By Mr. NEEDHAM: Resolutions of the State Council of California, Junior Order United American Mechanics, requesting amendments to the present immigration laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolutions of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, favoring negotiations between the United States and Great Britain of an unlimited arbitration convention, as proposed by President Taft; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the chambers of commerce of San Francisco and Stockton, Cal., requesting the transfer of the sloop of war *Portsmouth* to San Francisco; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of numerous citizens of California, indorsing Mr. BERGER's resolution for an investigation of the arrest of McNamara and McManigal; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. REILLY: Resolutions of the National Consumers' League at its annual meeting in Pittsburg, Pa., protesting against the employment of minors in the delivery of mail; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. WHITE: Papers to accompany House bill 11609, granting an increase of pension to William Ross; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: Resolutions of Milwaukee Clearing House Association, of Milwaukee, Wis., relating to proposed legislation affecting cold-storage industries; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolutions of National Consumers' League at its annual meeting in Pittsburg, Pa., protesting against the employment of minors in the delivery of mail; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, *June 16, 1911.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented resolutions adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of the city of Washington, D. C., favoring the consideration of the appropriation bills for the expenses of the District of Columbia by the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and House, instead of by the District of Columbia Committees, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a memorial of Keene Hill Grange, No. 1602, Patrons of Husbandry, of Ohio, remonstrating against the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Washington, D. C., praying that the District of Columbia appropriation bill be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia for consideration instead of to the Committee on Appropriations, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CULLOM presented a memorial of Local Union No. 47, Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, of Coulterville, Ill., remonstrating against the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of Retail Clerks' Union No. 219, of Belleville, Ill., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Club of La Grange, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation for the preservation and control of the waters of Niagara Falls, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Chicago Peace Society, of Chicago, Ill., praying for the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a resolution adopted by Group 8, Bankers' Association of Illinois, favoring the adoption of an amendment to the national-bank act permitting national banks to make loans on real estate, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. PERKINS presented a petition of Progressive Grange, No. 308, Patrons of Husbandry, of Healdsburg, Cal., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the so-called cold-storage bill extending the time limit for the cold storage of articles of food, which was referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

Mr. BROWN presented a petition of sundry Indians residing on the Winnebago Indian Reservation, Nebr., praying for the enactment of legislation permitting the Winnebago Tribe of Indians to submit claims to the Court of Claims, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. STEPHENSON. I present a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint resolution (J. Res. 120, A) memorializing Congress to cause all dams owned by the United States and maintained in and across the Fox River to be equipped with fishways.

Whereas the public right of fishing in the Fox River between the cities of De Pere and Oshkosh, Wis., has been practically destroyed by the placing of dams unequipped with fishways in said river; and

Whereas the United States Government owns, controls, and maintains a number of such dams in and across said river: Therefore be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be respectfully requested to cause all dams owned and controlled by the United States and maintained in and across the Fox River in Wisconsin to be equipped with adequate fishways for the free ascent and descent of fish; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the United States Senators and Congressmen from the State of Wisconsin and to the Chief Clerks of the two Houses of Congress.

C. A. INGRAM,
Speaker of the Assembly.
THOMAS MORRIS,
President of the Senate.
C. E. SHAFFER,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.
F. M. WYLIE,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.

Mr. STEPHENSON presented the petition of Capt. H. A. Hamilton and sundry other citizens of Whitewater, Wis., praying for the enactment of legislation to further increase the efficiency of the Organized Militia, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a memorial of sundry business men of Spooner, Wis., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation designed to prevent legitimate protective price agreements and restrictions, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the First Unitarian Society of Milwaukee, Wis., praying for the establishment of an international court of arbitration, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. BRISTOW presented memorials of sundry citizens of Kansas, remonstrating against the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. SHIVELY presented memorials of the congregations of the Seventh-day Adventists Churches of Minora, Noblesville, Middletown, North Vernon, Kennard, and Kokomo, all in the State of Indiana, remonstrating against the enforced observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine presented a memorial of the congregation of the Seventh-day Adventist Church of Washburn, Me., and a memorial of sundry citizens of Aroostook County, Me., remonstrating against the enforced observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. KERN presented memorials of the congregations of the Seventh-day Adventist Churches of Indianapolis, Elnora, Kennard, and North Vernon, all in the State of Indiana, remonstrating against the enforced observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which were ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. JONES, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (S. 1078) to amend section 4 of an act entitled "An act for the preservation of the public peace and the protection of property within the District of Columbia," approved July 29, 1892, as to kiteflying, submitted an adverse report thereon (No. 71), which was agreed to, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the same committee, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each with amendments, and submitted reports thereon:

S. 1072. A bill to amend section 895 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 72); and

S. 1081. A bill to provide for punishment for larceny of public property from the workhouse and the reformatory of the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 73).

He also, from the Committee on Fisheries, to which was referred the bill (S. 2775) to authorize the establishment of

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

fish-cultural stations on the Columbia River or its tributaries in the State of Oregon, reported it without amendment.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

S. 2600. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to prevent the exhibition of obscene, lewd, indecent, or vulgar pictures in public places of amusement in the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 74);

S. 2599. A bill to authorize certain changes in the plan for the permanent system of highways for that portion of the District of Columbia lying west of Fourteenth Street, south of Taylor Street, east of Rock Creek Park, and north of Newton Street NW. (Rept. No. 75); and

S. 1899. A bill to repeal a portion of an act heretofore passed relating to the alienation of the title of the United States to land in the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 76).

EXTENSION OF LAMONT STREET, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. JONES. From the Committee on the District of Columbia I report back favorably without amendment the bill (S. 238) to authorize the extension of Lamont Street NW., in the District of Columbia, and I submit a report (No. 69) thereon. I call the attention of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. JOHNSTON] to the bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the bill for the information of the Senate.

The Secretary read the bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama. A similar bill passed the Senate at the last session, and it is very important that it should be presently acted upon on account of the condition now prevailing of property there as to improvements.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HEIGHT OF BUILDINGS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am directed by the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (S. 2224) to amend "An act to regulate the height of buildings in the District of Columbia," approved June 1, 1910, to report it favorably without amendment and I submit a report (No. 70) thereon. I ask for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 and section 7 of the act of Congress entitled "An act to regulate the height of buildings in the District of Columbia," approved June 1, 1910, be, and they are hereby, amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. That from and after the date of approval of this act no combustible or nonfireproof building in the District of Columbia used or occupied or intended to be used or occupied as a dwelling, flat, apartment house, tenement, lodging or boarding house, hospital, dormitory, or for any similar purpose shall be erected, altered, or raised to a height of more than four stories, or more than 55 feet in height above the sidewalk, and no combustible or nonfireproof building shall be converted to any of the uses aforesaid if it exceeds either of said limits of height."

"SEC. 7. That for the purposes of this act the height of buildings shall be measured from the level of the sidewalk opposite the middle of the front of the building to the highest point of the roof. If the building has more than one front, the height shall be measured from the elevation of the sidewalk opposite the middle of the front that will permit of the greater height. No parapet walls shall extend above the limit of height except on nonfireproof dwellings where a parapet wall or balustrade of a height not exceeding 4 feet will be permitted above the limit of height of building permitted under this act."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, I should like to ask for some information of the proponent of the measure.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, all there is about this bill is that it extends the height 5 feet. It has been ascertained by architects that a four-story building can not be constructed in the best form, so far as the upper story is concerned, at the height of 50 feet, which is now the law. It is recommended by the architects and by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia that the height should be extended to 55 feet, which it is argued can do no harm. Indeed, before the law governing the height of buildings was passed there were buildings on the residence streets constructed even higher than 55 feet. We have to-day in construction at least two buildings which it will be impossible to construct satisfactorily, so far as the upper story is concerned, unless this change is made in the law.

Mr. HEYBURN. My attention was not directed to the limitation of the height, because I think that is very proper, but I did not hear enumerated among the buildings business blocks.

Mr. GALLINGER. The bill does not deal with business blocks at all. It simply deals with residence streets. There is some verbiage in it which is simply a repetition of existing law. The only change in the law is to give a right to construct buildings to a height of 55 feet in place of 50 feet, as is now provided.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, I have had in mind and I have frequently been called upon to notice the effect that the construction of a very tall business block right in a residence section of the city to a large extent depreciates the value of the residences. I have in mind a group of buildings that were built within a very recent time, some of them now under construction, that will entirely shut off the view of a large number of residences of importance and of great value.

It seems to me if we are going to place a limitation upon the height of buildings it should not apply alone to those buildings within the residential district. Senators will readily recall one building that is being constructed adjoining residences that have been there for a long time and that are the homes of people who do not desire to move or to see any conditions brought about that would compel them to move their place of residence. I think that the limitation should include business blocks.

I like to see the city improve, and I would not favor for a moment any legislation that would retard the building up of the city and the building of business blocks. But if you are going to place a limit in the residential districts you should also place a limit in the business blocks, because it must be in the interest of the residents of the city. This limitation is placed upon one class of buildings, and it must be against the interest of the people of this city that it is not placed upon other classes. A large residential system has been practically blocked out so that there is no hope of ever again enjoying a view greater than across the street. While this bill is being considered, it is a good time to make it sufficiently comprehensive to cover that condition.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, we have a law now which is very explicit governing the construction of all kinds of buildings in the District of Columbia. It may be that the limitation is too great. I am not going to argue that to-day. It was thought wise when the law was enacted.

I deprecate these high buildings as much as the Senator from Idaho does. I dislike exceedingly to see the skyline destroyed in the city of Washington. Yet it was thought desirable to pass the law which is now on the statute book, which the Senator can refer to and which will properly be a subject of discussion later on. But for the present I apprehend the law is not being violated in any respect.

The fact is, Mr. President, that business can not be halted in any city of the United States. Business has invaded Connecticut Avenue and is driving out the residents between H Street and Dupont Circle, and it is inevitable. I know they have not wanted to give up their homes; they were beautiful homes; but just as Fifth Avenue was invaded in New York by business houses and those who owned beautiful homes on that magnificent avenue had to surrender them just so it is in the city of Washington. Only a few years ago G Street and H Street were streets of residences, but to-day they are business streets; and, while there may be some hardships inflicted by the construction of these business blocks, I have never discovered that there is any way to stop the invasion of a street in any city by business enterprises, and I do not believe we can do it in Washington. That is my judgment.

But as to the height of the buildings, that of course is a matter for consideration and discussion, and if the present law permits them to be built higher than they ought to be, of course the law might be amended.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, I had in view, among other sections of the city, the one referred to by the Senator from New Hampshire. The value of residence property behind those tall structures has depreciated immensely. The fact is there is no longer a market for them for residential purposes. Some of the finest homes in the most desirable sections of the city have been practically destroyed for the purposes of residences within the last six or seven years.

I know of no reason why business can not spread over the ground the same as residences. In the great cities of the world outside of this country of ours the height of business buildings is restricted as is the height of residences, and if it can be made to work without hardship there it can here.

My sympathies are very much stronger for the residents of a city than for those who are engaged in making money off of the

residents. Business enterprises are necessary, and business buildings should be encouraged, but not to the destruction of residences.

You see the effect of it. It is driving residents out into a new country, farther and farther all the time from the business centers and from that which is above all else the center of this city—the Capitol and the White House and the Government institutions.

I would not have the limit greater for business than for residences, and there is no reason why a business block should flaunt itself in front of your door and shut out your sunlight. The resident is entitled to the first consideration. This is a city, a capital city, of residences.

While it is true that this only applies to the residences of the city, yet it might be just as well, while we have the matter up for consideration and are in a humor to consider it, to see if we can not curb this evil of constructing six, eight, or nine story buildings all along one side of a street, leaving the residences on the other side to depreciate in value and lose all of their attractiveness. I should like to see it taken up as a part of this bill in the nature of an amendment. I am not going to stand in the way of the passage of this bill, because I am in sympathy with it, but I do think that it would be a good time to place some curb upon the building of tall business blocks.

They are generally built for advertising purposes; if not, they are built for the purpose of economizing the cost of the land upon which they are placed.

I have been for some time chafing under the conditions as I see them, one after the other. A few years ago I settled down to reside during my term here, and I could then look out and see the Capitol; I could see the Post-office Building and the clock on it; I could see all the buildings around us. One after one great tall and obtrusive buildings have gone up until to-day the residences are practically shut off. That affects the value. A man has a right to the view that naturally belongs to his residence, and not only that but a more important consideration is the effect it has upon the property of other people. While I will not ask the Senator to do so, I should like if he would incorporate or delay until some one can incorporate in this measure a restriction upon the height of these buildings.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I trust the Senator will not halt the consideration of this bill.

Mr. HEYBURN. I am not going to do it.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will be very glad to take up the matter in which the Senator is so deeply interested, and if we think it wise to amend the existing law it can be done later on.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WATERS OF THE NIAGARA RIVER.

Mr. BURTON. I am directed by the Committee on Foreign Relations, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 3) extending the operation of the act for the control and regulation of the waters of Niagara River, for the preservation of Niagara Falls, and for other purposes, to report it favorably with divers amendments, and I submit a report (No. 77) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the joint resolution for the information of the Senate.

The Secretary read the joint resolution, as follows:

Whereas the provisions of the act entitled "An act for the control and regulation of the waters of Niagara River, for the preservation of Niagara Falls, and for other purposes," approved June 29, 1906, and extended by joint resolution (Public Res. No. 56) for a period of two years, approved March 3, 1909, will expire by limitation June 29, 1911; and

Whereas the extended date provided therein for the termination of the operation of said act was so extended that there might be consummated a more permanent settlement of the questions involved by a treaty with Great Britain and by further legislation appropriate to the situation; and

Whereas article 5 of a treaty between the United States and Great Britain, proclaimed May 13, 1910, provides a maximum limit within which the United States may authorize and permit the diversion within the State of New York of the waters of the Niagara River above the Falls of Niagara for power purposes: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the provisions of the aforesaid act be, and they are hereby, extended from June 29, 1911, being the date of the expiration of the operation of said act, to remain in full force and virtue during the life of the said treaty, save in so far as any portion thereof may be found inapplicable or already complied with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, I do not think this joint resolution should be taken up under the present order of business. When the question therein involved was before the Senate on a former occasion it occupied some time. It is a large question. Then it only proposed to extend the time until this month. Now it is proposed to extend it until the end of the treaty.

Mr. BURTON. If the Senator from Idaho will permit me, it is an extension for two years.

Mr. HEYBURN. Well, that is the life of the treaty.

Mr. BURTON. Until June 29, 1913.

Mr. HEYBURN. That is the end of the treaty, is it not?

Mr. BURTON. Oh, no.

Mr. HEYBURN. I should like to have the joint resolution again read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment proposed by the committee to the joint resolution before the request for its present consideration is put.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to amend the joint resolution on page 2, line 6, after the word "act," by striking out the remainder of the joint resolution and inserting in lieu thereof the words "for two years, or until June 29, 1913."

Mr. HEYBURN. I withdraw the objection, that amendment not having been stated when I made it.

Mr. CULBERSON. May I ask what is the measure before the Senate, Mr. President?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair asks the attention of the Senator from Ohio to the inquiry of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CULBERSON. I ask that the Secretary again read the title of the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will again read the joint resolution by title.

The SECRETARY. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 3) extending the operation of the act for the control and regulation of the waters of Niagara River, for the preservation of Niagara Falls, and for other purposes.

Mr. CULBERSON. By what committee is that joint resolution reported, Mr. President?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CULLOM. It is reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations; it has been considered by a subcommittee of that committee, and finally by the full committee, and is reported unanimously.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, let us devote a minute at least to the consideration of a measure of this magnitude. The fact that it was reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations is, of course, persuasive, but not conclusive. My recollection of this question is that the objection to it, when it was before Congress the last time, was that the other powers were not in the meantime restrained as we were. It is a large question; it is a question, of course, that must primarily be dealt with, if we are going to derive any benefit from it, through the intervention of a treaty, but we want to see to it that the terms of that treaty give an equal measure of rights and at the same time preserve the principle upon which we have acted in regard to the preservation of those Falls. We want equal rights to the use of the waters at the same time. We want those rights that are within the principle that has governed us in the past; and, in addition to that, the principle that we must recognize as essential for the preservation of those Falls.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I do not think the objections of the Senator from Idaho are applicable at all to this joint resolution. The treaty was made and finally ratified in the year 1910, but that does not prevent such regulations as are imposed by this joint resolution. These are a continuance of rules and regulations adopted in the year 1906. So far as equality is concerned, there is a difference in the amount of water that may be diverted on the Canadian side——

Mr. HEYBURN. A very large difference.

Mr. BURTON (continuing). And that which may be diverted on our side; but that is a matter of fact; it is included in the treaty.

Mr. LODGE. It is a difference under the treaty, and not under the law.

Mr. BURTON. If anything, this tends toward equality rather than away from it.

Mr. LODGE. This checks it.

Mr. HEYBURN. We gave up more than we should have given up. We allowed the other party to the treaty to reserve rights which are in excess of the rights they gave to us under it. At the time of its consideration, these questions were raised and they were debated and considered. To bring the joint resolution up under the five-minute rule, or by unanimous consent, is hardly the proper thing.

Mr. CULBERSON. What is the status of the joint resolution, Mr. President?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution has just been reported, and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] has asked unanimous consent for its present consideration.

Mr. CULBERSON. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made, and the joint resolution will go to the calendar.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. PENROSE:

A bill (S. 2776) to grant an honorable discharge to Henry Mulligan; and

A bill (S. 2777) authorizing the appointment of Maj. John S. Bishop, United States Army, retired, on the retired list of the Army, with the rank of brigadier general; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2778) granting a pension to Julia A. Roberts;

A bill (S. 2779) granting a pension to Elizabeth A. Malone; and

A bill (S. 2780) granting an increase of pension to David P. Sheibley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WORKS:

A bill (S. 2781) to correct the military record of H. J. Rowell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2782) granting a pension to David Murphy; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHILTON:

A bill (S. 2783) to correct the military record of William Norris (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Maine:

A bill (S. 2784) granting an increase of pension to Hiram B. Morey (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 2785) granting a pension to William H. Dennison (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2786) granting a pension to Priscilla T. Brewster; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KERN:

A bill (S. 2787) granting an increase of pension to Richard M. Fossett (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BACON (for Mr. TERRELL):

A bill (S. 2788) for the relief of the legal representatives of the estate of Benjamin Hamilton, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHIVELY:

A bill (S. 2789) to change the location and straighten the course of the channel of the Grand Calumet River through the lands of the Gary Land Co. and the Indiana Steel Co., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 37) directing the Interstate Commerce Commission to investigate and report on the use of the Andrew safety appliance upon railway trains engaged in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

ESTATE OF JOHN POOL.

Mr. OVERMAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 69), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay to the estate of John Pool, formerly a Senator from the State of North Carolina, the sum of $6,543.38, due him as a Senator of the United States in the Fortieth Congress, from the 4th of March, 1867, to the 24th of June, 1868, to be paid from the miscellaneous items of the contingent fund of the Senate.

MESSENGER TO COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS.

Mr. GAMBLE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 70), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Indian Affairs be, and it is hereby, authorized to employ a messenger at a salary of $1,440 per annum.

IMPORT AND EXPORT TRADE WITH CANADA.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, some weeks ago I requested certain information from the Bureau of Trade Relations, State Department, in reference to exports and imports into Canada, the United States and Great Britain, and also a statement as to certain prices of agricultural products covered by the reciprocity agreement for the 20-year period, 1890–1909, inclusive. In reply to that request the bureau has sent me the information in the form of statistics. I ask unanimous consent that the matter be printed as a Senate document. (S. Doc. No. 49.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Michigan? The Chair hears none, and the order is entered.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS FOR MONTANA AND IDAHO.

Mr. DIXON. I inquire, Mr. President, is the calendar to be called this morning? If not, I should like to ask unanimous consent——

The VICE PRESIDENT. When that order is reached the Chair will announce that the calendar is in order.

Mr. DIXON. I should like to ask unanimous consent to have Senate bill 2532 considered at this time. It is a short bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill named by him, the title of which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 2532) providing for an increase of salary for the collector of customs for the district of Montana and Idaho.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask for a brief explanation why this particular increase in salary is considered necessary.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from Mississippi has made the inquiry, for I know many times bills of this character are called up and passed without a word of explanation, and sometimes, apparently, an impression is left that something has been done surreptitiously.

The collector of customs for Montana and Idaho at Great Falls is the most important Federal officer in the Northwest, especially in those two States. Through the Great Falls customhouse all of the trade with northwestern Canada comes into the United States. The amount of customs duties collected there will average six or seven hundred thousand dollars per annum.

Until a year ago officers of this character, except at a few of the seaports, were on a commission basis, under an arrangement, I think, dating back to 1812 or 1813. The compensation of the collector heretofore has been about $4,500 a year, based on fees and commissions. Two years ago two smelters, one in Idaho and one in Montana, went out of business. Those smelters carried each a bonded warehouse, and, under the law, each of those smelters paid the collector a thousand dollars per annum. The dismantling of these two individual bonded warehouses, although the same work is done through other warehouses, chopped off $2,000 a year from the collector's compensation, which for 30 years had been about $4,500.

The bill was introduced last session and passed the Senate. It received favorable consideration in the House committee, but was not passed by the House of Representatives on account of the crowded condition of the calendar. The Secretary of the Treasury last session and at this time has strongly recommended that the collector's salary be made $4,000, instead of being continued under the old fee and commission basis. There is a unanimous report from the committee and a very strong letter from the Secretary of the Treasury recommending the passage of the bill. It merely puts this office on a basis with offices of similar character throughout the United States.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, what did the fees and salary heretofore paid aggregate?

Mr. DIXON. About $4,500 per annum.

Mr. REED. And did that include the $2,000 that was received from the smelters?

Mr. DIXON. Yes.

Mr. REED. So that the fees now would amount to about $2,500?

Mr. DIXON. About $2,500.

Mr. REED. And this means a raise of $1,500.

Mr. DIXON. It is really restoring the old compensation, although the salary proposed is about $500 less than under the old fee and commission basis for 30 years. As I have said, it is the most important port of entry in the entire Northwest.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That hereafter the salary of the collector of customs for the district of Montana and Idaho shall be $4,000 per year in lieu of the present salary and all fees, commissions, and perquisites of every nature allowed or permitted under the provisions of section 2648 of the Revised Statutes or other existing laws.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THE POSTAL SYSTEM.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, some days ago a report was made by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate upon a resolution (S. Res. 56) submitted by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. BOURNE]. At that time I asked that it go to the calendar so that I might examine it. I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of that resolution, being order of business 49. I desire to offer two or three amendments to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Hamsphire asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution, which will be read by the Secretary.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. BOURNE on the 1st instant and reported from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate on the 7th instant, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads is hereby authorized and directed, by subcommittee or otherwise, to inquire into and report to the Senate at the earliest date practicable what changes are necessary or desirable in the postal system of the United States or in laws relating to the postal service, and particularly with reference to the establishment of a parcels post, and for this purpose they are authorized to sit during the sessions or recesses of Congress, at such times and places as they may deem desirable or practicable; to send for persons and papers, to administer oaths, to summon and compel the attendance of witnesses, to conduct hearings, and have reports of same printed for use, and to employ such clerks, experts, counsel, stenographers, messengers, and other assistants as shall be necessary, and any expense in connection with such inquiry shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers to be approved by the chairman of the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution? The Chair hears none.

Mr. GALLINGER. I move to amend the resolution—and I will say that the amendments I now propose to offer are agreeable to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. BOURNE]—by striking out the words, on page 1, line 13, "experts, counsel," and in line 14 by striking out the word "messengers."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 1, line 13, after the word "clerks," it is proposed to strike out the words "experts, counsel," and in line 14, after the word "stenographers," to strike out the word "messengers."

The amendments were agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I favor the resolution for investigation of post-office matters as amended, and hope it may pass unanimously.

Mr. GALLINGER. It has passed.

Mr. WARREN. But I want to say at this time that I think we are sorely in need of information from a great many quarters. We seem to have been in a mad rush for some years for information. The Senate and the House of Representatives—the Congress of the United States—have had investigating committees galore, and have spent thousands and hundreds of thousands of dollars in investigations and reinvestigations. The Senate has committees for the examination of every one of the departments of this Government. The House has similar committees, and the House is now engaged in pursuing investigations on special subjects through a large number of special committees. Indeed, the call for information has been so insistent that we have provided for a Tariff Board, for which we appropriated $250,000 a year ago; and in the last sundry civil bill we appropriated an additional $225,000, making $475,000 for the Tariff Board. They were called upon by the action of Congress and the Executive to make certain investigations at an early date. They examined into the pulp and paper business, and we have the result of that examination before us in their report, and we have the wish and interest of others in the reciprocity bill, so called. We have advices from that board that, as per instructions, they have investigated the wood-pulp and paper industries, and are now investigating Schedule K; that they have been at work on the wool and woolen industries for sometime, and that they will not be able to report probably until next autumn.

But, Mr. President, in this mad rush for legislation we find that there are great bodies and great men in a legislative body who believe that they know more about Schedule K than the Tariff Board does or ever will know, and they are going along with Schedule K, the Tariff Board notwithstanding. We can now see in the volume I have in hand—the official report of the House committee, accompanying House bill 11019, concerning the wool tariff—the result of some of this work on Schedule K, which relates to wool, sheep, and woolens. This schedule embraces one of the oldest industries of this country—one that has been under discussion, back and forth, for more than a hundred years, and one probably in which more men are engaged or have been engaged, together with all of its branches, than in any other known industry. And it is well that men in high places feel so sure that they know all about this industry that they do not need to refer to or wait for a Tariff Board's report for information or advice.

Mr. President, we have before us a public document. It is the report of a great committee of a great legislative body, the ultima Thule, as you may say, of this 100 years of experience concerning sheep and wool; and it is complete. It goes into the dictionary business—in fact, it is a dictionary. It contains a glossary, explaining the technical terms, and it shows plainly that there is in the minds of some people no need of a Tariff Board or of any investigation or further information. Of course we have to admit in reading this——

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. WARREN. Certainly.

Mr. CURTIS. I should like to know if the Senator from Wyoming thinks all the definitions contained in the report were taken from the dictionary?

Mr. WARREN. I have before me the Underwood glossary, something more recent than the dictionary, more ably edited than the dictionary, in which more able people are interested; and they have given us definitions which are evidently intended to be final. I do not believe that these definitions will add very much to the hilarity of the sheep growers and the farmers who have been struggling along under the fear of free wool and selling their wool for one-half or two-thirds price for the last year. I do not think it will make them very happy to read the definitions and to find that at one fell swoop all of the sheep of the United States have been unsexed after their first year's shearing, and that thereafter, no matter what they were at birth, they become members of the male sex—all of the sheep of the world, in fact, according to this glossary.

I do not anticipate that it will add even to the pleasure of the ancient ewe sheep that have every year borne their lambs, sometimes one at a time, sometimes twins, and sometimes triplets, to find that they are now wether sheep, male sheep, because they have passed beyond their first year, for here we have it [reading from House Report No. 45]:

Wether.—A sheep after the first shearing.

Wether wool applies to all fleeces cut subsequent to the first fleece, which is called lamb's wool.

What need have we for information, or, indeed, do we need so much information as we now have? Or is it a case where we have always been wrong, and hence we must commence again at the very beginning and learn the fundamentals?

Mr. President, it seems to me——

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. May I ask my colleague from what he is reading?

Mr. WARREN. I am reading from Report No. 45, House of Representatives, Sixty-second Congress, first session, entitled "To reduce the duties on wool and manufactures of wool—Mr. UNDERWOOD, from the Committee on Ways and Means, submits the following report, to accompany H. R. 11019."

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Is the Senator satisfied with that definition of wether wool?

Mr. WARREN. Well, I am so well satisfied with it that I am not going to ask the proponents of this investigation of the Post Office Department to shear quite as close in the Post Office Department as these people propose to do in the case of a sheep.

Mr. President, either we need to go back to the very fundamentals, commence all over again, and investigate every industry and every branch of it, or else, as is assumed by the author of this report and others, there is nothing that can be added to their fund of information on Schedule K. When we assure the dear farmers that a lamb born a ewe becomes transfigured at her first shearing, and thenceforth remains a wether—a male sheep—it may add to the gayety of nations, but I fear the farmer will whistle and quote that old witticism, "It is better not to know so much than to know so much that isn't so."

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. WARREN. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. Before the Senator takes his seat, and leaves the subject of lamb's wool——

Mr. WARREN. There are a number of other items here that do credit to the text I have quoted.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to call his attention to the definition of "lamb's wool."

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. What page is it?

Mr. SMOOT. This is page 229:

Lamb's wool is naturally pointed at the end, because it has never been clipped.

Mr. WARREN. And furthermore——

Mr. SMOOT. Here is a definition of "wool":

Wool.—Fibers of all animals are not alike; they vary in fineness, soundness, length, and strength, from the finest Merino to the rigid bristles of the wild boar.

Mr. WARREN. And, furthermore, a sheep is a hog until it is a year old, according to this glossary.

Mr. REED. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. WARREN. Certainly.

Mr. REED. Before the Senator from Wyoming takes his seat——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has taken his seat. The Chair will ask him to resume a standing position.

Mr. REED. I wanted to inquire if it was his wether that was being shorn which had aroused his anxiety this morning?

Mr. WARREN. I am beginning to think that I do not know what a wether is. So I am unable to inform the Senator from Missouri. Certainly, if this glossary is correct, I have been many a long year groping in the darkness.

DECISIONS IN STANDARD OIL AND AMERICAN TOBACCO CASES.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I have here a brief review by Mr. Walker, who has published a work on the history of the Sherman law. It is a review of the decisions of the Supreme Court in the Standard Oil case and the Tobacco case, and I ask that it may be printed as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. BORAH. If that is the document which has been circulated pretty generally I think it ought to be read before it is printed as a Senate document.

Mr. NELSON. It is not that document, I will say to the Senator. It is a recent document; I have carefully read it and it is a fair and candid review of those decisions.

Mr. BORAH. The document starts out by designating the decision as the obiter dicta of the Chief Justice, and I for one am not willing, without further observation and looking into the matter, to consent to its being printed at this time, if I have a right to object, and the objection holds.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator certainly has that right. The Senator from Idaho objects to its being printed as a public document.

Mr. LODGE. May I ask the Senator a question? Do I understand him to say that this document starts out by saying that the recent decisions—I suppose the "recent decisions" referred to are those in the Standard Oil case and the American Tobacco case—are obiter dicta?

Mr. NELSON. Not at all.

Mr. BORAH. Will the Clerk please read the heading? I have seen one——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

The Sherman law; obiter dicta of Chief Justice White.

Mr. LODGE. I think it had better go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made.

Mr. BORAH. I ask that it go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made to its being printed as a public document.

ELECTION OF SENATORS BY DIRECT VOTE.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama. I ask unanimous consent that two short editorials from leading newspapers in Alabama, in reference to the election of Senators by the people, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the request is granted.

The editorials are as follows:

THE PRICE DEMANDED IS TOO HIGH.

[From the Montgomery (Ala.) Advertiser.]

The 47 States can now have United States Senators elected by popular votes, but to do so they must make to the Federal Government the greatest surrender of power since the formation of government. The chief power of the States in the affairs of the Federal Government has been exercised heretofore by the two United States Senators which each State sends to the highest lawmaking body in the world. If the legislatures of the various States ratify the action of the Senate taken Monday, these powerful officials will not only be selected by a direct vote, but they will be selected in elections over which the Federal Government will have supreme control, and for which it will prescribe rules and regulations.

The Southern States will stand firm with those southern Senators who declared that the price was too high to pay for the reform.

If the House of Representatives accepts the Bristow amendment to the bill providing for popular elections of United States Senators, and no doubt it will, the adoption of the required constitutional amendment will be fairly before the legislatures of the 47 United States. Three-fourths of the total number of these States will have to act approvingly upon the amendment before it can become effective. The Advertiser believes that the legislature of any Southern State would be foolish and reckless to buy the so-called reform of popular election of United States Senators at the price of Federal supervision. The proposed reform is prohibitively dear, if we have to buy it with our complaisant acceptance of the atrocious force bill, which a small band of devoted and courageous Senators defeated in the last generation when it appeared certain of enactment.

For nearly 50 years the compelling desire of the leaders of the Republican Party has been to seize the election machinery of the Southern States. They were successful in this for a short period, when, as Senator JOHNSTON of Alabama reminded the Senate, Federal soldiers stood about the polls in southern cities with drawn bayonets. "I have myself," said Senator JOHNSTON, "witnessed elections in my State where United States troops were assembled at the polls, and where supervisors and deputy marshals exercised potent influence. I never want to see either again. During the reconstruction period these officials were used for the most partisan purposes—to intimidate the voters and to prevent the full, fair, and free expression of the will of the voters."

Every man now living who passed through the trying and humiliating experience of reconstruction is one with Senator JOHNSTON—he never wants to see those distressing conditions restored in Alabama. Under the Bristow amendment the Federal Government will have the power to reestablish reconstruction conditions in the Southern States. When the Republican Party is in power the reestablishment of those conditions will depend entirely upon the will and inclinations of the partisan leaders of that party.

There is another phase to this question, which has been ignored by the light thinkers but loud talkers who have promised the coming of the political millennium with the election of United States Senators by a direct vote. The next step in the reform is that by which the United States Senators will be put upon a popular basis of representation. If Senators are to be elected by popular vote, the question will be asked, Why should the vote of one man in Nevada be equal to the vote of 50 men in New York? Is there any justice, it will be argued, in the claim that one voter in Arizona should be as powerful in naming a United States Senator as 30 men in Pennsylvania? The sincere advocate of the election of Senators by popular vote must be illogical when he argues that representation in the Senate must not be put upon a voting or population basis.

When we jump in the dark we sometimes jump downhill, and we have to keep on jumping. The man who thinks agitation affecting the Senate of the United States will end when the Senators are elected by a direct vote is foolishly blinding himself.

Looking at the question in a larger sense, with the light from the lamp of history thrown upon it, the United States Senate since the formation of our Government has been an abler, a more patriotic, and a more efficient body of lawmakers than the House of Representatives, the boast of which is that it was selected in a popular election and comes direct from the people. When the records of the two bodies are compared the higher credit does not go to the House of Representatives.

POPULAR ELECTION OF SENATORS VOTE.

[From the Mobile (Ala.) Register.]

Senators BANKHEAD and JOHNSTON of Alabama, BACON and TERRELL of Georgia, WILLIAMS and PERCY of Mississippi, FOSTER of Louisiana, and FLETCHER of Florida were the eight Democrats who voted against the resolution amending the Constitution to provide for the election of Senators by direct popular vote, their objection being to the Bristow amendment, giving to the Federal Government supervision of such election. Senator BACON had offered a resolution qualifying the Bristow amendment so as to prohibit Federal supervision unless the State legislators refuse or fail to act, and this was defeated by a vote of 46 to 42.

Sixteen Republicans joined with the eight Democrats in voting against the popular-election amendment—BRANDEGEE, BURNHAM, CRANE, DILLINGHAM, GALLINGER, HEYBURN, LIPPITT, LODGE, LORIMER, OLIVER, PAGE, PENROSE, RICHARDSON, ROOT, SMOOT, and WETMORE.

Senator JOHNSTON made the prediction that, with the Bristow amendment attached to it, the popular-election amendment will never receive the requisite indorsement of the States. It is probable that on this very account the majority voted for the Bristow amendment. There has been a very open declaration on the part of the Senators that popular election will not prove to be a good thing. Probably, therefore, these opponents of the theory of popular election insisted upon incorporating the Bristow amendment in order to keep popular election from becoming effective, even when adopted by the vote of the Senate.

Senator JOHNSTON's prediction will come true, if the recollection of former days has not faded from the public mind. He said, when opposing the resolution because of the Bristow amendment:

"I have myself witnessed elections in my State where United States troops were assembled at the polls and where supervisors and deputy marshals were potential in the result. I never want to see either again. During the reconstruction period these officials were used for the most partisan purposes and to intimidate the voters and prevent the full and free and fair expression of the will of the voters. Such methods as that gave the party in power swarms of unscrupulous partisans, paid by the Government to carry out the will of the bosses, and they did not hesitate to abuse their power. These men were not chosen from the voters of the counties in which they acted, but imported from other cities and counties and States. Pretending to represent the authority of the United States, they really represented the bosses of the party in power."

The legislatures of the South are not likely to accept the amendment under the terms that it is offered. Fortunately, there is available the State primary, which meets the needs of the people in expressing their choice for Senators; so that no loss will be suffered if the amendment fails of confirmation.

REESTABLISHMENT OF ARMY DIVISION HEADQUARTERS.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I offer a resolution and ask to have it read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the resolution for the information of the Senate.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 71) as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Military Affairs be authorized and directed to investigate and report to the Senate its findings and recom-

mendations upon the question presented in Senate document 42, involving the relative merits of divisional, as distinguished from departmental, headquarters in the military organization throughout the country, concerning which a controversy has existed for many years in the War Department, as is revealed by the letter from the Secretary of War, resulting in numerous changes from the divisional system of headquarters to the departmental system of headquarters and back again every few years.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I ask for the immediate consideration of the resolution because the matter is somewhat urgent. It develops from the letter presented by the Secretary of War in response to my resolution that the War Department during the last 90 years has operated in military affairs in the country about one-half of the time under the departmental system of headquarters, which now exists, under which there are at the present time, as I recall, nine military departments throughout the country, and during the other half of the time has operated the military affairs of the country, both tactically and in an administrative way through a system of divisional headquarters.

Mr. President, it is now proposed, by an order which has recently been issued, to make another change, on the 1st of July, back from the present system of departmental headquarters to the old and discarded system of divisional headquarters, and this will involve the transfer of a large number of officers and civilian employees from such departmental headquarters as St. Paul, San Antonio, Omaha, and other places, to either Chicago, New York, or San Francisco.

Mr. BACON. The Senator says "either." It is to those three.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes; to one or the other of those three in each case.

Mr. BACON. Those are the three selected.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes.

Mr. BACON. Those have already been selected as the three.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. If this were the first time that this change is called for, or if it had been known to have been made after any extended hearing before any legislative body, or if the experiment had never been tried before, it might be the proper thing to allow it to pass without any consideration, but the fact is that the present departmental system of headquarters has been in operation more than half the time during the last 90 years, as I recall. As is exhibited by this letter from the Secretary of War, this departmental system was installed again and the old divisional system was abolished in 1907, when the present President of the United States was then Secretary of War, and when Gen. Chaffee, an experienced Army officer, was Chief of Staff. It was discarded at that time, after it had been in use only four years—from 1903.

I think, Mr. President, that the time has come when the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate should at least have some hearings and make some investigation upon the relative merits of these two systems which have been tried from time to time and which have been abandoned and resumed and abandoned and resumed, each time at a considerable expense and each time with great disturbance to the organization throughout the country.

Now, I am frank to admit that I have a local interest. I happen to know that in my town, for instance, some 40 families will be required to move to Chicago or abandon their employment in the military service, and, as stated in this letter of the Secretary, they are in many cases old employees of the Government, entitled at least to fair treatment.

Mr. President, it is claimed that there are two reasons why this change should be made—first, that it will work for economy; second, that it will work for efficiency. I think, however, there ought to be a hearing before the Military Affairs Committee. I believe that the advocates in the War Department of the two systems—and there are in the War Department to-day, as I understand, advocates of the two systems—should be asked to come before the Senate committee and give their testimony and make their showing. Certainly at the time the Secretary of War, Mr. Proctor, made the change—I think in 1891—it was after quite an extended investigation, and certainly when the change to the present system was made, under the administration of Secretary of War Taft and of Gen. Chaffee, then Chief of Staff, it was entitled to considerable consideration; at least as much as it should be given at the present time.

I therefore ask that the Committee on Military Affairs, which, under the resolution introduced by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN], already has the general power to hold hearings and take testimony, be given authority to investigate this question, and it should be done at once, before the order goes into effect. The investigation may at least result in some modification of the order, and I ask, therefore, that this resolution may be adopted.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I agree with the suggestions made by the Senator from Nebraska, and there are some other suggestions which I wish to make in that connection.

I admit in the beginning, as has the Senator from Nebraska, that I have a local interest in the matter. One of the headquarters of these departments is located in Atlanta, and all that he has said in a general way as to the effect upon these different localities will, of course, apply to this particular department.

There is another suggestion that I wish to make, Mr. President, and that is this: The burdens of this Government extend over every section of this country—properly so. Whatever of benefit there may be ought to be, as far as practicable, distributed with equal impartiality. Of course, the military establishment is a very expensive part of the Government.

The expenses of that establishment bear a very large proportion to the total expenditures of government. The expenditures necessarily are in a great degree found in the localities where the headquarters are. This new arrangement proposes that the nine departments—I think that is the number—shall be practically superseded by three headquarters, one of them in New York, one of them in Chicago, and one of them in San Francisco. There is a vast scope of country south of the line drawn between those three points that is practically excluded from all the benefits which arise from expenditures by reason of the requirements of the War Department.

I am not prepared to say, because I have not the information necessary for me to form a judgment satisfactory to myself, whether it is important that these nine departments should be broken up and the substitutes for them in other headquarters be limited to a smaller number, but I want to say in that regard two things. If they are to be limited to a small number they ought to be distributed with some regard to the geographical arrangement of those headquarters.

I say, Mr. President, in that vast range of country south of the line running from New York through Chicago to San Francisco there ought to be, in part, a representation in the establishment of headquarters in some parts of that country. I do not say it ought to be in Atlanta, I do not say it ought to be in New Orleans or Memphis, or at any other point that may be selected, but I wish to say that I think it is a discrimination not to be justified that all three headquarters selected for this great country, for the distribution practically of $100,000,000, should be limited to the upper line of the country and not be so arranged that these expenditures would in a natural way be found to be made impartially throughout the country.

If there are only three, one of them ought to be in the South. If it is essential that there should be three at the several points indicated, then there ought to be another created which ought to be in the South.

Mr. President, I do not wish to be understood as presenting anything from a sectional standpoint. What I am presenting is to try to prevent that which is sectional. I do not want anything which is sectional. I am not asking that there shall be any preference shown to the vast extent of country known as the southern part of this country, embracing from a third to a half territorially of the entire country; but when that part of the country is discriminated against it is not sectional to ask that that discrimination be removed.

I wish to say with this disclamer of any purpose to do otherwise than attempt to affect that which would be impartial, that not only as to the War Department, but of any man will take up the appropriation bills he will find that outside of the appropriations for the Post Office Department, I can not state it with mathematical certainty, but I have not a doubt in the world that four dollars out of every five, if not nine dollars out of every ten appropriated by Congress, are expended in what we generally know as the Northern States, and not a fifth of it is expended in the Southern States, and possibly not a tenth of it. It may be that in some large degree that is unavoidable from the fact that a great many of the expenditures are for the procurement of things which are only manufactured at the North. The great shipbuilding industries are at the North, the great iron industries are largely at the North.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRANDEGEE in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. BACON. I do.

Mr. WARREN. It may be true, I say to the Senator, that the preponderance of money provided by some of the appropriation bills is more largely expended North than South. Of course it is a larger part of the country, taking it as a whole. But the Senator would hardly want that statement to stand as to

the river and harbor bill or as to the Agriculture appropriation bill and others of that kind.

Mr. BACON. Those are very small bills.

Mr. WARREN. The river and harbor bill is a matter of $45,000,000 or $50,000,000 in itself, and the sundry civil bill carries still more for those improvements.

Mr. BACON. Not in a year.

Mr. WARREN. If the Senator will take up the sundry civil appropriation bills and see the amount that is appropriated every year for rivers and harbors he will find that the major part of the money expended in the sundry civil appropriation bill is for rivers and harbors in the Southern States.

I do not want to be sectional in any way, as the Senator knows, certainly not in appropriation questions. It never came up, as far as I know, in the consideration of an appropriation bill. It was my pleasure in the last appropriation bill for the Agricultural Department to stand a pretty long and severe strain in conference insisting that the full amount desired for the protection of cotton should be given.

Mr. BACON. How much?

Mr. WARREN. I do not recall what it was. I think we added some $300,000 or so to the amount already included in the bill.

Mr. BACON. A mere bagatelle compared with the thousand million spent every year.

Mr. WARREN. Then, taking the entire agricultural appropriation bill, the Senator, I know, does not want to be unjust——

Mr. BACON. No; and for that reason I am willing that the Senator shall go on as long as he wishes.

Mr. WARREN. Perhaps I will wait until the Senator gets through the other branch.

Mr. BACON. No; I mean exactly what I say. The Senator can proceed.

Mr. WARREN. There is some misunderstanding about this distribution of troops, and there is no reason why the matter should not be examined into by the proper committee; and a foundation for that has been laid by the resolution which was introduced for information, the reply to which we now have printed. I have not had time to examine it closely.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. BACON. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. FLETCHER. In reference to the river and harbor appropriations in connection with the remarks of the Senator from Wyoming, it may be observed that out of the 30,000 miles of navigable streams in the whole country 23,000 of them are in the South.

Mr. WARREN. That is true as to many another matter relatively. The occasion for this expenditure and the business calls for it were exactly the same as the calls for the improvement of the great rivers of the South. For instance, take the matter of public buildings and grounds. I do not believe there is a Senator on the other side of the Chamber who has ever served upon the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds who will claim that there has been any neglect of any portion of the South or that the percentage of improvement to the South has been any smaller than that to the North.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, the Senator from Wyoming entirely misconceives the spirit and intent of what I have said. I have not charged that Congress has discriminated against the South. On the contrary, when the learned Senator interrupted me I was about to say that in the nature of things, out of the existing conditions, unavoidably the larger portion of it was spent at the North. I was proceeding to say that in the matter of those things that relate to the expenditures of the Navy Department very largely they are necessarily at the North, because the ships are built at the North, the great steel plants are in the main at the North, and, necessarily, the expenditure is there.

I was speaking not in a way of criticism, but of a fact, and I repeat it as a fact, that if anyone will examine the appropriation bills and trace out where the money goes that is appropriated, not having examined it in a mathematical way by adding up the exact figures but by noticing the appropriation bills every year, I have no hesitation in the belief that, outside of the expenditures of the Post Office Department, which of themselves are returned by the revenues of the department, at least four out of every five dollars appropriated are spent at the North. I do not say that it was the design of Congress that that should be so, but I am speaking of the fact that it is so.

Then I say there are other things in which the expenditures are not necessarily limited to the North, and that where that is so we ought to be all the more careful that the expenditures should be impartially distributed, and that our arrangements of the different departments should be such that there would be an impartial distribution of the large appropriations which we have to make.

There are a great many things, possibly, that it is not necessary to buy exclusively at the North, and yet almost all of them are bought there. There are some few supplies that are bought in the South in the great expenditures in the construction of the Panama Canal, but the large bulk of them are bought at the North.

Therefore it is, Mr. President, if the purchase of Army supplies and the benefits which are to result from the location of headquarters in different localities are such that they are not necessarily limited to a section, the very fact that now there are conditions which require that the larger part of the appropriations should be spent in that section makes it all the more important that appropriations which are not relating to matters where the expenditures must unavoidably be at the North should be distributed, and that the South should get its full proportion of them.

That is the whole purpose, I say, Mr. President. I am not criticizing Congress in any manner; and I do not wish to be understood as criticizing the department in this matter, because I have no thought that that was the purpose of the arrangement. The fact is that the arrangement was made under the administration of a former Secretary of War, who was himself a southern man, Mr. Dickinson, the late Secretary. I know well enough his feeling with regard to the section from which he came to know that that was not his purpose; but I think that is the effect.

I want to say further that I am sure of another thing, and that is that the Secretary, whoever he may be, is not always responsible for these things. The heads of departments and various officials, military and civil, of course all have their combined influence, and out of their various suggestions these plans are evolved.

I am glad the Senator from Nebraska introduced this matter and brought it up, because while I did not know exactly in what shape to present it, I have had it in mind for the past few weeks to say something on this subject. As was said by the Senator from Nebraska, it is not limited to the small matter of the expenditure of money in the purchase of supplies, but it is the large expenditure of money which necessarily is made by those who are in the employment of the military branch of the Government. Forty families, he says, in his own community will have to be torn up and carried away to Chicago.

I believe that economy probably will result from a diminution of the number of these headquarters. Whether you call them divisional headquarters or departmental headquarters is a matter of indifference. I believe that some economy can be secured from the change. And I believe the number of officers possibly who are on detail at these various places can be decreased, and a number of them returned to their regiments. Therefore, I do not wish to be understood as being utterly opposed to any change, but I am most decidedly opposed to a change which seems to be utterly blind to the fact that the distribution of these various headquarters in different sections of the country, unless impartially made, must result in a partial distribution of whatever benefits may flow to the people of this country in the expenditure of this hundred million dollars.

Of course, I know what is said by the officers; they have said it to me. I have received from them an official communication to the effect that it is not thought it would make any material change in the places in which this money is expended. That is said by some, but an official communication which I have received from the Secretary of War on this subject is a little more guarded in the language. I can not quote it with absolute accuracy, but it goes on to say substantially that the expenditures will continue to be made in the future as they have in the past, as those expenditures may be made in one way or the other most advantageously. That will simply mean that the purchasing officers being in New York, Chicago, and San Francisco, those purchases can necessarily more advantageously be made altogether in sections contiguous to those three great centers, and that in the vast extent of country which I have mentioned, where supplies can be purchased just as economically, or more economically, not simply the South, but the great Southwest, and, in a degree, the Middle States, will be debarred from all participation in the benefits of the expenditure of this large amount of money, because the line running from New York to Chicago and from Chicago to San Francisco is, so far as it relates to the country between New York and Chicago, on our very northern boundary, and it is only deflected a little to the southwest as it proceeds to the west from Chicago to San Francisco.

Therefore, Mr. President, I hope that this matter will be submitted to the investigation of the committee, and that they will not only investigate the question suggested by the Senator from Nebraska, but that they will particularly investigate another question, and that is whether, if the number of these departments or divisions, whatever they may be called, is to be decreased, they should be limited to our extreme northern boundary or whether they should be distributed properly throughout the country.

Mr. WARREN. A number of these points that have been brought out by the Senator from Georgia will of course be examined by the committee. It is my understanding that all those depots named, established for the purchase of supplies, are to be maintained, and that bids will be received through them all.

But what I rose to say, Mr. President, is that this subject is a broad one, and I join the Senator from Nebraska in the desire to have the committee take it up. The Senator is a member of that committee, and so is his colleague, and I will ask him if it will not serve the purpose to refer the resolution to the committee that has already all the powers that this can give it, and I will be glad to join the Senator in asking for an early and complete investigation through the medium of that committee, or a subcommittee if it so chooses.

Mr. CULBERSON. Before the Senator from Wyoming takes his seat I want to understand him. Do I understand him to suggest that without the adoption of the resolution presented by the Senator from Nebraska he personally will favor this investigation under a general resolution which has heretofore been adopted by the Senate?

Mr. WARREN. Most assuredly, Mr. President. The usual resolution asking for liberty to sit in session or out, and for the employment of stenographers, and so forth, has been presented and passed relative to the Committee on Military Affairs, and I will join with the Senator from Nebraska in asking the chairman of that committee to call an early meeting and to have a full investigation.

Mr. CULBERSON. Let me ask the Senator what harm could then come in adopting this resolution? It simply——

Mr. WARREN. In the first place, it is absolutely unnecessary, and it carries more language than I think the proponent perhaps himself would, upon reflection, care to embed in the records.

Mr. BACON. I suggest that the resolution be read from the desk again that we may know what it is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will again read the resolution to the Senate.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 71) as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Military Affairs be authorized and directed to investigate and report to the Senate its findings and recommendations upon the question presented in Senate Document No. 42, involving the relative merits of divisional, as distinguished from departmental, headquarters in the military organization throughout the country, concerning which a controversy has existed for many years in the War Department, as is revealed by the letter from the Secretary of War, resulting in numerous changes from the divisional system of headquarters to the departmental system of headquarters and back again every few years.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I only want to ask a question for information from the Senator from Nebraska. Does the Senator understand that the proposition is to concentrate the Army at these three divisional points, or only to move the headquarters from the various departments to the divisional points?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I understand that this does not involve the transfer of any troops; it permits the departments to still remain the headquarters for tactical purposes, but transfers the administrative work to the three divisional headquarters of the country. I should like to say, further, while I am on my feet, Mr. President——

Mr. POINDEXTER. In order that the Senator may answer the entire matter at one time, I should like also to ask what information the Senator has as to the present status of the proposition? To what extent has the matter been developed by the War Department?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The order has been issued—I think it was dated in May—and it is to go into effect on the 1st of July.

I may say further that the letter of the Secretary of War reveals the fact that it is not proposed at the present time to dismiss any of the civilian employees, but to move them to divisional headquarters, and then to gradually diminish the number, as is hoped by the department.

Mr. President, while on my feet, I should like to say to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] that I had some doubt whether the wording of the resolution which he had introduced early in the session empowering the Committee on Military Affairs to hold hearings and to make investigations was broad enough to cover this case, because it states that they may have the hearings upon any subject which may be pending before said committee. It seems to me there is no subject pending before the committee; there is nothing but this letter from the Secretary of War; but if this specific reference to the resolution were made to them, there would be no question about the propriety.

Furthermore, it seems to me, Mr. President, proper enough—if this widespread sentiment exists in the Senate, and I believe it does—for the Senate to express to the committee its desire for an investigation. I have not much doubt that the investigation will be had; but I can see no possible objection, if it is to be held, why it should not be under the specific authority of the Senate.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I do.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, I have no objection to this resolution being now referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, but I shall certainly object to the consideration of the resolution for the purpose of bringing it to a vote to-day. The resolution contains recitals of facts that are not known to the Senate, and which I believe not to be correct. The Senate is not in a position to act upon this subject, even so far as this resolution goes; it has not the material before it on which to express any opinion, and it ought not to express any opinion.

I do not for a moment suggest that it would not be quite proper for the Senate, upon ascertained grounds and upon due consideration, to interfere with the conduct of the military affairs of the country, but the Senate ought not to interfere without ascertaining the facts and without due consideration upon the facts which it knows; but the recitals of this resolution take the Senate, it seems to me, much further than it should now go.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. ROOT. Certainly.

Mr. CULBERSON. I merely suggest to the Senator from New York that the resolution seeks to put the Senate at an early date in possession of the facts just suggested by him, and it is necessary to proceed rapidly, or at least expeditiously, in view of the fact that the order will take effect on the 1st of July.

Mr. ROOT. But the resolution goes much further than merely calling for an investigation. Half of the resolution is taken up with statements of fact.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. ROOT. Certainly.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think there are no statements of fact in the resolution except those taken from the letter of the Secretary of War.

Mr. ROOT. I have never seen the letter of the Secretary of War.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It was presented to the Senate and has been printed.

Mr. ROOT. There are many papers which have been presented to the Senate which we do not carry in our minds.

Mr. WARREN. Will the Senator from Nebraska permit me to make a suggestion?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I want no misunderstanding about my attitude. I have no objection to the Senate directing the Committee on Military Affairs to take up the subject of a report to the Senate, but I do seriously object to asking a vote of the Senate upon what is said to be contained in some report—and I dare say that there is no misstatement made—but a kind of resolution that, without any premeditation on the part of the Senator, does in fact rather throw dirty water on the Army. It seems to me that a resolution directing the committee to make a report upon papers before it, called for by the resolution of the Senator, ought to be sufficient without advertising to the world, perhaps erroneously, that there is a contest of 100 years' standing in the Army. We can, of course, know nothing about it until we have examined the papers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Chair may be permitted to make a suggestion, the request of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] is for unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution; and the Chair understands that there are two objections to its present consideration.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator just a moment more? I fear I shall be called out of town, and I know the chairman of the committee is likely not to be here tomorrow. I should be perfectly willing to have it disposed of so far as I am concerned, and I do not wish to object to the consideration of the resolution.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. WARREN. I do.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. If there is any language in the resolution objectionable—any language which seems to reflect upon the War Department—I should be perfectly willing to have it modified. What I want is an investigation by the committee.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, may I inquire what is Senate Document 42?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That is the letter of the Secretary of War which was sent here in response to my resolution of inquiry.

Mr. ROOT. Has the Senator from Nebraska any objection to striking out that part of the resolution which follows the word "country"—that is, striking out the words "concerning which a controversy has existed for many years in the War Department"? I do not think that is a correct statement.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. My whole knowledge of this controversy is derived from this letter. It is because it contains the opinions of Gen. Chaffee——

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT] has the floor. Does he yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. ROOT. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. Why not let the resolution go to the committee and let them examine it? We will then have not only the testimony of one general, but of several. I would favor the Senator's resolution if he would simply reduce it to directing that there shall be an examination of the matters contained in the report.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. There is an objection, I think, to striking out that language, because the very reason for the investigation by the Committee on Military Affairs is the fact of the existence of a controversy in the War Department, as shown by the Secretary of War himself.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. ROOT. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I rise to inquire of the Senator from Nebraska whether or not he has a printed copy of the letter of the Secretary of War? I have made inquiry for it, but have been told that it is not yet in print.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It is in print, but there is a delay on account of the map. I have a printed copy of the letter here, if the Senator would like to see it.

Mr. GALLINGER. I should like to look at it. I made inquiry, but was told it is not yet in print.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I send a copy of the printed letter to the Senator.

Mr. GALLINGER. This, then, is the letter in full?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes, sir. There are bound copies, I may say to the Senator from New Hampshire, in addition to that.

Mr. ROOT. I can say to the Senate that between July, 1899, and the spring of 1904 there was no controversy in the War Department on this subject, and I do not understand that there is any controversy in the War Department now on this subject. There may be differences of opinion among individual officers, but I do not think the Senate ought to pass a resolution declaring that there is a controversy in the War Department, thus reflecting upon the discipline of that department. I have no objection to the proposed inquiry, but do not let us in advance of the inquiry make findings of facts that we know nothing about.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Will the Senator from New York kindly indicate just which words should be stricken out?

Mr. ROOT. I will read the words. If you leave in this language—

Resolved, That the Committee on Military Affairs be authorized and directed to investigate and report to the Senate its findings and recommendations upon the question presented in Senate Document No. 42, involving the relative merits of divisional, as distinguished from departmental, headquarters in the military organization throughout the country—

that is the effective part of it.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I want to offer an amendment to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. ROOT. Let me complete my answer to the Senator from Nebraska, if you please. I suggest that you leave that language in and strike out the words which follow, and which are a mere recital, to wit:

concerning which a controversy has existed for many years in the War Department, as is revealed by the letter from the Secretary of War, resulting in numerous changes from the divisional system of headquarters to the departmental system of headquarters, and back again every few years.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Well, Mr. President, I am willing to say, if that will satisfy those who object to the passage of the resolution, that I will accept the amendment offered by the Senator from New York.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I want to know whether the members of the committee to which this resolution will be referred understand that that language is sufficient to cover the scope of the particular inquiry to which I have directed attention, to wit, as to the propriety of the proposed geographical distribution of these headquarters? I do not desire to encumber the resolution with an amendment if it can be understood that that question is to be embraced in the inquiry.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I do not see how the inquiry can be made without covering that entire ground. That question would be revealed by the document itself, which, I will admit, I have not read; but it seems to me that an examination could not be made without involving that question.

Mr. BACON. Without involving the question as to the propriety of the geographical distribution?

Mr. WARREN. Certainly.

Mr. BACON. That being the case, Mr. President, I have no desire to encumber the resolution with an amendment, but I wish to say that the matter to which I have called attention is one about which I shall ask, either in connection with the investigation now called for or in connection with some other, that there shall be a proper investigation into that particular feature of the matter. I think it is an extremely—I started to use, probably, a stronger word than I should—I think it is an unjust thing to the different portions of this country that the location of these centers of influence from which distribution is made should be settled in a way entirely sectional. I think that, the burden being equally borne, the benefits should be as impartially enjoyed.

Mr. GUGGENHEIM. Mr. President, I hope the resolution offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] may receive favorable and immediate consideration. The State of Colorado is very much interested in the resolution. It is intended, so I am informed, that the Department of the Colorado shall also be abandoned. I hold in my hand letters of recent date from the Denver Chamber of Commerce, the Real Estate Exchange, and from many citizens protesting against the abandonment of the Department of the Colorado. It is for this reason that I should like to see the resolution now receive favorable consideration, and in view of the fact that the change is expected to be made on July 1, I should be glad to see the investigation carried on as promptly as possible. I see no harm in having the hearing at the present time, so that the matter may be thoroughly investigated and sifted without any possible delay. I ask for an impartial hearing by the Committee on Military Affairs, at which it will be demonstrated, in my humble judgment, that the State of Colorado, which I have the honor, in part, to represent, shall not be unjustly discriminated against, as now seems to be contemplated. I ask that the grievances of my many constituents be left to the Committee on Military Affairs for a prompt investigation, which I trust may be had.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution offered by the Senator from Nebraska? The Chair hears none. The Senator from Nebraska, as the Chair understands, has modified his resolution in accordance with the suggestion of the Senator from New York.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes, sir.

Mr. CULBERSON. I ask that the resolution as modified be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution as modified will be read by the Secretary.

The Secretary read as follows (S. Res. 71):

Resolved, That the Committee on Military Affairs be authorized and directed to investigate and report to the Senate its findings and recommendations upon the question presented in Senate Document No. 42, involving the relative merits of divisional, as distinguished from departmental, headquarters in the military organization throughout the country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as modified.

The resolution as modified was agreed to.

THE CALENDAR.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed, and the calendar, under Rule VIII, is in order. The Secretary will state the first business on the calendar.

The SECRETARY. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 1) to correct errors in the enrollment of certain appropriation acts, approved March 4, 1911.

Mr. HEYBURN. I ask that that may go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will go over at the request of the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I was about to make the same request; but I wish to say further that I shall ask at a very early date that the joint resolution be taken up and disposed of.

The bill (S. 20) directing the Secretary of War to convey the outstanding legal title of the United States to sublots Nos. 31, 32, and 33 of original lot No. 3, square No. 80, in the city of Washington, D. C., was announced as next in order.

Mr. HEYBURN. I ask that that bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will go over.

EXTENSION OF UNDERWOOD STREET NW.

The bill (S. 23) to authorize the extension of Underwood Street NW. was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I offer a substitute for the bill, which I ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Hampshire offers a substitute for the bill, which will be read by the Secretary.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert:

That under and in accordance with the provisions of subchapter 1 of chapter 15 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia, within six months after the dedication, in accordance with law, of the land necessary to widen Underwood Street from its present western terminus west of Eighth Street west to Seventh Street west to its full width of 90 feet, as laid down on the permanent system of highways plan, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and they are hereby, authorized and directed to institute in the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia a proceeding in rem to condemn the land that may be necessary to extend said Underwood Street from its present western terminus west of Eighth Street west to the Piney Branch Road, with a width of 90 feet, as laid down on the permanent system of highways plan: *Provided*, That if the dedication referred to herein shall have been made prior to the passage of this act, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized and directed to institute the condemnation provided for herein within six months after the passage of this act: *Provided further*, That the entire amount found to be due and awarded by the jury in said proceeding as damages for, and in respect of, the land to be condemned for said extension, plus the costs and expenses of the proceeding hereunder, shall be assessed by the jury as benefits.

SEC. 2. That there is hereby appropriated, out of the revenues of the District of Columbia, an amount sufficient to pay the necessary costs and expenses of the condemnation proceeding taken pursuant hereto, and for the payment of amounts awarded as damages, to be repaid to the District of Columbia from the assessments for benefits, and covered into the Treasury to the credit of the revenues of the District of Columbia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I submit some papers in addition to those already filed with that bill, which I ask shall accompany the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The papers will be received to accompany the bill.

SUNDAY OBSERVANCE.

The bill (S. 237) for the proper observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia was announced as next in order.

Mr. HEYBURN. I ask that the bill go over.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Alabama moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill, the objection of the Senator from Idaho to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. HEYBURN. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. HEYBURN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Idaho suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bacon	Culberson	Jones	Root
Bourne	Cullom	Kenyon	Shively
Bradley	Cummins	Kern	Simmons
Brandegee	Curtis	La Follette	Smith, Mich.
Bristow	Dillingham	Lodge	Smoot
Brown	Dixon	McCumber	Swanson
Bryan	Fletcher	Martin, Va.	Townsend
Burnham	Foster	Nelson	Warren
Burton	Gallinger	Nixon	Wetmore
Chamberlain	Gamble	Overman	Williams
Chilton	Guggenheim	Page	Works
Clark, Wyo.	Heyburn	Penrose	
Crane	Johnson, Me.	Perkins	
Crawford	Johnston, Ala.	Poindexter	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-three Senators have answered to the roll call. A quorum is present. The Senator from Idaho asks for the yeas and nays on the question of agreeing to the motion to proceed to the consideration of the bill.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill. [Putting the question.] The "noes" appear to have it.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama. I ask for the yeas and nays now.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays have just been refused.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama. We have had a vote since then—viva voce.

Mr. HEYBURN. I raise the question of order against it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Chair will put it again, but the Chair just this moment put it.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama. I do not think the Senate could have understood what was proposed to be considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Chair will again put the question.

Mr. HEYBURN. No; Mr. President, I object. The yeas and nays having been refused to one Senator, under no rule of this Senate can they be ordered now.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair can not put the question again in the face of an objection.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama. I submit, but I give notice——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill goes over.

BILLS PASSED OVER.

The bill (S. 291) providing for the retirement of petty officers and enlisted men of the United States Navy or Marine Corps, and for the efficiency of the enlisted personnel was announced as next in order.

Mr. BURTON. I ask that it go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will go over.

The bill (S. 25) to regulate the business of loaning money on security of any kind by persons, firms, and corporations other than national banks, licensed bankers, trust companies, savings banks, building and loan associations, pawnbrokers, and real-estate brokers in the District of Columbia, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GALLINGER. While I am very warmly in favor of the bill, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE], I think, has an amendment to offer to it. He is absent from the city, and I ask that the bill go over on that account.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will go over.

The bill (S. 123) to alter the regulations respecting the manner of holding elections for Senators was announced as next in order.

Mr. HEYBURN. Let the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will go over.

KANSAS RIVER DAMS, IN KANSAS.

The bill (S. 1524) to authorize the construction and maintenance of a dam or dams across the Kansas River in western Shawnee County, or in Wabaunsee County, in the State of Kansas, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with an amendment, on page 1, line 9, after the word "act," to insert "approved June 23, 1910, entitled 'An act to amend an act,'" so as to read:

That the assent of Congress is hereby given to the Topeka Commercial Club, organized under the laws of Kansas, its successors and assigns, to erect, construct, and maintain a dam or dams across the Kansas River at a suitable place or places in western Shawnee County, or in Wabaunsee County, in the State of Kansas, in accordance with the provisions of the act approved June 23, 1910, entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to regulate the construction of dams across navigable waters,'" approved June 21, 1906.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PUBLIC HEALTH AND MARINE-HOSPITAL SERVICE.

The bill (S. 2117) to promote the efficiency of the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service was announced as next in order.

Mr. JONES. I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will go over.

NORTH POINT LIGHT STATION, WIS.

The bill (S. 2052) relating to the expenditure of an appropriation for the razing of North Point Light Station, Wis., was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments, on page 1, line 5, after the word "for," to strike out "razing" and insert "raising"; in line 8, after the word "location," to insert "provided such removal is, in the opinion of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, for the best interests of the service"; and on page 2, line 3, after the word "granted," to insert the words "under the condition named," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the sum of $10,000, appropriated by the sundry civil appropriation act approved March 4, 1909, for raising North Point Light Station, Wis., is hereby made available for removing said light station to a site 3,000 feet northeast of its present location, provided such removal is, in the opinion of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, for the best interests of the service; said new site to be secured for the United States from the city of Milwaukee, Wis., by an exchange of a portion of the present lighthouse site; and authority to make such exchange of sites is hereby granted under the condition named.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill relating to the removal of the North Point Light Station, Wis., to another site."

PUBLIC HEALTH AND MARINE-HOSPITAL SERVICE.

Mr. FLETCHER. I understand the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] withdraws his objection to the consideration of the bill (S. 2117) to promote the efficiency of the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service.

Mr. JONES. Yes; so far as I am concerned, I withdraw my objection to the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The objection being withdrawn, the bill will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Secretary read the bill, and by unanimous consent the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to ask the Senator who has the bill in charge, if there are any amendments he proposes to offer to the bill, or does he intend to try to have it passed as it is?

Mr. FLETCHER. No amendments are offered. The bill as it was introduced is reported favorably without amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. Do I understand the Senator to want the three surgeons on waiting orders and one passed assistant surgeon on waiting orders to receive the increased pay?

Mr. FLETCHER. No. As the report shows, on page 2, as to the three surgeons who are mentioned as receiving at present the compensation of $1,875, there will be no increase. In the case of the other passed assistant surgeon, receiving $1,500, there is no increase. It will remain the same as it is now.

Mr. SMOOT. I wondered whether the bill was explicit enough on that point, because if one of the senior surgeons, of which there are to be 10, according to the bill, was, for some cause or other, placed upon waiting orders, and he, in the meantime, had received his increased compensation as provided in the bill, would he not draw three-fourths of the increased pay which he would receive under the bill, which would make it, if he were a surgeon on waiting orders, $2,250 instead of $1,875?

Mr. FLETCHER. I understand he would receive three-fourths of the pay which he is receiving at the time he goes on waiting orders, whatever that may be, depending on his position at that time; but there would be no increase under this bill of any compensation, commutation, or otherwise for those who are at present on waiting orders.

Mr. SMOOT. I understood the Senator from Florida in speaking of this matter to say that he intended to offer an amendment to the bill providing that whenever a surgeon was on waiting orders he was to receive $1,875 per annum instead of $2,250, and the passed assistant surgeons on waiting orders to receive $1,500 instead of $1,875 per annum. If the bill passes as it is, that will be the result on all those who are on waiting orders to-day, but if a surgeon is placed on waiting orders, which, in other words, simply means the retirement list, and he, through this bill, receives the increased pay, then he would receive three-fourths of the increased pay that he is receiving under the bill, would he not?

Mr. FLETCHER. I do not understand that he would. In discussing the matter with the Senator, I suggested that an amendment might be proposed to cover the point which he mentioned. But upon investigation of the present law and the effect of this bill, I am sure it does not mean to give those on waiting orders the increase which the Senator supposes.

Mr. SMOOT. I am afraid the bill as it now reads would give that increase, and I really would like to have adopted an amendment providing that whenever a surgeon goes upon waiting orders, he should receive the salary of $1,875 per annum, and whenever a passed assistant surgeon is on waiting orders he should receive $1,500. Then there would be no question about it.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. WORKS. I agree with the Senator from Utah that under this bill the compensation of the surgeons who are on waiting orders would be increased.

Mr. SMOOT. There is not, in my mind, any doubt about it; but, if the Senator will remember, in the committee the report that we received from the Surgeon General, which showed the increase both as to salary and commutation of quarters, did not provide any increase whatever for surgeons on waiting orders nor for passed assistant surgeons on waiting orders, and I did not insist upon my point. But after we adjourned and after I discovered this, I took up the matter with the Senator from Florida, and we thought that the bill ought to provide that hereafter surgeons upon waiting orders should receive $1,875 per annum and passed assistant surgeons $1,500 per annum; and I really believe that that was the thought of the committee when we ordered the bill reported out.

Mr. WORKS. I think the purpose of the committee was that their compensations should not be increased, but no such amendment was provided for; and if the Senator from Utah desires to reach that result, I think an amendment to that effect is necessary.

Mr. FLETCHER. Upon an investigation of that matter I found that the statement submitted by the Surgeon General to the committee was erroneous in respect to the possible increase to those surgeons on waiting orders, and the statement found in the report is not exactly the statement that was submitted to the committee. The report, on page 2, shows the actual conditions that matters would be in if this bill is passed. Three surgeons would receive $1,875, and no more. The passed assistant surgeons——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 4412) to promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada, and for other purposes.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. One moment. The Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] still has the floor.

Mr. PENROSE. Oh, I did not observe that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Florida desire to hold the floor?

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I think the objection suggested by the Senator from Utah is really more apprehensive than founded upon any effect of the bill. I am quite sure the objection he urges could not be urged to the bill if it should become a law, and I should like to see the bill passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill could not now be passed because the unfinished business is before the Senate. The question is whether the Senator desires to retain the floor.

Mr. FLETCHER. Very well; I will let the bill go over then.

RECIPROCITY WITH CANADA.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 4412) to promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada, and for other purposes.

Mr. PENROSE. I ask that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for the purpose of considering amendments, and that the committee amendment be considered first.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, as to the order of procedure that is the rule as to appropriation bills. We have undertaken to apply that rule once or twice to other measures of legislation and it did not work out well. I am speaking of what we

can enforce. We can not enforce it, because there is no rule under which we can do it. If we undertake it in that way it will have to be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. PENROSE. The bill is short. It does not make much difference, if the Senator from Idaho prefers to have the bill read.

Mr. HEYBURN. I do not want to interfere. I merely want to call attention to the fact that it has proved a failure in the past as a method of considering legislative measures other than appropriation bills.

Mr. GALLINGER. Let the bill be read in the usual order.

Mr. PENROSE. I ask that the bill be read in the usual order.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bankhead	Crawford	Jones	Reed
Borah	Cullom	Kenyon	Root
Bourne	Cummins	Kern	Shively
Bradley	Curtis	La Follette	Smith, Mich
Brandegee	Dillingham	Lodge	Smoot
Bristow	Fletcher	McCumber	Swanson
Brown	Gallinger	Martin, Va.	Townsend
Bryan	Gamble	Martine, N. J.	Warren
Burnham	Guggenheim	Nixon	Wetmore
Burton	Heyburn	Owen	Works
Chilton	Hitchcock	Page	
Clark, Wyo.	Johnson, Me.	Penrose	
Crane	Johnston, Ala.	Perkins	

Mr. SMOOT. My colleague [Mr. SUTHERLAND] is absent attending a hearing and it is impossible for him to be present.

Mr. JONES. My colleague [Mr. POINDEXTER] is unavoidably detained from the Chamber.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty-nine Senators have answered to the roll call. A quorum of the Senate is present.

Mr. GALLINGER. Before the reading of the bill is commenced I wish to ask the chairman of the committee in charge of the bill as to his information concerning the preparation of Senators to discuss the bill. There does not seem to be great enthusiasm manifested in that direction.

Mr. PENROSE. As far as I am advised, and I have made careful inquiry in the last two or three days, there are very few Senators who expect to speak in behalf of the measure, and those who expressed an intention to speak against it do not seem to have made much progress in the way of being prepared.

I am glad the Senator from New Hampshire has raised the question, because there ought to be some understanding as to the rapidity with which the consideration of the bill should be pressed. Either the Senate should fix a day to vote on the bill, in which case Senators can take their time, or else there ought to be some disposition shown to fill in the days as they pass by before we come to a vote on the measure.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I raised the question for the reason that Senators on both sides of the Chamber have suggested to me that they are not ready and will not be ready to-morrow to proceed with the discussion of the bill. Quite a number of Senators said to me that they are preparing speeches. Other Senators have said to me that they have important committee work to do to-morrow. The suggestion was made that we could, without detriment to the public service, adjourn over until Monday, and I will venture to make the motion now that when the Senate adjourns it be to meet on Monday next.

Mr. PENROSE. If I may be permitted——

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is not a debatable question.

Mr. PENROSE. Before the motion is put, I will state that I am not advised that any Senator will be ready on Monday.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think we ought to meet on Monday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Hampshire moves that when the Senate adjourns to-day it be to meet on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Do I understand the Senator from Pennsylvania correctly that there is no one willing to speak in behalf of this measure?

Mr. PENROSE. I understand that there are not as many desirous of speaking in behalf of the measure as there are those who desire to speak against it. The friends of the measure would be willing to vote this afternoon on the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Without any debate?

Mr. PENROSE. Without any debate.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Is that the disposition of the chairman of the Committee on Finance?

Mr. PENROSE. I will be willing to vote now on what has been before the country for six months and thoroughly discussed by both sides. Months have been taken.

Mr. HEYBURN. Does the Senator think that both sides have been before the country?

Mr. PENROSE. To an extent, I think so, in the hearings before the committee, which occupied nearly a month, during which over a hundred persons were heard from all over the country, chiefly against the measure.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, it seems very strange that a measure which is calculated to bring into unrestricted competition the natural products of a foreign country larger than our own, and the surrender of revenues amounting to between four and five million dollars a year, should excite no controversy in this Chamber.

Has this measure no champion in the Senate, North or South, on either side of the aisle? Then, in the name of reason, why is it here, and why was it begotten?

I am surprised that Senators who have hitherto asserted the right to be heard upon legislation affecting the welfare of our countrymen should hesitate at this critical juncture and not be willing to come out into the open and discuss a measure so shorn of actual merit, a proposition that has been rejected again and again by the chief officers of this Government. This agreement is analogous in almost every detail to the one entered into between Great Britain and the United States in 1854 on behalf of Canada, and which the great Lincoln asked the Senate to repeal. Canada proposed this same measure to President Grant, and it was rejected as undesirable. It was urged again and again by Canada upon Harrison and Blaine, and rejected by these great statesmen as inimical to the welfare of the American people. Perhaps, after all, no one in the Chamber is willing to defend it in view of our past experience in this direction, an experience which met the prompt condemnation of the immortal Lincoln, and which has met with no public or official favor since that historic day in January, 1865, when the old agreement was repealed through the efforts of Chandler, Wade, Sherman, and other great leaders in the Senate.

This is a history-making forum, the record here made is indelible, and fidelity and faithfulness to our own countrymen will be the sole test which the future will apply to our course in this matter. We must not turn the deaf ear to the apprehensions of our own people; we must not refuse to be guided by their wisdom and past experience in this direction; the back of labor must not be broken for the wedding feast; the rich soil of our own country must not be despoiled for the purpose of adding luster to the crown of England.

Mr. President, I can understand why there should be no affirmative side to this question, when we are to give to the people of a foreign state all the rights of membership in the American Union, and permit them at the same time to be protected, defended, and controlled by one of the foremost powers in all the world.

Are we, Mr. President, to put aliens upon an equality with our own American citizens, without any power to tax them or to draft them into the service of our country in time of peril, without a reason being given for this extraordinary procedure and this unfair advantage over the people of our own land?

I am amazed that a proposition so radical should have been so seriously considered for weeks in the Committee on Finance and appear here without a favorable report or a word of enlightenment, and that now no one on the committee is willing to rise and defend it.

Mr. President, what are the privileges of American citizenship? To labor and toil, preparing the vineyard for the stranger who only comes to us at daybreak and again recrosses our border as the sun goes down? Have we no exclusive joys within the confines of our own land beyond the prying gaze of strangers whose only mission among us is to tear down and to destroy? The burdens of this Government have in times past been heavy and hard to bear; were we able to enlist our northern neighbors when the day of reckoning came? Did they assuage the anguish of broken hearts or bind up the exposed wounds; did they defend us on the field of battle alongside the farmer soldier whose interest is now in jeopardy; did they pay the debt incurred in the maintenance of the Union of States, the largest ever assumed by a free people? No! It fell upon the toiler in factory and field, and without complaining he has paid it ungrudgingly. We promised him this market for his wares, gave him certain assurance of this land for the exclusive exercise of his genius, and now, when the harvest is ripe, it is to be garnered by strangers and with our consent. I protest, Mr. President and Senators, against this arrangement. It is unfair and unjust to the people upon the American farm and not helpful to those in factory or mine; it is reciprocity only in name and degrades that wholesome principle into sharp practice and chicanery. Sir, I would feel unworthy to stand in this high place if I did

not resent with all my vigor this assault upon the institutions of the State which sent me here.

Mr. President, I did not intend to make a speech at this time. I thought that we were to be enlightened by some great burst of wisdom that would shed a flood of light upon this vexatious problem. But, alas, all lights are out. The Chamber is in darkness, and no word is to be spoken; a fit setting indeed for the accomplishment of such a deed.

Mr. KERN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GALLINGER in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I am amazed that we are to have no enlightenment from Senators who have had the exclusive custody of this measure for many weeks past.

Mr. KERN. Will the Senator allow me a question?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Certainly.

Mr. KERN. Has the Senator read the very able argument in favor of this measure made by the Republican President of the United States and by the Republican governor of Michigan?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, I have read both.

Mr. KERN. Have they not illuminated the subject? Have they shed no light?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. In my opinion, Mr. President, the President of the United States has uttered many splendid thoughts; he has, with a power of analysis unsurpassed by many of his predecessors, been able to speak intelligently and instructively upon many public questions; but I am amazed, sir, that of all the things he has discussed, of all the wisdom he has uttered, of all the suggestions he has made, the only one that has found a warm welcome or a permanent lodgment in the brain of the distinguished Senator from Indiana and his colleagues on the other side of the Chamber is a measure so tinctured with Democracy that it finds no championship here in the party to which I belong.

Mr. President, I am going to discuss the bill later as thoroughly as my time and my strength will permit, but will not detain the Senate for that purpose at this time. Ordinarily, we consider the affirmative side of a proposition and then the negative, but we are not to have any discussion. It is to be taken blindly, without further thought, and those who are willing to do it are welcome to the responsibility which that course implies. But for myself I shall refuse to do it, and will, at an early day, give reasons which prompt my earnest opposition to this measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania asks that the bill be read. The Secretary will proceed to read the bill.

The bill was read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment reported by the committee will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 24, line 3, after the word "board," it is proposed to insert:

and when the President of the United States shall have satisfactory evidence and shall make proclamation that such wood pulp, paper and board, being the products of the United States, are admitted into Canada free of duty.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask that that amendment be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to passing over the amendment? The Chair hears none.

Mr. BACON. What is the proposition, Mr. President? I did not hear it.

Mr. LODGE. I asked that the amendment be passed over for the present, because the author of the amendment is not yet ready to speak upon it.

Mr. BACON. What is the particular amendment?

Mr. LODGE. The only amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. BACON. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there further amendments? If not, the bill will be reported to the Senate.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I do not suppose that that procedure, while strictly in order, would be in contemplation of the Senate, in view of the recent action in passing over the amendment. Of course, if we passed over the amendment, it would indicate that it would be left open and not that the bill would pass into the Senate. So far as I am concerned, I want to say that I am perfectly willing for it to proceed to the Senate and to be voted on to-day without further debate.

Mr. LODGE. As the Senator knows, I followed the practice usual in the case of appropriation bills and asked that the amendment be passed over for the present. That is all I intended to do.

Mr. BACON. Certainly.

Mr. LODGE. The amendment can be considered in the Senate just as well as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. BACON. If the Senator desires that, I have no objection.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I am not entirely familiar with the procedure of the Senate. I was out of the Chamber for the moment and am not informed as to what discussion has taken place so far, but I desire to state that I propose to offer an amendment to the bill providing that the President shall enter into negotiations with Canada for the purpose of enlarging reciprocal trade with Canada; and I am rising for the purpose of asking if I shall be foreclosed or estopped from doing that if the bill is reported to the Senate to-day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will not be foreclosed if he offers his amendment at any time before the bill is read the third time.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, inasmuch as the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] has asked that the amendment reported by the committee go over, and couples that with the suggestion that the author of the amendment is not yet ready to proceed to its discussion, it would, I think, be manifestly improper—or, at least, it would be very unusual—to have the bill reported to the Senate. Therefore I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, June 19, 1911, at 12 o'clock m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, *June 16, 1911.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, imbue us plenteously, we beseech Thee, with heavenly gifts, that we may be guided to a faithful and conscientious service to Thee and our fellow men here, now and always, in the spirit of the world's great Exemplar. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

THE WOOL SCHEDULE.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 11019), a bill to reduce the duties on wool and manufactures of wool, and pending that motion I desire to ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] if we can come to an agreement about closing general debate and taking up the bill under the five-minute rule.

Mr. PAYNE. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think I understand to some degree the position of the other side of the House with reference to next Monday and the order of business then, and it has been suggested to me by the gentleman from Alabama that if we could take a recess Saturday about adjournment time, of course occupying Saturday in general debate, until Monday at 11 o'clock, we could close general debate on this bill Monday, with the understanding we take it up on Tuesday under the five-minute rule. I told him, so far as I was concerned, I had no objection to that proposition. Of course, I can not speak for all gentlemen on this side of the House.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would ask the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. Suppose you let the matter go over until we get ready to close to-night.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Very well; then I will see if we can come to an agreement when the committee rises to-night.

Mr. PAYNE. I hope that will be about 5 o'clock; rise for that purpose, perhaps.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would like to run this afternoon until 6. There are a lot of gentlemen who desire to speak before we close debate.

Mr. PAYNE. Not later than 6; I will not object to it.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the House bill 11019.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 11019) to reduce the duties on wool and woolen manufactures, with Mr. HAY in the chair.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield one hour to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH]. [Applause.]