad center, in fixing rates they used what they called a 'differential' which represented additional charge for the 50-mile haul between Houston and Galveston. The railroad commission reduced the charge for such haul, which has never had a rate, compared with any other port, which represented a lesser charge for more miles."

James Anderson, vice president, Humble Oil and Refining Company, presented statistics and exhibits prepared by President W. S. Farish, and such exhibits were explained by Mr. Anderson showing the large investments of the company in its building plant and docks and wharves. He stated that there was necessity for a deeper and wider channel to bring ships of deep draft to the Humble plant, as well as other oil industries upon the Ship Channel; that oil companies were going to an enormous expense in providing loading lines and things of that sort, whereby a greater depth of water could be utilized; that it would be difficult for a refinery as big as Baytown to operate ships that could be operated to ports having a deeper draft; that a minimum depth of 32 feet in the channel was necessary, due to increase in tonnage year by year and that the Humble for 1927 anticipated a movement of 6,000,000 tons from Baytown, whereas in 1921 it had shipped therefrom only 500,000 tons."

Colonel Schley: "Have you not moved in and out of your terminal, drawing greater than 30 feet?"

Answer: "No, we have six ships that we could not operate fully, which we had to top off at other ports."
Colonel Schley: "There are approximately 150 miles of Ship Channel in Texas. Why should the Baytown terminals be given this particular advantage, when you consider the oil movement as a whole? Would not such an increase set a precedent to be followed for the rest of our channels in Texas, and establish a standard to be extended throughout all these waterways?"

Answer: You may be doing that, but there is a tendency on the part of oil shipping, and the building of oil ships, to use greater depth for more economical movement of their products."

Colonel Schley: "Is there any obligation on the part of the government to provide such depths in all ports, or at certain ports to be used by such ships, while other ports were available for other classes of ships?"

Answer: "It would be difficult for refineries such as Baytown, which has gone to enormous expenses in providing facilities which could utilize greater depths, to operate ships that could go to other ports where they had a deeper draft, and it would limit the scope of our operations."

Explanation:

The questions of Colonel Schley addressed to Mr. Pincoffs, Mr. Anderson and Captain Crotty, are recorded as being indicative of conclusions reached by Colonel Schley before the hearing, as to his duties and responsibilities in connection with all Texas harbors upon the Gulf Coast, which conclusions were evidenced by his adverse report on the survey. We were astounded by this report, which gave us no end of trouble. Said report indicated that he favored giving Galveston a ruling depth competitive with other gulf ports not on the Texas coast, and thereby enable government engineers to parcel out government appropriations to other Texas projects. The remarkable growth of Houston and its commerce may have inclined Colonel Schley to think that Houston was doing well with what she had.

Thomas B. Reed once said to me: "Bail, our people consist of two classes - One-half making strides beyond the pace of the other half - while the other half is putting sand in the shoes of those in front to keep them from going too fast."

This explanation is without criticism of Colonel Schley, a gentleman of high character, conscientious in the discharge of duty, and an engineer of great ability.

S. A. Dunlap testified: "I am a steamship agent operating several steamship lines, of which the French Line and the Holland-American Line are the most important at this time, all plying between here and foreign ports, carrying cotton, grain and general cargoes of all kinds, principally cotton and grain. In my opinion, it is necessary to have a usable depth of 32 feet in order to accommodate the vessels we handle from the Turning Basin to the gulf. When we come to Houston to get cotton, we cannot complete the load with grain, but have to go to Galveston for that purpose, which adds tremendously to the cost, as well as entailing loss of time and increased hazard in moving the ships in and out of ports. The tendency in the past two years is to build deeper and bigger ships."
They are getting larger all the time. One of our largest steamers with a capacity of 13,000 tons can only load at Houston to the extent of 10,120 tons. We could load to the full capacity with a greater depth of channel. Our lines control approximately 150 vessels."

T. E. Judkins, with Wilkins & Biehl, testified: "We are in the steamship business; we are general agents for the North German Lloyd, and the Ocean Line, Scandinavian American Line and the K. Line, and operate a large number of chartered steamers, and have brought in and out of Houston within the past 12 months approximately 100 vessels, beginning in 1922 with about 18 or 20 a year. We have handled about 320,000 bales of cotton during the past 12 months for foreign ports, and have quite a number of ships that we cannot bring here, that we could if we had a deeper and wider channel."

C. B. Fox, manager of the United Gulf Steamship Company, testified: "Our company operates a fleet of 52 ships and averages around eight to 12 ships a month out of Houston. We operate United States steamship board vessels from Houston to all United Kingdom ports, to the Mediterranean, the Adriatic and the north coast of Africa. We started in 1920, since which time operations upon the channel have increased rapidly, anticipating improvements in the channel. We have ships in the fleet that it is impossible to load to capacity on account of the present depth of the channel; we have to finish the cargo at Galveston, which results in an economical loss, as well as requiring additional time and other expenses. The most material need of the channel is greater depth, but the increased width and easing of bends would conduce to the steady operation and safe navigation of our vessels in and out. Of the ships we control, eight to ten cannot load fully here in Houston and get out."

J. M. Lykes testified:

"I am in the steamship business. We operate in and out of Houston an average of eight or 10 vessels a month. We reach West Indies ports, Bordeaux and Hamburg. The present depth and width of the Ship Channel are not sufficient to accommodate the commerce now using the port of Houston, or prospective commerce. Some of the vessels that we have coming in draw too much water to load them fully from the port, necessitating use of another port to complete loading, which is expensive in the matter of additional port expenses and lost time. Both an increase in depth and width are essential, but increased depth is the most important. A usable depth of 32 feet is the minimum that ought to be had at this time. I should say that of the vessels we operate, about 10 per cent could not load to full draft here."

Harvey C. Miller, president of the Southern Steamship Company, which has maintained a direct service between Houston and Philadelphia and Eastern ports from the beginning of the channel, August 15, 1915, until now, addressed a letter to the port commission, favoring the further improvement of the channel.

The Luckenbach Steamship Company sent a communication showing the vessels using the port and the necessity for improving the Ship Channel.
The deputy collector of customs wrote a letter to Colonel Schley showing increase from 1915 in customs collected, from $17,160.89 in 1915 to $791,729.01 in 1927.

The traffic manager of the Deepwater Oil Refinery wrote a letter to Captain Crotty containing information as to operations and necessity for enlargement and increased depth of the channel, as did A. E. Kerr of the Houston Oil Terminal Company.

Charles Baether, one of the Houston pilots, gave very interesting testimony showing the necessity of widening and deepening the channel from the Turning Basin to Morgans Point and then to Galveston, his principal reasons being the operation of larger vessels, making navigation safer and avoiding accidents. His testimony showed that he was familiar with ports around Cuba, all along the Atlantic Coast, England, the Manchester Canal and other important points. Colonel Schley cross-examined him at length and his answers were enlightening to all of us. A statement signed by Captain O'Brien, one of Houston's oldest pilots, was introduced, which was very informative.

Maj. B. C. Allin, director of the Port of Houston, testified: "From the time of the creation of facilities for the use of the port, beginning with the building of the wharves and docks by the City of Houston, I have served as port director and have been charged largely with the duty of looking after and directing the operations of the port. I have prepared a statement showing its growth, accompanied by exhibits and maps, which correctly reflect matters in a concrete form. From my experience in the rapid development of the port and the needs of the port, I deem an increase in the depth and width of the channel should be provided to take care of the commerce, present and prospective."

Captain Allin exhibited a statement accompanied by maps, which reflected in concrete form the growth of the port commerce and increased tonnage and municipal and other improvements upon the channel since he had been made port director. His exhibits showed expenditures by the city and navigation district as follows: By the city for facilities, approximately $3,290,000. For the construction of public terminals, in addition to the $3,290,000 expended by the city, the navigation district has issued bonds to the amount of $6,000,000, a part of which has not been spent but will be during the coming 12 months.

Captain Crotty, assistant port director, testified:

"I have been connected with the development of the Ship Channel since April, 1924, and among other things, have looked after procurement of dumping and spoil grounds. I also make recommendations in regard to things to be done with the channel.

"There are no private industries, wharves or docks on the Turning Basin proper, which the government has dredged out, and lands around the entire harbor are owned by the navigation district."
The burden of providing spoil grounds by the navigation district has become heavy. The navigation district is now negotiating for the acquisition of land for such purpose that will cost around a half million dollars.

"At the request of the Port Commission I have submitted suggestions that I thought, from my experience, would be advisable, in connection with proposed widening and deepening of the channel from Bolivar Roads to and including the Turning Basin, which will be applicable regardless of whether the channel is widened to 200 feet or 500 feet. Critical points along the waterway at which I think some changes and adjustments should be made are pointed out in the statement which I submitted for Colonel Schley's consideration."

H. L. Washburn, county and port auditor, submitted a statement showing the increase of property taxable values to have been from $134,000,000 in 1914 to $350,000,000 in 1926.

R. J. Seaman, industrial engineer, Chamber of Commerce, testified:

"I have prepared, at the request of the Port Commission, a statement accompanied by maps and exhibits showing various industries and developments since 1919, and the close relation thereof to the development of the Ship Channel. It shows the number and value of industries and their payroll as well as other matters including corporate names of the 18 railroads using the port; That postal receipts, 1919, $1,114,929,000, increased to $1,881,122.09 for 1926; building permits, 1919, $6,777,827, to $40,215,237 for 1926, and that in 1919 Houston's population was 134,100 and in 1926, 252,000." Mr. Seaman stated further that prior to development of the Ship Channel industries thereon had a capital investment of around $1,000,000, with average monthly payroll of approximately $20,000; that there were now 79 industries thereon, with capital investment in excess of $150,000,000 and with a monthly payroll in excess of $1,000,000; that in 1919 Houston had 9860 wage earners in manufacturing industries, which was an increase over the preceding 10 years of approximately 85 per cent; that on January 1, 1927, Houston had 35,307 industrial wage earners, an increase for a seven-year period of around 250 per cent, with a group-supporting dependency of 141,228 people, which as a whole was larger than the city's population in 1920.

Mr. Seaman expressed his opinion that the general increase in all lines, including commercial and distribution facilities, was directly traceable to the Ship Channel development, in combination with the rail facilities.

His exhibit contained much more information of value, as did other exhibits filed, which with much of the verbal testimony of all witnesses have been omitted for the sake of brevity.

In all my experience at public hearings, while a member of congress and during the years following, in which I have participated in public hearings, never have I come in contact with as comprehensive and informative evidence as was submitted at this hearing. I have given much space thereto, that readers may understand how shocked we were when Colonel Schley made his adverse report upon the survey. The port authorities had printed around 1000 copies of the
stenographic evidence and had sent the pamphlets to all members of the senate and house, the chief of engineers, the secretary of war, the board of engineers at Washington, and others, that they might be advised of Houston's just claim for further improvements of its Ship Channel.

Imagine our dismay and disappointment upon learning that Colonel Schley, having completed the survey in 1927, had forwarded his report through regular channels to the chief of engineers, in which he had disapproved the proposition to give the Ship Channel the increased depth and width requested.

I was sent to Washington post haste to see what could be done. General Edgar Jadwin, chief of engineers, who had been at one time district engineer in charge of the Galveston-Houston district, and a friend of the channel, was away upon duty in connection with the great Mississippi flood. General Deakine, assistant chief, as well as a number of United States engineers on duty at Washington, and familiar with the Ship Channel, extended me every courtesy, and I impressed upon them the injustice which had been done Houston by Col. Schley's report. In the absence of General Jadwin, they did not act but promised to take it up with him upon his return. I came home after filing a request for appointment of a special board to come to Houston and give a further hearing upon the project, which request was soon thereafter granted and three engineers of high rank were designated as a board of review.

HEARING BEFORE THE
BOARD OF REVIEW

When the Board of Review reached Houston, the Chamber of Commerce appointed a committee, headed by F. A. Heitman and Colonel Ike Ashburn, to arrange for their reception. At an informal dinner at the Rice Hotel, the visiting officers were introduced to representatives of the Port and other citizens, and we were invited to address them. Captain Crotty who had an intimate acquaintance with a large number of the engineering corps, first presented our reasons for overturning Colonel Schley's report. He was followed by several other speakers and I was expected to close for the Port. Colonel Schley was present by invitation, and to our surprise, stepped forward and made a lengthy argument in support of his report. He justified his action in passing upon an important matter by expression of his belief that under the prevailing policy of the national government, appropriations were made by congress in a lump sum, to be expended by the United States Corps of Engineers to the best advantage in providing for all approved projects, and he had reached the conclusion, there not being money enough to go around, that he should in making his recommendations to his superior officers apportion among the projects in his district a reasonable share of government funds, to the best advantage.

With this in mind, he said, that he had concluded that one port, providing a competitor on the Gulf for other great ports elsewhere, should be selected in his district; that Galveston, by reason of her location, was the best place to maintain such port in the Gulf district; the remainder of available funds to be divided among other ports and waterways under his jurisdiction.
I saw at once that Colonel Schley was entirely mistaken in presuming that Congress had abdicated and left the expenditures of all rivers and harbors monies to the United States Corps of Engineers.

I followed Colonel Schley and called his attention to the fact that he was misinformed as to his responsibilities; that he was without authority to recommend any new project for congressional attention; that he was without authority, as district engineer, to expend upon any project not adopted by Congress a sum exceeding $500 upon tributary streams; that when district engineers had sent their reports through regular channels to the chief of engineers, all went to the resident board of engineers at Washington with the chief engineer's approval or disapproval; that when Congress appropriated the annual lump sum, the chief of engineers called upon all district engineers to report to their superior officers what sums of money they deemed necessary to carry on the work upon adopted projects, for the current year, that when such reports from all over the United States reached the chief of engineers, they were carefully examined, and trimmed or increased as the chief of engineers deemed wise; that the chief of engineers thereupon submitted to the house rivers and harbors committee and senate commerce committee an itemized list of all sums to be expended out of such annual appropriation and where and for what purpose it was to be expended; that thereafter in framing the annual rivers and harbors bill, the chief of engineers and his staff were required to go before said committees and support every item included in their recommendations; and that after approval or rejection of appropriations recommended, the regular annual bill was passed, leaving it only to the well-known integrity of the engineering corps to expend the money upon projects as recommended and approved; and that neither the chief nor any of his subordinates could recommend any project that had not been surveyed by order of Congress, approved by the engineers and adopted by Congress.

Colonel Schley retired before the meeting was closed. The visiting officers were afterward given ample opportunity to examine the channel from Houston to Galveston and the public and private industries situated thereon, and were furnished with additional statistics to support Houston's demands. Colonel Schley was overruled by the reviewing board, who made a report in favor of the desired improvement of the Ship Channel from Galveston to the Turning Basin, sustaining his report, denying extension of the channel from the Turning Basin some two miles up the channel, and its extension upon Simms Bayou between the property of the port and the docks of the Manchester Corporation.
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Work of acquiring lands for the proper development of the Houston Ship Channel is reviewed in this installment of Col. Thomas H. Ball's history of the port.

How the Houston Ship Channel won its present 32-foot depth is related in this chapter by Col. Thos. H. Ball's story of Port Houston. Colonel Ball and Captain Crotty testified at a hearing before the United States Board of engineers in 1929. The board then approved the 32-foot project, which later was voted by congress.

CAPTAIN CROTTY AND MYSELF
SEN TO WASHINGTON

The report of the special board was sent to General Jadwin, chief of engineers, and submitted to the board of engineers at Washington for consideration.

The port commission, being advised of such action, had Captain Crotty to arrange for a hearing before the resident board of engineers and sent him and myself to Washington about March 4, 1929, to present Houston's claims.

In the absence of General Jadwin, General Deakin represented him, and when we went before the board, found it composed of members, many of whom were known to us, including Colonel Hoffman and Colonel Crosby who had previously been connected with improvements of the Ship Channel.

We enlisted the aid of Senators Sheppard and Connally and Congressman Garrett, and Congressman Mansfield showed up in his "roller chair". To our surprise and gratification, Congressman Dempsey of New York, chairman of the rivers and harbors committee of the house, voluntarily appeared and made a strong argument in support of Houston's claims, based upon his knowledge of the channel and its great municipal and industrial development.

Captain Crotty and myself remained for two days, in attendance upon the sessions of the board, which propounded many questions to me, relating largely to past developments and future possibilities, and to Captain Crotty upon the same subjects and especially respecting engineering problems about which, by reason of his long service, Captain Crotty knew more than did any single United States engineer who had had official supervision thereof.
PORT HOUSTON MAKES RAPID RISE

When Port Houston began growing, its rise was rapid. Here are a few scenes which reveal its progress.

Top, left: The North German seamer York, which inaugurated passenger service in the port in 1908.

Top, right: The Shell refinery when the industrial belt was extended to aid in its operation.

Center, left: The Sinclair refinery when Clinton Island (the wooded spot in the background) was acquired in connection with the channel development.

Center, right: The port commission boat, which has been used since 1929 for inspecting port projects and for showing the channel to visitors.

Bottom: Government dredge, one of several types now in use in the Ship Channel.
The two photos shown here demonstrate the value to major industries of the Houston Ship Channel. Above is the Shell refinery with a view of the deep water loading facilities. Below is a view of the Sinclair refinery with the ship channel in the background. Ships can be seen at docks.
The 32-foot project was favorably passed upon by the board and chief of engineers and sent to congress, where it met approval by the house and senate.

Contract was let by Maj. Miles P. Fox, Colonel Schley's successor, in 1929, and work soon thereafter began. The navigation district was confronted with the necessity of procuring rights-of-way and spoil grounds, to permit the widening and deepening of the channel, and the cutting off and easement of bends, which were procured by Captain Crotty and myself. In doing so, we were able to get the owners of much valuable property to give rights-of-way, or sell same on both sides of the channel, for practically one-half their value, due in part to the willingness of owners to deal fairly with the port commission and in part to the fact that the establishing of harbor lines upon both sides of the channel made it impractical for the owners of frontage to construct wharves or docks jutting out over the Harbor lines.

We were able to show such owners that it would be of great benefit to have the government make excavations, especially in the upper reaches of the channel, taking away much of the frontage within such lines which would otherwise have to be removed by the owners or their assignees.

By amicable agreement with all property owners, we were able to meet the government's demand, well within the limits of the port commission's budget. Upon completion of the 32-foot project, in 1935, the facilities and use of the channel were tremendously increased, thereby encouraging located industries to expand and new industries to locate.

THE SHELL COMPANY COMES

The Shell Oil Company had acquired a large body of land having extensive channel frontage on the lower reaches of the channel, and planned to build a great refinery, with improvements, to cost around fifteen million dollars. It was promised municipal belt service, which would give it access not only to the channel, but to every railroad entering Houston. The railroad companies operating the belt, anxious to avoid friction with the interstate commerce commission, notified the navigation board that they could not operate the municipal belt to serve the Shell plant unless with a certificate of "convenience and necessity" from the interstate commerce commission, as they would be threatened with prosecutions. Frank Andrews, general counsel for the Missouri Pacific lines, was in New York, and H. R. Safford; vice president and general manager of said lines, arranged to have him meet me in Washington upon my arrival, to take up the matter with the interstate commerce commission. He and I had an extended conference with Mr. Mahaffey of the interstate commerce commission, who thought the matter might be arranged, especially if the navigation board would consent to interstate commerce commission jurisdiction in the future. He referred us to a fine-looking lawyer, who impressed me as having been given his legal connection on account of his looks or some political pull, rather than his legal ability.
I told him the status of the Municipal Belt, and of all its extensions and activities, and that the navigation board had extended it to the Shell plant, at their cost and expense.

I told him that I had given a legal opinion to the port commission that purely municipal belt railroads, which performed only switching service at an agreed price, and neither issued nor received bills of lading for intra-state or interstate freight, were not subject to the jurisdiction of the I.C.C. and the port commission acting thereon had declined to make reports upon forms repeatedly sent them by the I.C.C; that the only case which the I.C.C. relied upon was that of a short, municipally owned railroad at Mobile, which had voluntarily applied to the I.C.C. for the privilege of joining railroads in making rates, which of course was granted, as there was no objectant.

That after the railways began operation of the Municipal Belt and after numerous extensions had been made, without application to the I.C.C. for a certificate of "convenience and necessity," the I.C.C. was "putting coals of fire" on the heads of railways and their attorneys who, although I believed they agreed with my opinion, were anxious to have the port commission apply for such certificate when it began the extension of the Belt to reach the Shell plant. This the port commission was unwilling to do, as to begin such a custom would require such applications for every extension of the Municipal Belt to serve industries seeking its service. However, to relieve the fears of the railway officials that trouble with the interstate commerce commission might result if the railways were permitted to operate immediately, the navigation board was willing to make an application now for a certificate of "convenience and necessity," and continue to do so as to future extensions.

The lawyer stated, with great vigor, that we had been violating the law. I replied that if he would not interfere with the railroads but would institute criminal proceedings at once in the federal court, we would fight it out with them without fear of the result. Further, that numerous extensions had been made with the knowledge of the I.C.C., and knowledge of the refusal of the navigation board to recognize their jurisdiction, and that I thought he might well agree to let us comply without obligations to the Shell company.

"Do you want me to compound a violation of law because your navigation board has been doing so?" he pompously asked, rising from his chair.

I arose and replied, with some heat: "I want you to do a sensible, proper and legal thing, which could be done, and the navigation board thus allowed to carry out its plans without delay."

Without further argument, Mr. Andrews and I left. He went to the railroad office to arrange for our transportation and I to the telegraph office to send a wire to Sterling, substantially as follows:
"Mission unsuccessful. Suggest arrangements be made to accept from contractors for the Belt extension, which is practically complete, and either get an engine and cars and give the Shell the needed service for material to build its plant, or accept the road and turn it over to the Shell for operation without cost to it." When I reached Houston, necessary arrangements had been made, the track accepted, and the service given and nobody went to jail.

The railways constituting the Port Terminal Association were still unwilling to operate the belt extension constructed to serve the Shell plant, and concluded, in their corporate names, to file application for such certificate, including all properties to be operated over the line from Harrisburg, on the south side of the Ship Channel, thence eastward some 10 miles through districts designated as Manchester, Pasadena and Deepwater, to Deer Park, near a new oil refinery then under construction; and further stating that the track reaching the oil refinery had been constructed by the Navigation District since the application was filed.

It will be noted that all of the belt mileage which had been operated by the railroads for nearly five years was included in the application. As counsel for the Port Commission, I did not join in the application; for the reasons hereinbefore stated. J. H. Tallichet of general counsel for the S. P. Lines had prepared and filed the application, but it had not been acted upon because of his being so pressed with other matters.

None of the other railway lines could reach the Shell plant, to which was being shipped much freight, including a tremendous number of cars of oil from the recently discovered East Texas oil field, and they, as well as the port officials, were anxious to give the Shell plant the desired service. Mr. Tallichet was glad to turn over the matter to W. L. Cook, of counsel for the Missouri-Pacific Lines, and myself to aid him, without joining the Navigation District in the application. We prepared a brief and amended application, and secured prompt action thereon without making a trip to Washington; the interstate commerce commission certificate being issued February 9, 1929, authorizing the railroads to operate over all Navigation District tracks.

I am making record herein of what I deem a very important matter, as by such certificate all municipal belt tracks theretofore or hereafter constructed may be operated by the railways, or the Navigation District if it takes over the operation thereof, without being harassed by a continued necessity to get such certificate and make expensive and uncalled for reports to the interstate commerce commission.

ACQUISITION OF CLINTON ISLAND

While Captain Crotty and myself, by direction of the Port Commission, were negotiating for some lots for right of way purposes in the old townsite of Clinton, we learned that the ownership of lots upon Clinton Island, lying...
between the new and old channel, were owned by the Southern Pacific and a large number of unknown owners, and that a squatter was laying claim to the island under deeds from various parties. We took the matter up with the Port Commission, and they decided that the 23-acre island, situated as it was, would furnish the Navigation District with very valuable frontage upon either side and both ends, capable of accommodating many docks and vessels. It was found that to perfect the titles to a very large number of lots upon the island it would be necessary to ascertain from the records the names of all persons claiming or likely to claim ownership thereof; and that condemnation suits against claimants and unknown owners would be necessary. The Port Commission retained Ewing Werlein and W. J. Coulson to conduct negotiations with owners having title to lands in the subdivision, and to perfect title by condemnation proceedings when necessary, Captain Crotty and myself to co-operate with them in all matters, especially in obtaining lands at satisfactory prices, subject to the approval of the Port Commission.

The acquisition by purchase and condemnation of property required much time, during 1925 to 1929, inclusive, but the Navigation District acquired the island, of about 23 acres at about $1200 per acre, when mainland property was being sold at from $3000 to $5000 per acre, the title to which was approved by me as counsel.

In acquiring right of way and spoil grounds, a number of graveyards, which the Navigation District could not condemn, gave the Port Commission much trouble and expense. Among others, Captain Crotty found a private graveyard upon Clinton Island which had to be removed. Fortunately, the living members of the Crispi and Barcelo families appreciated the necessity thereof and greatly aided Captain Crotty in obtaining the right to disinter and remove the remains to other locations. In all, 40 bodies were carefully removed by a contractor employed by the Port Commission, and re-buried at designated places as follows: The remains of three children of the Sawyer family and two adults were re-interred in Harrisburg Cemetery, 10 bodies in lots 65 and 71 in Hollywood Cemetery, of which four were members of the Rival family, four of the Williams family and two of the Crispi family. Mr. Barcelo removed the four bodies of the Barcelo family to a lot in Harrisburg cemetery. Markers were procured and placed at the head of graves of members of the Rival, Crispi, Williams and Barcelo families.

A part of the Clinton Island cemetery had been set apart for negro people and the remains of 22 were removed and re-interred in the negro cemetery of the Baptist Church at Fidelity.

The total cost of moving these bodies, including purchase of lots in the colored cemetery near Clinton and in Harrisburg, was only $1650. Had sentiment or greed controlled, either a much larger cost would have been incurred, or the proper development of Clinton Island seriously interfered with.

This incident is set down as outstanding evidence of the spirit of co-operation by our citizenship in every walk in life, in matters affecting the development of the Port of Houston.
ACQUISITION OF LANDS
FROM SINCLAIR OIL COMPANY

When the Southern Pacific conveyed its holdings upon Clinton Island to the Navigation District for an agreed and satisfactory price, it had a small mill thereon, under an unterminated lease, and the conveyance was subject thereto. The mill-owner used the old bayou channel, which lay between Clinton Island and the large holdings of the Sinclair Oil Company. In the operations of the oil company, the mill owner claimed that it had so filled the old channel as to deprive him of the use thereof in his business, and filed suit for damages and an injunction to restrain the oil company from making use of the old channel in a way to affect his rights to its use, which injunction was removed to the federal court.

The mill-owner obtained a judgment for $10,000 and injunction as prayed for. The judgment was not so serious, but the injunction was. The Sinclair Company, having no right to condemn lands, took up the matter with the Port Commission, which detailed Captain Crotty and myself to see what could be done to relieve the situation. Captain Crotty obtained a proposition from the oil company to donate 36 acres of land along the east side of Sims Bayou to the Navigation District, conditioned upon the Port Commission's securing from the national government the right to close and fill the western entrance of the old bayou channel between Clinton Island and the mainland, so that the waters from Sims Bayou would be diverted to the Houston Ship Channel. The desired authority was obtained through the United States engineers, and the Port Commission filled the old channel for a distance sufficient to connect the land acquired from the oil company with Clinton Island, and permit the Municipal Belt to reach Clinton Island, owned by the Navigation District. The 36 acres thus acquired from the oil company, together with Clinton Island, made available a waterfront owned by the Navigation District sufficient to develop twelve to fourteen ship berths reached by the Belt Railroad, which will be of great value in the expansion of the port's facilities. The 36 acres thus donated by the oil company fronts upon Sims Bayou, directly across from lands owned by the Manchester Corporation, and have an estimated value of not less than $5000 per acre, at which price the donated land would be worth at least $150,000, a price that I am sure would not be accepted by the Port Commission.
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The Chronicle continues publication of Col. Thomas H. Ball's eye-witness account of the development of the Port of Houston.

Colonel Ball this week tells of the recognition given the port and city in naming the cruiser Houston, and tells of the launching ceremonies.

This week's installment also covers the period in which R. S. Sterling was nominated for governor of Texas and Joe W. Evans was named to succeed him.

NAVY CRUISER NAMED FOR HOUSTON

When congress authorized construction of eight treaty cruisers of large tonnage and great speed, after two had been named Pensacola and Salt Lake City, some 80 cities applied to have one of the remaining six named in their honor.

William A. Bernrieder, secretary to Mayor Holcombe, was an active member of the Navy League of the United States, and while the Mayor was in Europe attending the World's Ad Club convention, Mr. Bernrieder took up with Mayor Pro-Tem H. A. Halverton the matter of having a cruiser named for Houston. Together with Col. Ike Ashborn, vice president and general manager of the Chamber of Commerce, they made out a list of citizens whom they invited to meet in the Chamber of Commerce quarters. I was not invited to attend the meeting, but received a phone call to come over. Upon my arrival I found a large crowd assembled and was told by Mr. Halverton that they had decided to draft me for service as chairman of a committee to conduct a campaign to get one of the cruisers named for Houston. Complimentary references were made as to my fitness for the job because of acquaintance with officials in Washington and members of congress. From past experience I knew they were calculating upon my known weakness to accept public service carrying no perquisites except honor. I told them that due to press of demands upon my time, I would not take the place unless all present and others interested would do the greater part of the necessary work; and unless the mayor gave me the services of Mr. Bernrieder to do contact work and carry on correspondence under my direction; also that I would not head the committee if it was expected to solicit funds for the purpose, or if anyone was to be paid for services. These conditions were agreed to and the following committee was selected:
Cruiser Houston Launching Committee at White House

Mayor O. F. Hallumbe was made honorary chairman, and Lieut. Commander E. S. Jefferson, U.S.N., chairman of the board, announced that Messrs. W. Michaux, Gen. J. E. Whittet, etc., as active members.

I have among my prized possessions a copy of the resolution prepared by a committee consisting of Judge Norman Atkinson, Cavin Ulmer, C. B. Gillespie, and Col. Jacob F. Walters, which was adopted by the full committee. A copy thereof was beautifully engraved upon parchment, and was sent me, inscribed as follows.

Mayor O. F. Holcombe was made honora ry chairman, and Lieut. Commander E. V. Iverson, U. S. N., recruiting officer, and Lieut. L. R. McDowell, U. S. N. were named ex-officio members.

Through Doctor Oberholtzer, superintendent of Houston schools, we enlisted the services of all public school teachers and their pupils and had them write original letters direct to the secretary of the navy, urging the naming of a cruiser for Houston.

Officials of leading cities of Texas were induced to add their endorsements. The governor and legislature of Virginia, the birthplace of Sam Houston; the governor and legislature of Tennessee, where his early manhood was spent and high honors achieved, and the governor and legislature of Texas, where his life was crowned with yet greater honors, gave their official endorsements, as did Virginia, Tennessee and Texas delegations in congress. The executive committee secured and forwarded endorsements from many municipal officials, chairmen of the Democratic and Republican executive committees, labor organizations, civic clubs, societies, fraternities, women's clubs, business and commercial organizations, veterans of all wars, and the Boy Scouts.

I think there was filed with the secretary of the navy, the Hon. Curtis D. Wilbur, a greater column of letters and endorsements carrying the names of citizens of Texas and inhabitants of other states than ever found a resting place in the files of the navy department. The secretary of the navy, on a trip from California en route to Washington, stopped off in Houston long enough to tell Mayor Holcombe to stop the flood of telegrams and letters that had come to his office in such numbers as to tax filing space therefor; that (nor for publication) Houston had won, which the secretary verified officially on September 7, 1927.

Proper credit cannot be given to all members of the committee and others who rendered invaluable service, but I am impelled to say that Mr. Bernrieder, who initiated the movement to have a cruiser named for Houston and devoted his time to the intelligent and efficient discharge of his secretarial duties, was an indispensable factor in crowning our efforts with success.

I have among my prized possessions a copy of the resolution prepared by a committee consisting of Judge Norman Atkinson, Gavin Ulmer, C. B. Gillespie, and Col. Jacob F. Wolters, which was adopted by the full committee. A copy thereof was beautifully engraved upon parchment, and was sent me, inscribed as follows:
"Whereas, official announcement has been made by the secretary of the navy that one of the cruisers now under construction will be named Houston in honor of the City of Houston; now, therefore,

"Be it resolved, in recognition of the unselfish service, valuable leadership and counsel of the Honorable Thomas H. Ball, who acted as chairman of the committee for a U.S.S. Houston, that he be tendered a special vote of thanks on behalf of the citizens of Houston.

The construction of the cruiser at Newport News, Va., was speedily begun and it was ready to be christened and launched on September 7, 1929. The mayor and cruiser Houston committee decided to make the occasion a gala event. In accordance with established custom, a sponsor and maid of honor had to be chosen. The committee had chosen Miss Elizabeth Holcombe, the mayor's daughter, as sponsor, prior to the election of his successful opponent, W. E. Monteith. At a called meeting of the committee some thought it might be well to select Miss Holcombe and present her name to Mayor Monteith. I told my co-members that it was inadvisable to select her officially, that I knew Mayor Monteith would gladly and graciously name Miss Holcombe as sponsor, with the right to choose her maid of honor.

The committee called upon Mayor Monteith and advised him of the desire of the committee that he name Miss Holcombe as sponsor, with the right to choose her maid of honor, and that he invite Miss Charlotte Williams, the granddaughter of Sam Houston, to attend the launching as the sole guest of the city, others going at their own expense. Our recommendations were promptly and favorably acted upon by Mayor Monteith. Miss Williams and Miss Holcombe accepted and Miss Holcombe named Miss Mary Ellen Bute as her maid of honor.

Thereupon, my work as chairman of the committee being completed, I tendered my resignation and upon my motion Mayor Monteith was made chairman over his objection, which he waived when assured by our committee that the launching of the cruiser Houston should be attended by the mayor of the city as head of the delegation.

I was made honorary chairman of the committee but did not go to the christening as my presence was not necessary.

WOMACK AND FARISH APPOINTED

In 1930, D. S. Cage, who had served as a member of the city harbor board while I was chairman thereof, and had been appointed a city commissioner when the new board of navigation and canal commissioners was created, resigned from the board on account of failing health, and left a vacancy hard to fill.
Mr. Cage had given unsparingly of his time for more than ten years to the development of the port, and by his acquaintance with real estate, transportation, shipping and general knowledge as an experienced businessman, had been a wise counselor and aid to his associates in solving the many problems demanding vigilance and good judgment. Mayor Monteith, an intimate friend of K. E. Womack, induced him to become Mr. Cage's successor upon the board.

While chairman of the city harbor board and member of the navigation and canal commissioners, I had every opportunity to learn of Mr. Womack's friendliness for and interest in the Ship Channel and to know of his quiet and effective interest in the development of the port, especially in matters affecting the use of the channel by cotton factors, who in handling their products made the largest possible use of the Ship Channel before and after it became a deep waterway. As an influential member of the Houston Cotton Exchange and a former president thereof, he brought to his membership on the board a large experience in his own business, as well as that of a man of excellent business qualifications. From his appointment in 1930, he has proved an excellent successor to Mr. Cage, now deceased. Mr. Womack is still one of the port commissioners.

Former Mayor Campbell, who had been so potential in the development of the Ship Channel, and who, in 1924, had been induced by County Judge Chester H. Bryan to accept appointment as a county member of the new navigation board, also resigned in 1930.

S.P. Farish, a young man of fine business capability, and with large experience in business matters, manager of an important corporation which had located adjacent to the Ship Channel, was appointed by County Judge R. H. Spencer to succeed Mr. Campbell. He qualified at the same time that Mr. Womack did and made an excellent representative of the county and member of the board until his resignation, in 1932 on account of imperative business interests.

LAUNCHING OF U.S.S. HOUSTON

A large delegation headed by Mayor Monteith and the late Judge W. O. Huggins, the latter acting as special representative of Governor Dan Moody, chartered a special train to Washington to attend the christening of the Houston, September 7, 1929. At Washington a steamer was engaged for the trip down the Potomac to Newport News.

Governor Harry Flood Byrd of Virginia, by proclamation, named the day of launching "Houston Day," and the mayor of Newport News declared a holiday.

The governors of Tennessee and Virginia attended with their military staffs, and the assistant secretary of the navy presided at the ceremony, with six admirals present. In the background were five battleships, eight cruisers and a large number of smaller craft.
The Texas senators and congressmen, including Houston's representative, the late Congressman Daniel Garrett, were in attendance, as were many senators and members of congress from other states, and high naval officials. Around 10,000 visitors were there, including more than 2000 Texans.

A bottle of Buffalo Bayou water was used by Miss Holcombe in christening the cruiser Houston. Her maid of honor, Miss Butte, and Miss Williams, special guest of Houston, were with her as she broke the bottle over the prow of the Houston as it glided down the ways amid the acclaim of the multitude.

**ROTARY SALUTES CRUISER.**

The Rotary Club, of which a large number of Houston's representative citizens are members, concluded to have a public meeting, call it "Cruiser Houston Day," and turn over the conduct thereof to the Cruiser Houston committee. Rotarians and their guests taxed the capacity of the Rice ballroom, and corridors and balconies reaching thereto were filled.

The assembly room was profusely decorated with flags and flowers and a large picture of the cruiser was hung on the wall.

The president of the Rotarians introduced me to the audience in a complimentary way and called to mind the occasion when the Rotary Club had honored me by presentation of a beautiful medal upon which was inscribed: "In grateful appreciation of the splendid service rendered during many years, especially in the interest of the Houston Ship Channel." After briefly expressing my heartfelt gratitude, I pointed to the picture of the Houston, admitted my ignorance as to how it was constructed, and called up Lieut. E. E. Kerr, a member of our committee, to make the principal speech. He did so in a most informative and entertaining way, making an educational talk that would ordinarily be a dry subject, very informative to all present except the naval officers upon the platform, who, as honorary guests, also made speeches. I have never attended a meeting where the program was better carried out, and at which all speakers recognized the importance of "terminal facilities". However, my judgment may be influenced by the fact that I was referred to in a way to cause me and perhaps many others to wonder if they were talking about me."

**SILVER SERVICE FOR CRUISER.**

In accordance with the custom of states and cities to present silver services to naval vessels named in their honor, Mr. Bernrieder was authorized to negotiate for a silver service to cost around $25,000, the city authorities having agreed to pay for it.

J. W. EVANS CHAIRMAN

R. S. Sterling, having been nominated for governor of Texas, resigned the chairmanship of the Port Commission in October, 1930. The city and county authorities were confronted with the responsibility of finding a man
fitted to assume the duties so ably discharged by Mr. Sterling and his predecessor, Mr. Peden.

Friends of J. W. Evans, without his knowledge, recommended his appointment as chairman, stressing the fact that he was a prominent member of the Houston Cotton Exchange, had served as president of the Chamber of Commerce, and had been actively identified with all movements looking to the development of the Houston Ship Channel, as well as the material interests and civic obligations of the city, county and community. The city council and commissioners court tendered him the place, which he accepted, and has given unsparingly his time and business ability in discharge of the duties thus assumed.

When Mr. Evans became chairman, his associates upon the board were R. J. Cummins and K. E. Womack, city appointees, and W. T. Carter, Jr., and S. P. Farish, county members. Mr. Cummins and Mr. Carter were made vice chairmen. Captain Allin, port director; Captain Crotty, assistant port director; H. L. Washburn, auditor, and myself as counsel, continued to hold our respective positions.

SILVER SERVICE RECEIVED.

On October 25, 1930, the Houston arrived and was made fast at one of the docks. Elaborate preparations had been made for its reception, and the presentation of the silver service. The vast crowd was wonderfully handled, and when the city officials, headed by Mayor Monteith, followed by the cruiser committee, boarded the magnificent vessel, Capt. Jesse B. Gay, U. S. N., his officials and crew, were in readiness.

Mayor Monteith, in a short, appropriate speech, presented the silver service, which was accepted by the commanding captain in well chosen words. The ship's colors, provided by the school children of Houston, were next presented, and together with the silver service placed in front of the captain's and admiral's quarters, and the many floral gifts, made a beautiful display. Trophy cups given by the Rotary Club and Boy Scouts were also presented. After the ceremonies, all visitors were shown over and through the ship in an orderly way and left greatly impressed. On April 21, 1931, the Houston became the flagship of the United States Asiatic fleet; in February, 1932, it was detailed to protect American interests in the bombardment of Shanghai by Japanese; on June 30, 1934, it was detailed to take President Roosevelt on a cruise to the West Indies, Panama and Hawaiian Islands; in September, 1934, commanded by Capt. W. B. Woodson, U.S.N., it made a second visit to our city as flagship, at which time its officers were entertained in the city and at San Jacinto Inn; in May, 1935, it was detailed to take President Franklin D. Roosevelt, a former assistant secretary of the navy, to annual maneuvers and a special visit to the Hawaiian Islands, and in July, 1935, won the white "E" for excellency in engineering.
To keep in touch with the Houston, the living members of the original cruiser committee effected a permanent organization, with A. D. Simpson, chairman; Gavin Ulmer, vice chairman; William A. Bernrieder, executive secretary and treasurer; Mayors Holcombe, Monteith and myself as honorary chairmen, and Lieut. Com. E. V. Iverson, U. S. Navy recruiting officer, ex officio member—all residents of Houston. May B. A. Law, Col. B. C. Allin, Lieut. L. R. McDowell, U.S.N., and E. W. Grunthoffer were named as non-resident members.

C. B. Gillespie, late editor of The Houston Chronicle; D. W. Michaux, late vice president of the James Brox Company; Gen. J. F. Wolters, late general counsel of the Texas Company, all of whom rendered splendid service as members of the original committee have since "passed away," and now, at roll call, are "absent but not forgotten."

ACQUISITION OF BORSODI DOCK

When the Navigation District took over the city facilities it continued to operate the Manchester dock, constructed under Mayor Campbell’s administration, to comply with the conditions of the gift to the city by J. R. Cheek and associates of 1500 feet of channel frontage. This dock having proved one of the most remunerative of the city docks, the Navigation District opened negotiations for the purchase of a dock constructed by V. H. Borsodi and associates under a lease from the city. The dock had been specially constructed for handling coal and for other purposes, and the non-use of coal after oil and gas came in had greatly impaired the value of the dock and lease and made the city frontage less valuable, as the Borsodi dock occupied practically one-third thereof and was not adapted for use as a commercial dock because of the character of its construction.

Will Hogg, who had advanced a large sum to aid in the construction and operation of the dock, and had acquired control thereof, was liberal in dealing with the Port Commission; the dock was bought and lease canceled at a price that made his investment practically a total loss.

The Port Commission by this purchase was enabled to regain control of some five acres of land covered by the lease and to command the use of the 1500 feet of water frontage occupied in part by the Manchester dock.

It has been learned, while this story is being written, that the Port Commission has been able, by using portions of the material in the old superstructure, to construct at a very moderate cost a facility which will make the wharf serve a desirable purpose, worth more to the port than the amount paid for the Borsodi dock.

STOCKTON DELEGATION.

In 1930 the fame of Houston’s success in bringing deep water inland for 57 miles and establishing a great port had spread to California.
Stockton, which had long visioned a like project, sent a delegation of more than 50 members to Houston, where they were received and entertained with true Southern hospitality. They became acquainted with Lieutenant Colonel Allin, who had been promoted as a member of the reserve corps, and were impressed with his work as port director. Colonel Allin, on December 9, 1930, tendered his resignation, to take effect as soon as practicable, and thereafter accepted a like position at Stockton, an inland waterway port in California.

WAIT MADE DIRECTOR.

There were many applications for the position of port director, including that of J. Russell Wait, port director at Beaumont. Mr. Wait was not only an engineer of ability, but had an extensive knowledge of terminal railroad building and port operations, having been in charge of the municipal docks and railways at Charleston before going to Beaumont. He was requested to meet with the port commission, and after going over matters generally, Chairman Evans expressed the port commission's unwillingness to take him from Beaumont, a port with which Houston's port had always been friendly and co-operative. The port authorities at Beaumont gave their consent, however, and on December 16, 1930, Mr. Wait was appointed port director, effective January 1, 1931. Since that time he has served with great ability, both in the discharge of his duty as port director and as secretary of the Port Terminal Railway Association.
Top—This rare picture, taken in 1912, shows the officers of the Intracoastal Canal Association when it was organized. Seated, left to right: C. S. E. Holland, president; Col. C. S. Richie (now deceased), United States district engineer; L. A. Gueydan, vice president. Standing, left to right: Roy Miller, active vice president, and Leon Locke (now deceased), vice president.

The bottom pictures are the present members of the Port Commission. Top, left to right: J. W. Evans, chairman of the board; J. Russell Wait, port director, and D. A. Simmons, general counsel.

Bottom, left to right: Port Commissioners W. A. Sherman, H. C. Cockburn and K. E. Womack.
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The Chronicle again publishes another chapter in the stirring story of the growth of the Port of Houston by Col. Thomas H. Ball, Colonel Ball himself played a major part in the port's development and saw Houston's deep water port emerge from its humble bayou origin. His detailed and accurate account of the port's history should prove of value to every Texan who wishes to know his Houston.

NORTH SHORE ELECTRIC RAILROAD

Before the Municipal Belt extension to and across Greens Bayou had been made, Judge R. E. Brooks, the owner of a large tract of land east of Greens Bayou and north of the Ship Channel, had urged such extension thereto and offered a substantial donation of lands as an inducement. The Port Commission was not in a position to avail itself of his offer and thereafter Judge Brooks conveyed the lands and privileges offered the Navigation District to the North Side Electric Railroad Company, which H. K. Johnson and associates had projected for the purpose of a suburban electric road between Baytown, Goose Creek and Houston. The Missouri-Pacific lines had acquired and was operating it and had gone to considerable expense in laying tracks and providing terminals to serve the Haden plant and other industries then located upon Greens Bayou, and thereafter to be located upon the Brooks lands.

The Port Commission, after being advised by Captain Crotty and myself, requested me to give a legal opinion as to the rights of the Port Commission in the matter. I advised that the North Side Electric Railroad Company was within its rights in securing the concessions from Judge Brooks, as it was not a party to the contract with the railways operating the port Terminal Railway Association; but that the Missouri Pacific Lines, being a party thereto, was subject to the agreement that none of the railway members would attempt to serve industries not exempted from its terms, when the contract was made, which rule had been invoked as to the Southern Pacific when the Municipal Belt was extended to serve the Shell plant, H. R. Safford of the Missouri Pacific lines advised of the port's position readily agreed to abide by any fair settlement of the controversy. I made an appointment with Judge Brooks and found him anxious to have the Municipal Belt service and willing to make a larger donation and grant a more favorable franchise to the Navigation District than he had given the North Side Electric Railroad Company. The Missouri Pacific lines agreed to and did sell the Navigation District the roadbed acquired from Judge Brooks; reserving the right only to use the spur switch from its main line to comply with its obligations to the Haden Company; the public belt to have the
right to serve said plant. Judge Brooks conveyed the use of all lands included in former lease and franchise, and the right to use additional lands not included therein, and sold to the Navigation District at a very low price the right of way across his entire holdings in the northern part thereof from Greens Bayou to his east boundary line. Since then, the Navigation District has acquired from the Brooks estate a large tract of land reasonably priced, which can be used for dumping grounds and industrial sites and has oil prospects.

NORTH SHORE BELT

Prior to the election of Mr. Evans as chairman of the Port Commission, the Navigation District had acquired a right of way from the Municipal Belt Railroad yards to Clinton, which right of way adjoined that of the Clinton branch of the Southern Pacific, and had begun negotiation with property owners, from a point near Clinton, for right of way in a northerly direction around the Southern Pacific terminals to a point from which the Municipal Belt might be thereafter extended to a terminus at Lynchburg.

It was found that the Texas Company was willing to arrange a right of way through its property but that prices of land and damages claimed by some property owners were so great that they exceeded the budget of the Port Commission, based upon the estimate of Captain Allin.

After re-examination and further reports from Captain Allin and Captain Crotty, it was found that a more direct route for the Municipal Belt might be had by acquisition of a right of way parallel with the south side of the North Side Belt Railway, constructed by Mr. Cullinan, which railway had been granted the privilege of reaching and using the Municipal Belt's yards and facilities, in common with other railway lines, so as to operate therefrom to the dock and terminal at Nosworthy Bend which had been provided by J. S. Cullinan.

After purchasing the right of way adjoining the North Side Belt Railway, the Port Commission was confronted with the problem of obtaining a right of way through the extensive holdings which Mr. Cullinan had acquired and laid out for industrial purposes, and upon which expensive improvements, including an oil refinery, had been constructed. Such right of way, including damages incident to Municipal Belt operation, was likely to cost much money.

Chairman Evans and Commissioner K. E. Womack were requested to take up the matter with Mr. Cullinan, who had ever been a strong advocate of the channel. He had gone on record at Washington, while president of the Houston Chamber of Commerce, as having given assurances that a belt service upon both sides of the Ship Channel would be provided and maintained so as to insure reasonable rates for switching service to all industries located upon either side of the Channel.
After conferences with Mr. Cullinan, Mr. Evans and Mr. Womack advised the other port commissioners that Mr. Cullinan was willing to sell or lease the North Side Belt upon fair terms.

The port representatives ascertained that the North Side Belt, including right of way, damages, et cetera had cost much more than $300,000, and that the railroad commission had authorized a bond issue thereon of $300,000, with interest at 6 per cent, which bonds and the entire capital stock of the railroad were in the possession of and under the control of Mr. Cullinan.

During the negotiation, Mr. Cullinan suggested a price in excess of the cost, as estimated by the port engineers, of constructing a Municipal Belt Line upon the right-of-way already acquired. After further negotiations Mr. Evans and Mr. Womack reported that by the acquisition of the North Side Belt the port would absorb a competing line, and control a large tonnage, and in the extension of the Municipal Belt through Mr. Cullinan's holdings it was important to have Mr. Cullinan's cooperation.

The matter was given consideration, with the result that the chairman was authorized to offer Mr. Cullinan an annual payment of $12,000 for a satisfactory lease of the North Side Belt for a period of 90 years, which would be a return of 4 per cent interest upon its bond issue, with no return upon the capital stock of the road or the monies paid out by the company in excess of its bonded indebtedness. The Port Commission was short of funds, and the lease of the road would avoid the necessity of a bond issue for Municipal Belt construction at that time.

Mr. Cullinan agreed to such lease but thought during the 99-year period a revaluation of the property ought to be made at stated intervals. Mr. Carter and Mr. Cummins opposed such revaluation as it would involve future generations in the consideration of a deferred problem, and Mr. Cullinan agreed to have a lease drawn for the period of 99 years, without revaluation; which lease was prepared by his attorney, Judge Moore and myself as attorney for the port. It was approved by the Port Commission, and the North Side Belt is now operated as a part of the Municipal Belt Railway system.

Mr. Cullinan secured donation of right-of-way through all the lands owned by himself and associates; the Port Commission has extended the Municipal Belt through same, and therefrom to Greens Bayou, had built a bridge across said bayou, and provided Municipal Belt service for the Haden plant and other located industries east of Greens Bayou and can without delay provide service to future industries which may locate upon lands N.S.B.B. of the Ship Channel in that vicinity.

Securing this lease was of permanent outstanding advantage to the port. It enables the Municipal Belt to own and control a 200-foot right-of-way; accommodate industries located upon the Belt line or the Ship Channel by means of spur tracks; operate a shorter line that lessens the risk attendant upon crossing at grade, the main Clinton road, and probably avoid the necessity of overhead or under passes being hereafter required.
INTRACOASTAL CANAL

Mention of the important waterway known as the Intracoastal Canal, which forms a connecting link with the Mississippi and Ohio rivers, and thence to Pittsburgh, has been made, together with the fact that it will ultimately extend from the Sabine River along the Texas gulf coast to Brownsville. To this waterway may be attributed the location of the great Carnegie plant on the Ship Channel.

The canal project was first given impetus by a Texas organization with C. S. E. Holland, then a resident of Victoria, as its president. The Texas organization joined hands with Louisiana and fought for more than 25 years for recognition before any marked success attended its efforts.

The citizens of Houston enlisted strongly in the movement, J. S. Cullinan becoming very active in its work. Roy Miller, then of Corpus Christi, was selected as its Washington representative, and Loop Locke of Lake Charles, La., was for a long time its secretary. Col. C. S. Riche, as United States district engineer, became an enthusiastic advocate of the canal project and with other waterway enthusiasts of Houston I lent my aid and for years attended the annual meetings of the Texas-Louisiana Intracoastal Canal Association.

The original plan for a five-foot canal was wisely abandoned, and the present project contemplates a depth of not less than nine feet, which depth is now in effect more than half of the distance in Texas.

The success of this waterway is now assured and forms an important connection with our Houston Ship Channel.

EVENTS SINCE MY RETIREMENT

Since my resignation as counsel for the Port Commission, in July, 1931, my interest in the development of the port has not abated, and the continuance of this story is based upon some facts within my knowledge, but more largely upon information derived from the press and port officials.

No appropriations for the enlarged project have yet been made, but the chief of engineers is in favor thereof, and Congressman Mansfield, chairman of the rivers and harbors committee of the house; both Senators Sheppard and Connally and Congressman Eagle are at this writing urging the allotment of funds to give the desired depth and width.

No additional docks or wharves have been built, but the city and navigation district own 15 wharves, one being two-story, with 7634 lineal feet; while 19 wharves are privately owned with lineal feet of 16,025, both systems equipped to give berthing facilities to 58 vessels at one time.
The Port Commission has made many important improvements upon Navigation District facilities and various industries have expended large sums in improving their properties and extending the facilities. The Shell Company is adding to its great plant improvements around $4,000,000. The main line of the Municipal Belt Railroad extends down the south side of the channel to the Shell Refinery, a distance of approximately 12 miles, and serves public facilities thereon, also private industries with their own industrial spurs from the belt to their plants or water front terminals.

The Municipal Belt on the north side extends to the Turning Basin across Greens Bayou, a distance of eight and one-half miles, and has a three-mile section from the basin to the Carnegie plant.

The various industries which have located upon or near the Ship Channel since deep water was had are now estimated to have a capital investment of $200,000,000 on or near the water front, employing from 10,000 to 12,000 men, with a daily payroll of from $50,000 to $60,000. The General American Tank Storage and Terminal Company has recently completed its oil terminal at Galena Park, with 11 storage tanks, having 10,000 to 80,000 barrels capacity, and with pumps, pipe lines, office, laboratory buildings, residences for its executives, and others.

The Champion Paper and Fiber Company has acquired 160 acres from J. S. Cullinan, south side Buffalo Bayou, and at this writing is constructing a plant at an estimated cost of $3,500,000.

Above the Turning Basin, nine important industries have located and made large investments for plants on the channel, which will have water rates by vessel and barge lines.

Additional dumping grounds on the north side, one tract containing 262.03 acres, another of 126.68 acres, and 18 lots in the Brunsville Addition, have recently been acquired. Intracoastal Canal traffic during 1935 reached a total of 162,277 tons.

The American Barge Line comes from Pittsburgh to New Orleans and from there through the Intracoastal Canal to Houston, with cargoes of steel and sheet iron.

The tax rate of the district has been reduced from 29 cents to 24 cents upon $100 district values, which are less than the values upon city property; the bonded indebtedness has been reduced by retirement of bonds, and the 10-cent limitation upon taxation of Navigation District property is still in force.

The commerce using the port has gone constantly forward and it now ranks first in cotton, fourth in total tonnage and third in foreign export. Its commerce for 1935, coastwise and foreign, was carried by vessel movements, in and out, numbering 5039 tugs and barges being used in local and intracoastal traffic.
The total tonnage for the fiscal year ending 1936, including imports, exports and local amounts to 19,753,565 tons, of the value of $433,398,677. For the months already expired during the year 1936 both the tonnage and the value thereof have increased over the same period during 1935.

Cotton and oil are still our chief reliance; for the last fiscal year, ended in 1935, Houston shipped out 1,386,611 bales of cotton. For part season 1935 to May 8, 1936, Houston has shipped out 1,459,282 bales.

At five of the state's major ports oil is the principal commodity handled, and at Houston, oil capital of the state, over two and one-half million tons of petroleum products were entered as export cargo during 1935. The railway lines entering Houston have made partial recovery of lost earning capacity.

Without the service rendered by the railways, and their pay rolls and large contributions in the way of taxes; without the large investments of the oil companies, with pay rolls, taxes paid, and tonnage furnished the Channel; without the large investments made to handle cotton; the pay rolls thereof, the taxes paid, and tonnage contributions to the Ship Channel, Houston undoubtedly would not have been the city to suffer least of all during the "great depression," neither would she have made as rapid developments as she has along all lines.

When we consider these great commercial agencies, the proper regulation of which are deemed necessary in the public interest, will we not be justified in "speaking softly even if we carry a big stick"?

SERIOUS PROBLEMS

So far as the necessary deepening and widening of the Channel are concerned, the success of the port gives it a commanding position which assures funds necessary therefor as and when rivers and harbors bills are annually passed; and the Navigation District can be depended upon to meet all proper demands of the national government and to provide further necessary facilities.

So long as the present method of selecting the Port Commission prevails, which has practically eliminated politics from the selection of port officials, the services of citizens able and willing to give conspicuous service in the discharge of their duties can be commanded.

Such duties have been greatly increased, as the business management of its affairs are as much or more complicated than that of the city and county governments, or the affairs of any great bank or corporation.

The fact that their appointment carries with it the necessity of having no pecuniary interest in any undertaking or contract with which the Navigation District is concerned is a guarantee of unselfish and patriotic service which is not always required of "captains of industry."
PRESENT PORT MANAGEMENT

The affairs of the Navigation District are now being efficiently managed by Chairman Evans, Vice Chairman R. J. Cummins and W. A. Sherman, K. E. Womack and H. C. Cockburn.

Mr. Sherman is a prominent business man and has been an active friend of the Ship Channel for a good many years. Mr. Cockburn has not been so long identified with port interests, but as a citizen has actively joined in pushing Houston to the front. The latter two were appointed to fill vacancies occasioned by the retirement of Commissioners Carter and Farish.

In discharging their responsible duties, they are ably aided by their executive officers: J. Russell Wait, director of the port; Capt. Charles Crotty, assistant; J. L. Archer, accountant; J. T. Hanway, superintendent of wharves; George S. Colby, superintendent grain elevator department; H. L. Washburn auditor, and loyal and competent employees.

D. A. Simmons, my former law partner, succeeded me as general counsel and is not only an outstanding lawyer but a wise counselor.

Harbor Patrol Officer, L. A. McMillian recently passed away, to the sorrow of all his associates and a multitude of friends, after patrolling the channel for some 20 years.

The Navigation District will no doubt be able to enlist the services of highly qualified officials in the future, as it has in the past, to carry on the interests of a port which constitutes the leading asset of Houston and Harris County.
FOREWORD.

This is the concluding chapter in Col. Thomas H. Ball's history of Port Houston. It describes what was finally achieved after years of labor by enthusiastic workers for the development of the port.

PROBLEMS OF RATES

Since the adoption of the deep water project, the matter of freight rates has been a "thorn in the flesh" to Houston interests.

When the state railroad commission was created, it was confronted by a demand for a reduction or abolition of the charge from Galveston to Houston. The commission, headed by John H. Reagan, reduced the rate on cotton from Houston to Galveston from 50 cents to 30 cents a bale, and for years the rate thus stood, being the lowest for any 50-mile haul in the state.

The business interests of Houston, largely through the Cotton Exchange, Chamber of Commerce and other organizations, have consistently fought the proposition of giving other ports their natural advantages and denying recognition of the natural advantages of Houston as an inland harbor, commercial and railroad center, with shorter haul to the interior.

Politics got into the matter, and an issue was made pro and con by candidates for railroad commissioners. The seriousness of the situation was not quite so great until the policy of "Port Equalization" was attempted by the railroad commission.

Such policy was no doubt due to the success of Houston in bringing a great commerce to an inland harbor, by the Navigation District and city expending tremendous sums and assuming great burdens in co-operating with the national government. "Port equalization, and the desire of some railroads reaching Houston to fix rates not fair to Houston, but to their advantage," have managed to give Houston the worst of it in nearly every rate controversy.

In making the operating contract with the railroads which secured uniform switching rates for industries desiring to use the channel, the Port Commission was compelled to exempt from its operations certain industries then exclusively served by two of the great railways. Thereby the Port Commission was unable to compel the railways to serve all industries over the Municipal Belt and thus give the Navigation District its small allowance for cars handled; or prevent some of them from absorbing the switching charge in their long haul rate.

I understand that Houston now suffers by reason of the desire of one or more
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railways which reach New Orleans to give that port the preference over either Houston or Galveston, by making a lower or equal rate thereto over a much longer haul. It is human and not subject to just criticism for the hard-pressed railroads to be governed by what they deem their own interests. It is not only human but fair, that officials and citizens of a community should stand for just treatment.

TRAFFIC PROBLEMS

While the Port of Houston was going forward by leaps and bounds, intensive competition for business began.

Various solicitors have been employed from time to time and a number of bodies created to take care of the situation.

Backed by the Houston Cotton Exchange, the Chamber of Commerce and other business organizations, much good has come from their activities, which changed from time to time to get results.

I have learned from the press and port officials that a new governing body has been created which will hereafter act as an integral part of the port organization. H. B. Cummins, nationally known rate and traffic expert, assumes the management thereof. The shipping interests and board of directors consist of nine members, four from the Navigation District, two from the Cotton Exchange, two from the Houston Terminals, and one from the Maritime Committee.

J. W. Evans, chairman of the Navigation District, is chairman; K. E. Womack, port commissioner, vice chairman, and J. Russell Wait, port director, secretary. The directors are: Mr. Evans, Mr. Womack, D. A. Simmons, and Mr. Wait, from the Port Commission; R. D. Ernst and J. M. Johnson, from the private terminals; Lamar Fleming and H. M. Crosswell, from the Cotton Exchange; and R. B. Wilkens from the Maritime Committee. The executive committee is composed of Mr. Wait, chairman, Mr. Ernst and Mr. Fleming, members, with Mr. Evans an ex-officio member. The offices of the new organization will be in the Cotton Exchange Building.

Mr. Evans and Mr. Wait have given expression to the thought that the new organization means to secure all proper rate structures and business for Houston, and give a militant organization to better the port's position by securing equality in rates and practices for all forms of transportation.

SHIP CHANNEL COSTS

For construction and maintenance of the Ship Channel, according to the report of the government engineers, the United States government has, from the beginning through the succeeding years, including 1935, expended the sum of $24,209,807.02.
For construction only the Navigation District has contributed to the costs of the Ship Channel $2,774,178.78, making the total cost thereof during said periods $26,983,995.80.

To insure the use and development of the channel, the City of Houston, has provided facilities representing a capital investment of $3,482,376.96.

For facilities, rights of way, spoil grounds, etc. the expenditures of the Navigation District represent a capital investment of $9,855,723.74, making the total capital investments of the Navigation District and city $13,338,100.70.

The cost of the Ship Channel to the United States government, city and Navigation District during said periods aggregates the sum of $40,322,096.50.

It may be safely said that no harbor and waterway in this country of ours has more fully justified the expenditure of the sums named than has the Port of Houston, viz: By the development of its commerce, saving thereto of land and water charges; increased state, interstate, coastwise and foreign commerce; revenues from import and other duties; increased taxable values, with greater ability upon the part of taxpayers to support the national, state and municipal governments.

It can truthfully be said that no other project has received local co-operation and contributions thereto comparable with the "free will offerings" made by the City of Houston and the County of Harris to the Ship Channel.

HOW STATE HAS HELPED

The Houston Ship Channel, without contributions from the state, has had recognition and support from all departments thereof to an unusual and marked extent, and the following laws have been passed at Houston's request:

1. The creation of a Navigation District law under which all subsequent Navigation Districts have been created, which law was subsequently amended to give certain rights to Navigation Districts then or thereafter having a city of 100,000 inhabitants. By this provision we were able to secure measures which the Ship Channel wanted, but which were not desired or required by other navigation districts.

2. During Mayor Rice's administration, it was found impossible to protect the Ship Channel, from the city limits to Morgans point, from depredations and misuse either by property owners or trespassers. At Mayor Rice's request, Senator L. H. Bailey of Harris County secured the passage of a bill extending the city limits of Houston for a distance of 20 miles, so as to include a strip 5000 feet from the channel upon each side. The bill gave the city authority to regulate navigation and wharfage rates upon city facilities or those of private persons or corporations, and made such territory subject to civil and criminal laws enjoined by the city. The bill expressly exempted the annexed territory from taxation as to all parts thereof until embraced within the regular limits of the city. Senator Bailey conferred with General McKensie, chief of engineers,
who believed the bill very desirable, but doubted its legality. The senator stated that the same problem existed in many other sections, but no such extension of police power and privileges contained in the bill had ever been resorted to as far as he knew. The bill was passed and has proved of great importance in the development of the channel.

3. The law giving broad and extensive powers to Navigation Districts containing 100,000 inhabitants in the matter of creating and maintaining all kinds of facilities, and making improvements, as hereinbefore mentioned.

4. The law authorizing the consolidation of navigation and city boards and creating a five-member board to manage and control Ship Channel matters.

5. The law creating a Pilot Board without any precedent therefor, as herein set out.

6. The law granting the Navigation District submerged, lands and islands, with reservation therein of mineral rights and other privileges to the state, as herein outlined.

7. The law making substantial reduction in the amount of bond required of officials handling district funds, and of all contractors undertaking Navigation District improvements. Prior to the passage of this law, prepared by myself and Auditor Washburn, and approved by the Port Commission, the chairman of the district and the county treasurer were required to give individual bonds for the amount of all bond issues passing through their hands, the proceeds from which were to be deposited in a bank at the best interest rate thereon. Such bonds of officials ran as high as $3,000,000 and contractors were required to give surety bonds in double the contract price to be paid, which in some instances would amount to over $2,000,000. The making of these unnecessarily high bonds were troublesome and expensive, which expenses were necessarily carried into the cost of port development.

The banks actually handling Navigation District money were properly required to execute a bond sufficient to cover the maximum amount of funds coming into their hands. This law, which amply safeguarded the interests of the district, saved much trouble, considerable sums of money and greatly enlarged the field of bidders upon port improvements, especially upon smaller projects.

It is worthy of note that the state, acting through the legislature and both branches with the approval of every governor in office from the creation of the Navigation District until now, has given cordial support and encouragement to the Harris County Houston Ship Channel Navigation District. The several senators and all members of the legislature from Harris County have given energetic, intelligent and effective support to every measure coming before the bodies of which they were members.
Mayor Holcombe. The bottom picture shows the yacht bearing Mr. Roosevelt down the channel.

The men pictured in the middle row and at bottom right are those who have made engineering contributions to the port, beginning at the left with Port Commissioner R. J. Cummins. Mr. Cummins, who is a consulting engineer, was appointed to the old harbor board in 1919 and was a “carryover” when the present port commission was formed in 1922. Hence he has been in service longer than any of the other present commissioners, and throughout the years has given his engineering talents to the commission without cost or stint. Port officials say they would have had to keep a consulting engineer employed at all times if Mr. Cummins had not been on the commission. Others in the row, from left to right, are Gen. E. M. Markham, Col. Edwin H. Marks and Gen. Edgar Jadwin, all United States engineers. At the bottom right is another United States engineer, Gen. H. M. Roberts.
PREDICTIONS.

In writing this story I have avoided, as far as possible, giving dry statistical information, my purpose being to make the narrative more readable. However, through the medium of addresses given, statements made by friends and supporters of Houston's waterway, and the evidence of responsible witnesses whose words carry more weight than would an array of figures set down chronologically, I have made a fair record of events as they occurred over a period of 39 years.

By the united efforts of its citizens, our city, named for the immortal Houston, and the great state which won its independence 100 years ago, have now a magnificent harbor to serve the commerce of the world; a port reached by an inland "arm of the sea," the waters of which wash the shores of the battle field of San Jacinto.

Houston has a great future and its port will continue to grow in value and volume of business. I will not undertake to prophecy as to what is yet in store for her and her people.

During all the years which have passed, the citizenship of Houston has been its greatest asset. Let us hope that she may enjoy throughout all time a manhood and womanhood equal in courage and fidelity to those who have so blessed her progress from pioneer days to the present; who have brought Houston from a mere village to become the chief city of our great state.

A HAPPY ENDING.

This story had been ended with hopes and prophecies for the future and had been given to the papers for publication before a happy event transpired which seemed to provide a more fitting climax with which to conclude.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt, en route to Dallas to honor the Centennial celebration of the history of Texas since the battle of San Jacinto was fought and won, came first to Houston. Here he honored the shrine of victory at San Jacinto before going to San Antonio, where at the Alamo, the Texas immortals died to a man, casting the flaming torch of their martyrdom to be grasped by the heroes who followed Sam Houston until the Lone Star of Texas was carried to victory. When the presidential train reached Houston a multitude of men, women and children had assembled to greet and honor him.

When the president, Mrs. Roosevelt and others of the presidential party, including Governor Allred, alighted from their special train, they were met and were greeted by a small committee headed by Mayor Holcombe and that grand old Irishman, Former Mayor John T. Browne, 92 years of age. As they took their cars to begin a short parade upon some of our principal streets, they were greeted by a chorus of joyous welcome from the throngs which had lined the
streets, the sidewalks and by-streets, along the route over which the parade was to pass. From every balcony and from the windows of buildings along the route, smiling faces and joyous voices extended a cordial welcome, while the Texas Lone Star flag and the national flag in countless numbers gave silent and eloquent evidence of loyalty to the chief. The presidential party left their cars at the city docks to embark upon the yacht which awaited their arrival to make the trip down the ship channel to San Jacinto battlefield. All commerce upon the channel was stilled during the voyage and the president and party were given opportunity to inspect a waterway which, with the co-operation of the national government and the taxpayers of Harris county, has become a great inland harbor rivaling the chief ports of the world.

A. C. Burton's yacht, which carried the president and his party, was followed by the beautiful yacht of J. E. Josey, publisher of The Post, carrying Mrs. Roosevelt, Mrs. J. L. Shepherd, Sr., and Mrs. Mollie Cotton King, sisters of Mr. Josey, and other representatives of the womanhood of Texas, who added grace and interest to the party.

It was my privilege to go down the ship channel in Commodore Lane's attractive yacht. Mrs. Frank Andrews had a bevy of lovely women in charge; W. L. Clayton, tall and slender, while not neglecting his men friends, was solicitous for the comfort of the ladies; and big-hearted, big-bodied John T. Jones made himself a committee of one to look after me.

Upon my other side was seated M. E. Foster, editor emeritus of the Houston press, a born newspaper man and an ardent supporter of President Roosevelt. His newspaper, as well as The Post, published by Mr. Josey, and the Chronicle, owned by Jesse H. Jones, were, in the support of our guest, the president, for the first time in complete accord.

Upon reaching the battlefield, the president and party were quickly carried to the place prepared for his address. Facing a great throng, the radiant smile and resonant voice of the chief executive found their way to the inmost hearts and listening ears of all gathered to do him honor. Governor Allred introduced President Roosevelt in a stirring address. Just behind the nation's leader stood the tall form of Jesse H. Jones, first chairman of the city harbor board; to his right Senator Morris Sheppard, a loyal friend of the channel, and near them Congressman Joe Eagle, long a representative of the district.

The speech of the president was brief and comprehensive, and his perfect diction and historic information made it a contribution well worthy of such surroundings. To me, and doubtless to all others privileged to witness it, the most thrilling episode was when the president grasped the hand of Colonel Andrew Jackson Houston, 82 years of age, the son of the Victor of San Jacinto, and paid him gracious tribute to which Colonel Houston feelingly responded.
The arrival and departure of the president was attended by sunny skies and gentle breezes from the gulf. Another "rare day in June" had given us the opportunity to enjoy the visit of a great man, and to demonstrate to our president the beauty and marvelous development of the Houston ship channel.
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LED IN CIVIC AND POLITICAL AFFAIRS

FOR HALF CENTURY

Col. Thomas H. Ball, active leader in state and civic affairs for half a century, and the man credited with being the first to recognize the possibilities of developing Buffalo Bayou into an ocean port, died at 7:30 p.m., Sunday, at the home of his daughter, Mrs. Rebecca Ball, 1136 West Gray.

Colonel Ball was born in Huntsville in 1868, and named for his father, Rev. Thomas H. Ball, Methodist minister and president of the Andrew Female College of that city. His father died when he was six months old and six years later his mother died. The child was reared by his mother's bachelor brother, Sidney Smith, a captain in the Confederate Army.

ADMITTED TO BAR IN 1888.

He was educated at a private school and the Woodall Academy and later at Austin College, graduating in 1887. For a while, he worked as a clerk and salesman. He started reading law a short while later with Abercrombie & Han- dlinck, and was admitted to the bar in 1888, after attending law lectures at the University of Virginia.

Four years previously, in 1884, he began his public political career - a career that has lasted for nearly half a century. He toured the state, speaking in more than 36 counties in the interest of prohibition. That same year he was elected mayor of Huntsville, holding the office for three terms.

While he was mayor, the town issued bonds for a private school on the site of the old college which his father had been head. It was the first bond issue in Texas by so small a town as Huntsville.

FOUGHT FOR PROHIBITION.

For years he led every political battle for prohibition in Huntsville and for many years was a state leader in the fight for prohibition.

Colonel Ball was 87 when he was in Congress in 1936, when Capt. J. C. Hutcherson, father of the present Federal Circuit Court Judge J. C. Hutcherson, resigned his seat in congress. He was re-elected and served until 1939. Meanwhile, he moved to Houston in 1932.
Col. Thomas H. Ball, 85, active leader in state and civic affairs for half a century, and the man credited as being the first to recognize the possibilities of developing Buffalo Bayou into an ocean port, died at 3:15 p.m., Sunday, at the home of his daughter, Mrs. Rebecca Ball, 1952 West Gray.

Colonel Ball was born in Huntsville in 1859, and named for his father, Rev. Thomas H. Ball, Methodist minister and president of the Andrew Female College of that city. His father died when he was 6 months old and six years later his mother died. The child was reared by his mother's bachelor brother, Sidney Spivey, a former lieutenant in the Confederate Army.

ADMITTED TO BAR IN 1888.

He was educated at a private school and the Woodall Academy and later at Austin College, graduating in 1877. For a while, he worked as a clerk and salesman. He started reading law a short while later with Abercrombie & Randolph, and was admitted to the bar in 1888, after attending law lectures at the University of Virginia.

A year previously, in 1887, he began his public political career - a career that was to last for nearly half a century. He toured the state, speaking in more than 100 counties, in the interest of prohibition. That same year he was elected mayor of Huntsville, holding the office for three terms.

While he was mayor, the town issued bonds for a private school on the site of the old college which his father had been head. It was the first bond issue in Texas by so small a town as Huntsville.

FOUGHT FOR PROHIBITION.

For years he led every political battle for prohibition in Huntsville and for years he was a state leader in the fight for prohibition.

Colonel Ball was appointed to congress in 1896, when Capt. J. C. Hutcheson, father of the present Federal Circuit Court Judge Joe C. Hutcheson, resigned his seat in congress. He was re-elected and served until 1903. Meanwhile, he moved to Houston in 1902.
While in congress he served on the house rivers and harbors committee and the committee on the revision of laws. It was his congressional work in behalf of rivers and harbors that focused his attention on the possibilities of Houston and Buffalo Bayou.

CAMPAIGNED FOR BRYAN.

An early Democrat, Col. Thomas H. Ball, was a firm supporter of William Jennings Bryan when he ran for governor, he urged the establishment of a harbor commission. He fought side by side with Bryan throughout the state in behalf of the eight-hour law and the Bryan ticket.

He was given the name work for the development of the harbor. $100,000 was appropriated for work on the Houston Harbor in 1893. Three years later he secured a federal appropriation of $500,000, and in 1901, another $500,000.

Upon retirement from congress, he returned to Houston and began practicing law as a partner with Andrews & Ball, remaining a member of the firm until 1916, when he became a candidate for governor as leader of the prohibition forces of the state.

His connection with the Democratic party gave him important positions in the organization. He was chairman of the Walker County Democratic executive committee from 1884 to 1896. With three exceptions he was a delegate to every state Democratic convention from 1886 to 1916.

When a relative newcomer, James C. Ferguson, defeated Colonel Ball in the July primaries in 1910, after the election of Colonel Ball had seemed assured, he often was referred to as one of the martyrs of prohibition.

ON FIRST HARBOR BOARD.

Following the election he returned to his general practice of law in Houston.

Colonel Ball was a member of the first harbor board formed in Houston. Other members were Jesse H. Jones, John F. Scott, R. M. Farrar and C. H. Pilini.
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While in Congress he served on the House Rivers and Harbors Committee and the Committee on the Revision of Laws. It was his congressional work in behalf of rivers and harbors that focused his attention on the possibilities of Houston and Buffalo Bayou.

CAMPAIGNED FOR BRYAN.

An early Democrat, Colonel Ball campaigned throughout the state in behalf of William Jennings Bryan and the Free Silver issue. While James Stephen Hogg was governor, he urged the establishment of a state railroad commission. He went to Chicago to the Democratic convention to lead the protesting fight against the repeal of the purchasing clause of the Sherman Act. He fought side by side with Governor Campbell when a recalcitrant legislature tried to prevent the enactment of the state bank guaranty laws.

In Congress he was a leader in the rivers and harbors fight to secure money for developing the nation's water courses; he worked for the eight-hour laws and won national recognition from labor throughout the country.

He was given the name "Father of the Port of Houston" because of his active work for the development. In 1899 he secured a federal appropriation of $300,000 for work on the Ship Channel, the first appropriation made for that work. Three years later, he secured a second appropriation of $300,000, and in 1903, just before his retirement from Congress, a third for $500,000.

CANDIDATE FOR GOVERNOR.

Upon retirement from Congress, he returned to Houston and began practicing law as a partner with Andrews & Ball, remaining a member of the firm until 1914, when he became a candidate for governor as leader of the prohibition forces of the state.

His connection with the Democratic party gave him important positions in the organization. He was chairman of the Walker County Democratic executive committee from 1884 to 1896. With three exceptions he was a delegate to every state Democratic convention from 1886 to 1929.

When a relative newcomer, James E. Ferguson, defeated Colonel Ball in the July primaries in 1914, after the election of Colonel Ball had seemed assured, he often was referred to as one of the martyrs of prohibition.

ON FIRST HARBOR BOARD.

Following the election he returned to his general practice of law in Houston.

Colonel Ball was a member of the first harbor board formed in Houston. Other members were Jesse H. Jones, John T. Scott, R. M. Farrar and C. G. Pillot.
He was instrumental in having legislation enacted by the legislature allowing the formation of a navigation district.

The Harris County Navigation District was formed and took over the operations of all publicly owned facilities of the Houston Ship Channel.

He became counsel for the district in May, 1922, when the city harbor board was absorbed by the navigation district. He held the position until August, 1931, when he resigned.

Even after he was no longer connected with the port in an official capacity, Colonel Ball continued to be keenly interested in the port's development.

NO PAY FOR PORT WORK.

Following his retirement from active connection with the port, his former law partner, Frank Andrews, made the statement:

"Colonel Ball never received a penny of compensation for any of his vast amount of work for the port from the time he left Congress until, in 1923, 20 years later, when he became counsel for the Port Commission. I happen to know that Colonel Ball bore all of his expenses during those two decades out of his own pocket.

"He attended every meeting in Washington and elsewhere affecting the interests of the Port of Houston, and fought vigorously for the advancement of this port."

Colonel Ball was married in 1882, his bride being the former Miss Minnie Fisher Thomason, also of Huntsville. She died in 1941.

OF PIONEER FAMILIES.

Both Colonel Ball and his wife were members of pioneer Texas families. Mrs. Ball's people came to Texas in the 1840's, while it was still a republic. The Colonel's earliest boyhood recollections, he had told friends, was his mother reading the proclamation freeing the slaves to a group of negroes gathered before the family dwelling in Huntsville.

During World War I Colonel Ball was counsel for the state council for national defense, and his son David and seven nephews served in the armed forces.

Colonel Ball was a member of the Texas delegation to the Democratic convention in Houston in 1928 and it was he who made the speech placing in nomination the name of Jesse H. Jones as candidate for president.
MEMBER OF LODGES.

Colonel Ball was a member of the Harris County and Texas Bar associations, the Masonic Lodge, Knights Templar, Arabia Temple Shrine, the Houston Club, the Lumbermen's Club and the River Oaks Country Club. He was for many years a member and trustee of St. Paul's Methodist Church.

In 1936, when Colonel Ball was 77, he wrote an eyewitness story of the beginnings and development of the Houston Ship Channel from a shallow, sluggish stream for barge and small craft, to one of the nation's greatest ports. That year he was elected president of the board of regents for Texas State Teachers Colleges.

The town of Tomball, in northern Harris County, is named for Colonel Ball.

In his later years, while no longer connected with the Port of Houston or with political affairs, he continued to be keenly interested in the waterway he had given so much of his time to develop and to all public matters.

MIND REMAINED ALERT.

His mind was keen and alert up to the time of his death. He was ill less than a month before his death.

Colonel Ball is survived by two daughters, Mrs. Rebecca Ball and Miss Minnie F. Ball, both of Houston; a son, David Ball of Houston; three grandchildren, Mrs. A. Townsend Winmill of Long Beach, Cal., Aviation Cadet David Ball, Jr., stationed at Stockton Field, and Miss Rebecca Ann Ball of Houston; a great granddaughter, Elizabeth Winmill of Long Beach, and several nieces and nephews.

Funeral services will be held at 5 p.m. Tuesday in the drawing room of Settegast-Kopf Company. Burial will be in Forest Park Cemetery.
Death has ended the brilliant career of Col. Thomas H. Ball who served this community and state as a leader in public affairs for more than half a century. He lived a full life, dying at the age of 85 after an illness of less than a month. Colonel Ball lived through an interesting period in history and exerted a powerful influence in the development of Houston and the great Southwest. Born in Huntsville of pioneer Texas stock in 1859, he lived through wars and panics and eras of peace and prosperity. Left without father and mother at the age of 6 as the Civil War was ending and the era of reconstruction beginning, he was reared by a bachelor uncle who brought him up well and saw to it that he was provided with a good education.

His public career began in 1887 when he was elected mayor of Huntsville. An ardent prohibitionist, he toured Texas that year in the interest of prohibition, making speeches in 100 counties. A forceful speaker, he soon became recognized as leader of the dry forces in the state and one of the leaders in the national movement. With the support of the "drys" he made the campaign for governor in 1914 but lost to that rising master of politics, James E. Ferguson.

Colonel Ball is known as the father of Port Houston because of his work in developing the Ship Channel. Appointed to congress in 1896, he soon saw the possibilities of Houston as a deep water port. He had the vision to see the far reaching results of making Buffalo Bayou into a deep water outlet to the gulf and championed through congress the necessary measures to bring those dreams to a full realization. He obtained the first appropriation for the Ship Channel project, $300,000, in 1899. Three years later he was successful in getting a second $300,000 appropriation and before retiring from congress in 1903, obtained an additional $500,000 appropriation for the work.

His interest in the port continued until his death. Moving from Huntsville to Houston while a member of congress, he began the practice of law in this city in 1903. Colonel Ball was named member of the first Houston Harbor Board. After the navigation district was formed as a separate political unit and took over the port and harbor facilities from the city, Colonel Ball was retained as general counsel for the district and continued in that capacity until his retirement in 1931. He continued throughout the remainder of his life to maintain a keen interest in the port and was one of the most ardent and active supporters of projects designed to make Houston one of the leading ports of the United States.
Houston is especially indebted to Colonel Ball. His foresight, his unusual ability and his energy helped change this city from a struggling little town on the banks of sluggish Buffalo Bayou into a metropolitan city which already is one of the largest industrial and transportation centers in the country. He had a hand in the shaping of legislation which will have long lasting and beneficial effects on the state as a whole. He was a giant in mental stature and his influence will long be felt in this great state.