

Congressional Record.

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE SIXTY-FOURTH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, July 25, 1916.

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we seek Thy gracious favor and blessing for this day as we enter upon the obligations of the day, for Thy grace and Thy blessing alone can safeguard all that we count dearest to us, all that means most to us. The ideals of life come to us out of Thy revealed Word. The law of life has its foundation in Thyself. We must come at last to render an account to Thee, the God of all men.

Grant that this day we may so live and act and think that there shall be nothing to regret at its close, but a blessed consciousness of having faithfully discharged the solemn duties that pertain to the Members of this great Senate. For Christ's sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Saturday, July 22, 1916, when, on request of Mr. OWEN and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

FINDINGS OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate communications from the Chief Clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting certified copies of the findings of fact filed by the court in the following causes:

Louise L. Millett, daughter and sole heir of Augustus W. Lothrop, deceased, *v. The United States* (S. Doc. No. 503);

Alma Jones Alling, grandniece and one of the heirs of Josiah H. Martin, deceased, *v. The United States* (S. Doc. No. 504);

Fannie Belle Tucker, daughter and one of the heirs of Thomas J. Myers, deceased, *v. The United States* (S. Doc. No. 505);

Mary L. McCurdy, widow of John McCurdy, deceased, *v. The United States* (S. Doc. No. 506);

Mary D. McPherson, widow (remarried) of Freeman Norrell, deceased, *v. The United States* (S. Doc. No. 507);

Bina V. Pearse and Eliza Swinharte, daughters and sole heirs of Jong Van Pearse, deceased, *v. The United States* (S. Doc. No. 508);

Nina B. Greene et al., children and sole heirs of Elias J. Pendrick, deceased, *v. The United States* (S. Doc. No. 509);

William Poe, son and one of the heirs of Arnold Poe, deceased, *v. The United States* (S. Doc. No. 510);

Elizabeth C. Plunkett, widow of Christopher Plunkett, deceased, *v. The United States* (S. Doc. No. 511);

Florence Plaisted et al., sole heirs of James H. Plaisted, deceased, *v. The United States* (S. Doc. No. 512);

Charles T. Payne, administrator of Eugene B. Payne, deceased, *v. The United States* (S. Doc. No. 513);

Mary P. Drane et al., children and sole heirs of Frank H. Pope, deceased, *v. The United States* (S. Doc. No. 514);

First Bank & Trust Co., administrator of James S. Reardon, deceased, *v. The United States* (S. Doc. No. 515);

Josephine Sheldon, widow of William A. Sheldon, deceased, *v. The United States* (S. Doc. No. 516);

Anna Zimmerly, daughter and sole heir of Frederick Schaun, deceased, *v. The United States* (S. Doc. No. 517);

William F. Smith, son and sole heir of William A. Smith, deceased, *v. The United States* (S. Doc. No. 518);

Paulina F. Shelt, widow of John Shelt, deceased, *v. The United States* (S. Doc. No. 519);

Mary H. Amsden, widow (remarried) of William D. Wrighter, deceased, *v. The United States* (S. Doc. No. 520); and

Mary B. Taylor, widow of Isaac Taylor, deceased, *v. The United States* (S. Doc. No. 521).

The foregoing findings were, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by E. T. Taylor, jr., one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 4866. An act for the relief of Julia R. Goodloe;

H. R. 8787. An act for the relief of the heirs of Hundley V. Fowler, deceased;

H. R. 10484. An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes;

H. R. 14725. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to subdivide a part of the town site of Plummer, Idaho, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 218. Joint resolution authorizing the acceptance of the gift of the Berkshire Trout Hatchery, Berkshire County, Mass.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I have a telegram which I ask to have read. It is very short.

There being no objection, the telegram was read, as follows:

SAVANNAH, GA., July 23, 1916.

Hon. HOKE SMITH,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

We wish to vigorously protest against the British black list. To allow this black list to remain effective will not only put many neutral exporters out of business but will materially affect prices of American commodities, particularly cotton. Our cotton exporters are already feeling the effect of this unjust invasion of American rights. To us this black list does not appear to be a war measure, but a scheme of English merchants to corner the world's business by force.

GREATER SAVANNAH COMMERCIAL CLUB,
P. S. BACON, Chairman Executive Committee.

Mr. ROBINSON presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Benton County, Ark., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. JONES. I have a copy of the report of the temperance committee adopted by the synod of Alabama of the Southern Presbyterian Church on November 18, 1915. It relates to the advertisement in certain newspapers of intoxicating liquors. I move that it be referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. JONES presented a telegram in the nature of a memorial from the Commercial Club, of Seattle, Wash., and a telegram in the nature of a memorial from D. G. Collier, of San Diego, Cal., remonstrating against a tax on copper, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GALLINGER presented petitions of the Piano and Musical Instrument Workers' International Union of America and the Railway Employees' Department of the American Federation of Labor, praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of E. A. Farrington, of Rockland, Me.; Lewis D. Bement, of Framingham, Mass.; Edgar B. Goldstein, of White Plains, N. Y.; M. Berry, of Newport, R. I.; Joseph R. Barrell, of St. Louis, Mo.; Carl J. Feckheimer, of Pittsburgh, Pa.; I. H. Freund, of Chicago, Ill.; A. W. Hunt, of Providence, R. I.; E. M. Johnson, of Pawling, N. Y.; Almee Guggenheimer, of Oquossoc, Me.; Mary M. Hinkley, of Poughkeepsie, N. Y.; and of H. D. Andrews, of Lawrence Park, Bronxville, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit interstate commerce in the products of child labor, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. SHEPPARD presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Brenham, Tex., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Stoneham and Plantersville, in the State of Texas, praying for prohibition in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of the District of Columbia, praying for prohibition in the District of Columbia, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. OWEN presented a memorial of the Illinois State Medical Society, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to prohibit officials of the Public Health Service from joining medical societies, which was referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

He also presented a petition of the Illinois State Medical Society, praying for the enactment of legislation to establish a Division of Mental Hygiene and Rural Sanitation in the United States Public Health Service, which was referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

Mr. THOMPSON presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Topeka, Kans., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to increase the rate of postage on second-class mail matter, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of the Christian Endeavor Society of Waterloo, Kans., praying for prohibition in the Island of Porto Rico, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. NELSON presented telegrams in the nature of memorials from sundry citizens of the State of Minnesota, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to prohibit corporations from paying normal tax for bondholders under the income-tax law, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN presented a petition of sundry citizens of Eugene, Oreg., praying for the enactment of legislation for the prohibition of interstate commerce in the products of child labor, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. WADSWORTH presented a petition of sundry citizens of Glens Falls, N. Y., praying for Federal censorship of motion pictures, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. HARDWICK, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

H. R. 7396. An act for the relief of Hiram P. Geaslin (Rept. No. 730); and

H. R. 14889. An act for the relief of the heirs of Jackson J. Mash, deceased (Rept. No. 731).

Mr. HARDWICK (for Mr. BANKHEAD), from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 2208) for the relief of James L. Yokum, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 732) thereon.

Mr. CLAPP, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 135) for the restoration of annuities to the Medawakanton and Wahpakoota (Santee) Sioux Indians, declared forfeited by the act of February 16, 1863, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 735) thereon.

Mr. FLETCHER, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 6698) for the relief of Edward L. Keyes, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 736) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 7) for the relief of Edward L. Keyes, reported adversely thereon, and the joint resolution was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. NELSON, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 14299) to amend section 33 of an act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary, approved March 3, 1911, reported it without amendment.

Mr. MYERS from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 147) extending the provisions of the act approved June 16, 1898, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report (No. 737) thereon.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (S. 6667) to incorporate the American Nurses' Association, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 738) thereon.

Mr. KERN, from the Committee on Finance, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 10546) for the relief of the Illinois Central Railroad Co., and for other purposes, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 739) thereon.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia, from the Committee on Education and Labor, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 153) to create a Bureau of Labor Safety in the Department of Labor, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 734) thereon.

He also, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6918) to relieve Congress from the adjudication of private claims against the Government, reported it with amendments.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 151) authorizing the appointment of a special joint commission of the Senate and House of Representatives to investigate the employment of Federal prisoners in industrial occupations for the benefit of the Government of the United States, reported it with an amendment.

COMPENSATION OF INJURED EMPLOYEES.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. From the Committee on Education and Labor I report favorably with an amendment the bill (H. R. 15316) to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 733) thereon.

I will state that this bill was considered by a subcommittee consisting of Senators BORAH, HOLLIS, and myself, and it was submitted to Senators MARTINE of New Jersey, JOHNSON of Maine, SWANSON, ASHURST, PENROSE, and KENYON, who agreed that the report should be made, with the reservation of the privilege by one Senator to offer an amendment on the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

ST. LOUIS RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 3032) authorizing the county of St. Louis to construct a bridge across the St. Louis River between Minnesota and Wisconsin, and I submit a report (No. 729) thereon. I call the attention of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] to the bill.

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

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

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

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. POMERENE:

A bill (S. 6702) for the relief of S. S. Yoder; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ROBINSON:

A bill (S. 6703) granting an increase of pension to Frank Plumlee; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MYERS:

A bill (S. 6704) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patent for certain land to school district No. 9, of Sanders County, Mont.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SMITH of Maryland:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 157) giving authority to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make special regulations for the occasion of the reunion of the Confederate Veterans' Association, to be held in the District of Columbia in the year 1917, and for other purposes, incident to said encampment; to the Committee on Appropriations.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. REED submitted an amendment proposing to enable qualified voters of the United States engaged in the military service of the country as the Organized Militia and Volunteer Army to vote for electors of President and Vice President and for Members of Congress, intended to be proposed by him to the Army appropriation bill (H. R. 16460), which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. CURTIS submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$125 to pay H. G. Larimer for fees and expenses as an expert witness on behalf of the Government in the case of *The United States v. Henry Samuels, etc.*, intended to be proposed by him to the general deficiency appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL RESERVE ACT.

Mr. WEEKS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 13391) to amend the act approved December 23, 1913, known as the Federal reserve act, by adding a new section, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

THE REVENUE.

Mr. WADSWORTH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 16763) to increase the revenue, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

INSPECTION OF VESSELS.

Mr. FLETCHER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 13223) to provide for appeals from decisions of boards of local inspectors of vessels, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

WAR DEPARTMENT ORDERS.

Mr. JONES. I submit a resolution and ask for its present consideration.

The resolution (S. Res. 238) was read as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to transmit to the Senate copies of all orders issued by his department during the last three years directing the nonemployment of, or discriminating between, citizens of the United States in connection with the work, activities, and projects carried on by his department.

Mr. OWEN. Let that go over, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will go over under the rule.

FEDERAL FARM-LOAN ACT.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I have had numerous inquiries, hundreds daily, for copies of what is known as the rural-credits or Federal farm-loan act. I have no doubt other Senators have also been requested to furnish copies of that act. The Joint Committee on Printing ordered the limit within its power, but the number printed under that order has been exhausted. Demands are coming in, and I offer a resolution for printing extra copies of that act, and I ask to have it read and referred to the Committee on Printing.

The resolution (S. Res. 239) was read and referred to the Committee on Printing, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed 65,000 copies of Public Law No. 158, known as the Federal farm-loan act, of which 60,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate and 5,000 copies for the use of the Senate document room.

NATIONAL BANKS.

Mr. OWEN. I present a letter from the Comptroller of the Currency, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY,
Washington, July 22, 1916.

HON. ROBERT L. OWEN,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Permit me to bring to your attention the inclosed statement prepared by this office, showing the increases and decreases in the national banks and national-bank capital for the 12 months ending July 1, 1916. This statement, I think, affords a very complete answer to the disparaging reports which are being published in newspapers hostile to the administration. For example, a newspaper clipping which I find on my desk this morning, copied from a New Orleans paper, says:

"A number of national banks, week by week, are surrendering their Federal charters and taking out State bank charters instead, and the published reason for this change is the high cost and troublesome exactions imposed on the banks by the Comptroller of the Currency. The number of Federal reserve banks is decreasing instead of increasing."

From the inclosed statement you will see that during this period 120 new national banks were organized and 92 existing banks increased their capital, while the number of banks liquidating (other than those consolidating with other national banks), together with the number of banks reducing their capital, was only 108.

The statement also shows that there was an aggregate increase in the capital of national banks during the year of \$17,612,700, and that the total reduction of capital owing to liquidations (other than for consolidation with other national banks) and reductions of capital was only \$8,940,500, making the net increase in national-bank capital for the year on this basis \$8,672,200.

With high regard,

Faithfully, yours,

JOHN SKELTON WILLIAMS.

Statement showing the increases and reductions in the number of national banks and the capital of national banks during the period from July 1, 1915, to June 30, 1916.

New charters issued to 120 banks, with capital of	\$8,005,000
Increase of capital approved for 92 banks, with new capital of	9,607,700
Aggregate number of new charters and banks increasing capital, 212, with aggregate of new capital authorized	17,612,700
Number of banks liquidating (other than those consolidating with other national banks), 87; capital of same banks	7,893,000
Number of banks reducing capital, 21; reduction of capital	1,047,500
Total number of banks going into liquidation or reducing capital (other than those consolidating with other national banks), 108; aggregate capital reduction	8,940,500
The foregoing statement shows the aggregate of increased capital for the period was	17,612,700
Against this there was a reduction of capital, owing to liquidations (other than for consolidation with other national banks) and reductions of capital of	8,940,500
Net increase	8,672,200

During this period there were 15 national banks, with an aggregate capital of \$935,000 placed in the hands of receivers, and 4 national banks, with an aggregate capital of \$155,000, were restored to solvency and reopened.

The Comptroller's Office refused 18 applications for charters for national banks during this period.

Of the 87 national banks liquidating during the year (exclusive of 45 which consolidated with other national banks) the records indicate that 75 consolidated with State banks or reorganized under State laws, while 58 State banks during the same period were converted into national banks or reorganized under the national banking laws.

SAFETY AT SEA.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I present a paper which, without taking the time of the Senate to describe, I deem of sufficient importance to have printed as a public document, and I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Printing for their consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That action will be taken.

NATIONAL PARK IN HAWAII.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I submit a report of the committee of conference on the bill (H. R. 9525) to establish a national park in the Territory of Hawaii, and ask that it be now considered. It will take but a moment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read.

The Secretary read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9525) to establish a national park in the Territory of Hawaii, having met, after full and free conference agree to recommend, and do recommend, to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its insistence upon its amendment striking out the following in lines 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12 on page 8 of said bill:

"Provided, That no appropriation for the maintenance, supervision, and improvement of said park in excess of \$10,000 annually shall be made unless the same shall have first been expressly authorized by law; and."

JOHN F. SHAFROTH,

JOHN W. KERN,

MILES POINDEXTER,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

SCOTT FERRIS,

EDWARD T. TAYLOR,

IRVINE L. LENROOT,

Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, in pursuance of Senate joint resolution No. 60, creating a joint subcommittee from the membership of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce and the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate the conditions relating to interstate and foreign commerce and the necessity for further legislation relating thereto, and so forth, I, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce, announce the following five members of that committee as the Senate members of the joint subcommittee: The Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE].

SIR ROGER CASEMENT.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I desire, if it is in order, to ask that the resolution I offered some days ago be now taken up for action. I refer to Senate resolution 237, which reads as follows:

Resolved, That the President be requested to advise our ambassador to Great Britain to use his kindly offices, unofficially, to ask for the commutation of the sentence of death passed upon Sir Roger Casement.

Mr. OWEN. If it leads to no debate, I interpose no objection, but I do not wish to see the morning hour again consumed by debating this question.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I appreciate the situation, and I have no desire to incur any debate. I think the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations will acquiesce in the consideration of the resolution at this time.

Mr. STONE. So far as I am individually concerned I have no objection to the two resolutions, the one offered by the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] and the one offered by the Senator from New Jersey, being laid before the Senate and to dispose of them in their order, offering one as an amendment or a substitute for the other, without debate. Is that satisfactory?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I do not know that I caught just the remark of the Senator.

Mr. STONE. There are two resolutions.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I will agree to have them both go before the committee.

Mr. STONE. Not the committee, but the Senate.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Of course, it would be beyond me; I could not prevent them from going before the Senate, they are both before the Senate now. If I may be permitted, I want to say it seems to me the one offered by the Senator from California is not directed at the question at issue. The question at issue is not the leniency to Irish prisoners but the question at issue is whether the President shall be requested to advise our ambassador to Great Britain to use his kindly offices to ask for the commutation of the sentence of death passed upon Sir Roger Casement.

Mr. STONE. But the question I ask the Senator is whether he consents, as far as he is concerned, to submit the matter to a vote without further debate?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Yes, sir; utterly. I have no desire to incur any further debate.

Mr. ASHURST. The Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] is not present, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. STONE. He is not in the city.

Mr. ASHURST. Then I withdraw the request. I do not want this matter disposed of without debate. I wish to be heard for two minutes, and I think I will be heard now.

Mr. STONE. The matter is not before the Senate now. We were trying to reach an agreement to have it disposed of without debate.

Mr. ASHURST. I was objecting to that. I want to be heard for two minutes. I know how pressed we are for time, and, therefore, I wish only to take two minutes; but that I will take.

Mr. STONE. Well, outside of that, will the Senator from New Jersey agree?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. That is entirely satisfactory.

Mr. STONE. Then, Mr. President, I have no objection to the resolutions being presented. I am not very particular about the order in which the two resolutions are presented. The Senator from New Jersey calls up his resolution, and if that is laid before the Senate, on behalf of the Senator from California I shall propose his as a substitute.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I will say that I am opposed to that resolution as a substitute. My reason, I assert again, is that it is not directed at the question at issue. The question at issue is this—

Mr. STONE. Now we are going to have debate.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. But I feel I am justified in stating that the question at issue is the relief of Sir Roger Casement, not merely to express our desire for leniency to political prisoners.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I think we are to have debate upon it. I will move to refer both resolutions. I am perfectly willing to have them laid before the Senate with the understanding that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] shall take two minutes, and then I shall offer on behalf of the Senator from California his resolution as a substitute.

Mr. JONES. I hope it is not understood that the agreement between the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from New Jersey will cut off debate on the proposition.

Mr. STONE. I will ask unanimous consent that with the exception of two minutes to the Senator from Arizona the resolutions be voted upon without further debate.

Mr. JONES. 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:

Ashurst	Hardwick	O'Gorman	Simmons
Brandege	James	Oliver	Smith, Ga.
Bryan	Johnson, S. Dak.	Overman	Smith, S. C.
Clapp	Jones	Owen	Smoot
Clark, Wyo.	Kenyon	Page	Sterling
Colt	La Follette	Penrose	Stone
Culberson	Lane	Pittman	Thomas
Cummins	Lee, Md.	Polindexter	Thompson
Curtis	Lodge	Pomerene	Tillman
Dillingham	McCumber	Ransdell	Vardaman
Fall	Martin, Va.	Reed	Wadsworth
Fletcher	Martine, N. J.	Robinson	Weeks
Gallinger	Myers	Shafroth	Williams
Groana	Nelson	Sheppard	Works
Harding	Norris	Sherman	

Mr. KERN. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. TAGGART]. This announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I am requested to announce the unavoidable absence of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-nine Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

The VICE PRESIDENT. At the request of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINE] the Chair lays before the Senate a resolution, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 237) submitted by Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey on the 22d instant, as follows:

Resolved, That the President be requested to advise our ambassador to Great Britain to use his kindly offices, unofficially, to ask for the commutation of the sentence of death passed upon Sir Roger Casement.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, what we may say here or elsewhere regarding Ireland's long struggle for freedom has, and can have, no bearing upon or relevancy to the present European conflict. But no doubt the war conditions surrounding England fired the zeal of Irish patriots with the hope of a successful revolution against the unspeakable oppression which had so long held Ireland in its intolerable chains. I am in favor of the passage of this resolution and would favor the passage of a much stronger one were I convinced that it would be of any efficacy in securing the relief for those unhappy people.

The same sentiments and aspirations that animated George Washington, John Adams, Sam Adams, Thomas Jefferson, Alexander Hamilton, Benjamin Franklin, Warren at Bunker Hill, Nathan Hale, John Stark, Anthony Wayne, and Daniel Morgan in our Revolutionary War animated and controlled Sir Roger Casement, Patrick H. Pearse, Thomas J. Clarke, and their compatriots and coadjutors in 1916.

The same aspirations and sentiments that animated Andrew Jackson and his Kentucky and Tennessee riflemen at New Orleans in 1815, animated and controlled the Irish patriots in 1916. Let us, therefore, the free and untrammelled Senators of a Nation consecrated to liberty, not fail at this time to make proper expression of a genuine and warm sympathy for the Irish political prisoners, for they represent a race which for centuries has offered to the world a continuous example of pure motives, pathetic patriotism, strong and splendid, but unavailing courage.

Agricola, Roman statesman and general, and father-in-law of the historian Tacitus, advised the empire builders of his day that Imperial Rome should "war down and take possession of Ireland, so that freedom might be put out of sight." From the day of Agricola's brutal expression down to this good hour the Irish people have waged an uncompromising resistance, so that freedom in Ireland might not be "put out of sight"; and in all the troubled centuries, from the time of Agricola to this day, the Irish people have never sought to impose a yoke of tyranny upon other people or to build empires, but have sought simply their own freedom and independence.

Some years ago I read an extract from a speech attributed to the eloquent Senator Bob Taylor, of Tennessee, whose service here gave glory to this Senate. He said:

"If I were a sculptor I would chisel from the marble my ideal of a hero. I would make it the figure of an Irishman sacrificing his hopes and his life on the altar of his country; and I would carve on its pedestal the name of Robert Emmet.

"If I were a painter I would make my canvas eloquent with the deeds of the bravest people who ever lived, whose proud spirit no power can ever conquer, and whose loyalty and devotion to the hopes of free government no tyrant can ever crush. And I would write under the picture 'Ireland.'

"If I were a poet I would melt the world to tears with the pathos of my song. I would touch the heart of humanity with the mournful melody of Ireland's wrongs and Erin's woes. I would weave the shamrock into garlands of glory for the Emerald Isle, the land of heroes, the nursery of liberty. Tortured in dungeons and murdered on scaffolds, robbed of the fruits of their sweat and toil, scourged by famine and plundered by the avarice of heartless power, driven like the leaves of autumn before the keen winter winds, this sturdy race of Erin's sons and daughters have scattered over the face of the earth, homeless only in the land of their nativity, but princes and lords in every other land where merit is the measure of men."

In conclusion, I wish to say that I am very much in favor of the passage of this resolution requesting the President, through diplomatic channels, to ask Great Britain to exercise clemency in the treatment of Irish political prisoners, and I also express the hope that in dealing with Sir Roger Casement Great Britain will be wise enough to see that she can not get a "place in the sun" by snuffing out the lights of the world.

Mr. O'GORMAN. Mr. President, I should be disposed to favor either of the resolutions pending before the Senate at this time relative to the case of Sir Roger Casement. They both convey the same thought—the expression of a hope for clemency in behalf of one whose only offense is love of his native land.

In recent days, perhaps more than in other periods, many appeals have been addressed to the nations of the earth in the name of humanity, and I can not conceive of the sensibilities of any nation being disturbed by a respectful appeal coming from one of the units in the family of nations urging, in the name of a common humanity, that clemency be extended to a man guilty of no moral turpitude, animated by the purest purpose and moved only by a passion to free his people and his race from an oppression under which it has labored for seven centuries.

If Sir Roger Casement be a criminal, then George Washington and John Hancock and John Adams were criminals. They were all rebels protesting against wrong and tyranny. Mr. President, the names of those who fall no less than those who succeed in rebellion remain enshrined in the hearts of a grateful people.

What is the demarcation between the rebel who triumphs and the one who fails? Is one animated by a nobler purpose than that which moves the other? According to the standards that guide men, are they not both, the successful and the unsuccessful rebel, to be judged by the animating purpose of their conduct? Though its votaries fall, the struggle for liberty is eternal.

Mr. President, it has been stated that there is no precedent for this action. I am sure the distinguished Senator who made that statement must upon reflection recognize his own error. It has frequently happened in the past that the Executive of this Nation, voicing the sympathy and the hope of many thousands of our people, has conveyed to foreign countries an expression of the sentiments and the sympathy of the American people.

It was done by President Grant, in 1869, in behalf of Irish political prisoners; by Mr. Seward, as Secretary of State, in 1867, in behalf of clemency for Maximilian; by Mr. Jefferson, who, as Secretary of State, in 1793, urged the French Government to release Gen. Lafayette from imprisonment; and throughout the long line of Presidents and Secretaries of State scarcely an administration has come without some appeal in the name of humanity being conveyed by the Washington Government to some foreign power.

A Senator thought he found in this incident a parallel in the case of Mrs. Surratt; and he inquired what impression would be produced upon the American Government if, in 1865, Great Britain had respectfully asked the American Government to extend clemency to Mrs. Surratt. It might not have accomplished its purpose; but, at least, it would have checked the wrong, the injustice, the horrible crime of taking the life of an innocent woman at a time when this Government was not overzealous in respecting those rights of personal liberty which, except in war time, have so distinguished the laws and the government of this country since its inception. Is there an American to-day who attempts to vindicate the hanging of Mrs. Surratt? Is it not the universal judgment of the country that a cruel and unspeakable injustice was inflicted in time of terror upon an innocent woman? And if Great Britain or France or Germany at that time had sought to intercede to save the life of Mrs. Surratt, we Americans of this generation, at least, would be grateful for the intercession, for it might have spared the writing of one of the saddest pages in the annals of the Civil War or the period immediately succeeding.

I rose chiefly, Mr. President, however, to say a word regarding an observation made by my distinguished friend from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] and seconded, in a measure, by the able Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER]. During the discussion, reference being made to the War of Independence, the statement was made by the junior Senator from California [Mr. PHILLAN] that 50 per cent of the Continental soldiers were of Irish birth or Irish extraction, and, while the accuracy of the statement was not openly disputed, there was an implication of doubt in the remarks of the two Senators to whom I have referred, because one Senator asked, if it be accepted as a fact that 50 per cent of the Continental troops were Irish, and if the Germans and the Poles and the French were given the credit which is claimed in their behalf, were there any Americans fighting in the Continental Army?

Well, just what he meant by "Americans" may be a question, considering the sense in which he used the word. If he meant real Americans, there were none of them fighting in the Continental Army. They were in the employ of the British Army, receiving rewards for the use of the tomahawk and the scalping knife in trying to suppress the patriotic aspirations of an outraged people. If you mean by the American of that period the immigrant of English ancestry, the record shows that four-fifths of all the inhabitants of America during the Continental period boasting English ancestry remained loyalists, and were the Tories of that period.

Mr. President, in the third year of the War of Independence a parliamentary inquiry was instituted by the Government of

Great Britain, and among the witnesses called on the 16th of June, 1779, before this committee sitting in London was Joseph Galloway, who was a native of this country, and who stated:

I have lived in America from my nativity to the month of October last, about 48 years. * * * I have lived in the Province of Maryland, in the Delaware Counties, and in the Province of Pennsylvania, chiefly in Philadelphia. My public profession was that of the law. I practiced in all the courts of Pennsylvania, in those of the Delaware Counties, and in the Supreme Courts of New Jersey. I was a member of the Assembly of Pennsylvania 18 years; speaker of the house 12. I was appointed by the assembly of that Province to attend the American Congress, which met on the 5th of September, 1774. During the last war, under an appointment of the same assembly, I was one of the commissioners for disposing of the money granted to the Crown, and have been several times a commissioner to treat with the Indians.

I speak of his antecedents to show his respectability, although he became a Tory. In his testimony he was asked this question, which I know will be of interest to some of the Members of this body:

Q. (By one of the committee.) That part of the rebel army that enlisted in the service of the Congress, were they chiefly composed of natives of America, or were the greatest part of them English, Scotch, and Irish?

And Mr. Galloway answered:

A. The names and places of their nativity being taken down, I can answer the question with precision: There were scarcely one-fourth natives of America; about one-half Irish, the other fourth were English and Scotch.

Mr. President, I venture to submit that this authority can not very well be impeached. The book from which I read is: "The Examination of Joseph Galloway, Esq., late Speaker of the House of Assembly of Pennsylvania, before the House of Commons, in a committee on the American Papers," published in London in 1779, and this book is accessible in the Library. Plowden, the historian, in his History of Ireland, published in 1809, said:

It is a fact beyond question that most of the early successes in America were immediately owing to the vigorous exertions and prowess of the Irish immigrants who bore arms in that cause.

The Marquis de Chastellux, a Frenchman who spent some time in America in 1782, wrote:

An Irishman the instant he sets foot on American soil becomes ipso facto an American. This was uniformly the case during the whole of the late war. While Englishmen and Scotchmen were treated with jealousy and distrust, even with the best recommendations of zeal and attachment to the cause, the native of Ireland stood in need of no other certificate than his dialect. Indeed, their conduct in the late war amply justified their favorable opinion, for whilst the Irish emigrant was fighting the battles of America by sea and land, the Irish merchants, principally of Charleston, Baltimore, and Philadelphia, labored with indefatigable zeal at all hazards to promote the spirit of enterprise and increase the wealth and maintain the credit of the country. Their purses always were opened and their persons devoted to the country's cause, and on more than one eminent occasion Congress itself, and the very existence of America probably, owed its preservation to the fidelity and firmness of the Irish.

In 1828 George Washington Parke Custis, grandson of Martha Washington, in answer to an appeal from Ireland for funds in aid of the struggle for Catholic emancipation, wrote:

And why is this imposing appeal made to our sympathies? It is an appeal from that very Ireland whose generous sons, alike in the day of our gloom and of our glory, shared in our misfortunes and joined in our success; who, with undaunted courage breasted the storm which, once threatening to overwhelm us, howled with fearful and desolating fury through this now happy land; who with aspirations deep and fervent for our cause, whether under the walls of the Castle of Dublin, in the shock of our liberty's battles, or in the feeble expiring accents of famine and misery, amidst the horrors of the prison ships, cried from their hearts, "God save America." Tell me not of the aid which we received from another European nation in the struggle of independence; that aid was most, nay, all essential to our ultimate success, but remember, years of the conflict had rolled away. Of the operatives in war—I mean the soldier—up to the coming of the French Ireland had furnished in the ratio of 100 for 1 of any foreign nation whatever.

Then honored be the good old service of the sons of Erin in the War of Independence. Let the shamrock be entwined with the laurels of the Revolution, and truth and justice, guiding the pen of history, inscribe on the tablets of America's remembrance "Eternal gratitude to Irishmen."

Ramsey, the historian of North Carolina, writing in 1789, declared: "For the last 70 or 80 years no nation has contributed so much to the population of America as Ireland."

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. O'GORMAN. With pleasure.

Mr. NELSON. I want to say to him that in Lecky's History of the Eighteenth Century exactly what the Senator says is stated to be true. He states in that history that fully half of the Continental Line were Irishmen, mainly from the north of Ireland.

Mr. O'GORMAN. The statement of the Senator from Minnesota is largely accurate. It is open to revision, in my judgment, when he states that the Irish were mainly from the north of Ireland. I think it will be found that they were about equally divided, because for a hundred years before the American Revolution no people on earth were so cruelly persecuted as the Irish in the south of Ireland, and no people during that period

had a greater incentive to leave their homes and hazard the dangers of the ocean and the seas that they might find an asylum in distant lands against the wrongs and tyranny that oppressed them in their own country.

One of my colleagues near by has just made an observation which did not escape me, in which he said, in substance, that if the statement of the Senator from Minnesota be correct, that they were north-of-Ireland Irishmen, then they were not Irish at all. By the same method of reasoning the Senator making that observation, although an ornament of the American Senate, is not an American, because he is Welsh, inasmuch as his grandfather or great-grandfather was a native of Wales. By his own rule the Senator is a Welshman and not an American. It is sometimes forgotten that the so-called Scottish element in the north of Ireland is as Irish as those in the south. Scotland was colonized by the native Irish, and after some centuries many of the descendants of the early colonists returned to Ireland, the home of their ancestors. Racially they are one people.

I might say in this connection, Mr. President, that the first general who fell in the struggle for American liberty was a native-born Irishman, Gen. Richard Montgomery. The first British ship captured in the war was captured by the son of an Irish immigrant in Machias Bay, Me.—Capt. Jeremiah O'Brien. The richest man in the American colonies—the man who imperiled more than any other man, not even excepting George Washington, when he embraced the patriotic cause—was the grandson of an Irish immigrant, Charles Carroll, of Carrollton.

John Hancock, President of the Continental Congress, was a descendant of a native of Ireland.

Charles Thompson, Secretary of the Congress, who made the first official copy of the Declaration, was born in Ireland.

John Nixon, member of the Pennsylvania Council, who first publicly read the Declaration from the steps of the statehouse in Philadelphia in 1776, was a son of Richard Nixon, a native of County Wexford, Ireland.

John Dunlap, who first printed the immortal document, was born in Strabane, County Tyrone, Ireland.

Among the signers of the Declaration, Thomas Smith and George Taylor, of Pennsylvania, were both natives of Ireland. Matthew Thornton, of New Hampshire; George Reed, of Delaware; Thomas McKean, of Delaware; Edward Rutledge, of South Carolina, were sons of natives of Ireland.

Among the generals who fought under Washington, Richard Montgomery, Thomas Conway, John Armstrong, William Thompson, Andrew Lewis, William Maxwell, William Irvine, Edward Hand, Richard Butler, Walter Stewart, and Stephen Moylan were natives of Ireland. Maj. Gen. John Sullivan, Maj. Gen. Henry Knox, Gen. Anthony Wayne, Brig. Gen. James Clinton, Brig. Gen. Joseph Reed, Brig. Gen. John Nixon, and John Stark, were sons of natives of Ireland.

When I look about this Senate, having in mind the rather equivocal significance attached to the word "American" as I thought it was used here a day or two ago, and when I see, representing great Commonwealths, able and patriotic Senators who were born on foreign soil, and when I see other able and distinguished Members of this body who are the sons of immigrants or, in some instances, the grandsons of immigrants, I can not help the reflection that all the power, that all the glory of this great experiment of government by the people is due to the blood, the intellect, the enterprise, the energy, and the patriotic devotion of men from many lands and many races. If there be one nation which might assert unquestionably the right to petition a foreign power to do an act of clemency in the name of justice and humanity, it is a country such as ours, whose population is made up of the peoples of all the earth and whose sympathies embrace the world.

Reverting to the suggestion that we might have taken offense at Great Britain if that Government interposed in behalf of Mrs. Surratt, it will be well to bear in mind this difference between the two countries: If there were any considerable number of Americans in Great Britain, the case would be more analogous to our own, because in this country, with many people formerly part of the British Empire, or whose ancestors were part of the British nation, there would seem to be an especial propriety in Great Britain listening, under all these circumstances, to a respectful appeal for clemency in the name of humanity.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. STONE. Which is the resolution?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINE].

Mr. STONE. In accordance with the statement I made earlier, I offer the resolution, which is also on the President's table, proposed by the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] at the same time the pending resolution was offered. I offer that as a substitute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The substitute will be read.

The SECRETARY. As a substitute for the resolution of the Senator from New Jersey, the Senator from Missouri offers the following:

Resolved, That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, requested to ask the British Government to exercise clemency in the treatment of Irish political prisoners.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I do not desire to discuss this resolution, but I want to make a single suggestion along another line.

It has been stated over and over again in the Senate, and was repeated by the Senator from New York to-day, that it is "universally" conceded that Mrs. Surratt was an innocent woman, and that in those terrible times, when there was great excitement and very likely many things were done that ought not to have been done, a woman entirely innocent of the crime charged against her was executed.

Mr. President, I have been a reasonably attentive student of the history of the Civil War, and I have never yet discovered any evidence that satisfies my mind that the Government executed an innocent woman. I think it was an unfortunate circumstance, much to be deplored, beyond a doubt; but that the execution was without cause at that time has escaped my attention if it is a historical fact.

I make this observation for the purpose of emphasizing the fact that it is not universally conceded that Mrs. Surratt was an innocent woman, as I believe that she was cognizant of the crime charged against her and deserved punishment at the hands of the Government. The question as to the severity of the punishment is another matter, on which I do not propose to enter.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, if I may speak with reference to the resolution offered by the Senator from Missouri, as I remarked before, it is not regarding the question at issue at all; and if it is adopted it will be adopted as a substitute. It takes the place of the resolution which I had the honor to offer. My resolution appealed directly for a commutation of the sentence of Sir Roger Casement. The people of Ireland, I feel, are not asking clemency at the hands of the British people. They are simply asking justice.

I believe that Great Britain will grant that which satisfies best her own interests, and if her own interests are best subserved by the adoption of the course requested in my resolution she will commute the sentence; otherwise she will not.

If, as I understand it, this resolution is to take the place of mine, while I have as much clemency in my heart as any other Senator, I shall vote "nay" on the question of substituting it for my own.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I do not rise to take part in this debate further than to say that in our earnest advocacy of a cause we are sometimes apt to lose sight of the fact that there is another side to the controversy; and I can not help but think that the advocates of the resolutions now pending have lost sight of the circumstances attending the Sinn Féin revolt, for the participation in which Sir Roger Casement and others were arrested and have on trial been convicted.

But waiving all this, I am in sympathy with the general purpose of the resolutions. But, Mr. President, the question is as to how we may best accomplish the result. I think, as a means to that end, we may well express some interest and sympathy in at least one great question now confronting the Government of Great Britain, and that is the question of home rule for Ireland. I think an expression of interest and sympathy on the part of this body in the efforts of English statesmen and Irish statesmen and leaders as well to bring about home rule for Ireland would further the object sought to be accomplished by any such resolution, and would perhaps, through our manifestation of interest in this one problem, tend to procure clemency on the part of Great Britain.

Hence with this in view, I have somewhat hurriedly prepared here a resolution, which I offer as a substitute for the pending resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate of the United States, mindful alike of what it believes to be in the best interest of the Government of Great Britain, of the Irish people, and the cause of self-government throughout the world, has viewed with satisfaction the progress of late made toward the accomplishment of home rule for Ireland. That such home rule will not only be in accord with American traditions and ideals, but with the general practice of Great Britain for the greater part of a century. That while the Senate has viewed with concern and has deplored the loss of life and property resulting from the late so-called Sinn Féin revolt, it expresses the hope that clemency will be exercised by the Government of Great Britain toward all prisoners held or tried and convicted as a result of their participation in such revolt.

Resolved, That the President of the United States be requested to communicate this expression of the views of the Senate, through the Department of State, to the Government of Great Britain.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the sting and the evil in the resolution offered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINE] the other day, the international insult and offense contained in it, have been removed; and the resolution pending as a substitute can not be attacked upon that ground.

I am still of the opinion that for one nation, through one of its official bodies, to arraign the validity of the course of justice in the courts of another, as was proposed the other day by the Senator from New Jersey, is necessarily from its very nature offensive. I am of the opinion that even in a very extreme case, like that of Mrs. Surratt, cited by me, where the whole world recognizes now that there was a hasty and unjust conviction "after a so-called trial"—not a trial at common law but under martial law, and of a woman who had never been a part of the naval or armed forces of the United States—that even in an extreme case like that a criticism by the House of Commons of Great Britain arraigning and denouncing the course pursued by the Federal Government would have been offensive and insulting. Nobody has ever said that a resolution passed by the House of Commons, or signed by members of the House of Commons, respectfully asking mercy in a case of that sort was without precedent. If I am not mistaken, the House of Representatives at one time passed some resolution concerning Kossuth, the Hungarian—though I am not quite sure; I think so—appealing to Austria for clemency.

Mr. President, I did not rise, however, to talk about that. I rose to talk about another thing. The Senator from New York has indulged in one of those truly amusing racial outbursts which so frequently occur in the United States. I was not long ago reading a book, the name of the author I have just at this moment forgotten, but it is a leading book, having the title "The Germans in America." Therein the author proves without absolute finality, according to his method of procedure, that 40,000,000 of the American people are Germans or of German descent. I have seen accounts showing that about that number were Irish. I have also seen accounts showing that some 15,000,000 were Scandinavian, and so on until when you get through with it, without counting a single English, Scotch, or Welsh derived man upon the continent of the United States, you have about 115,000,000 population that are Germans, Irish, Scandinavians, Polacks, Russian Jews, or something else.

Now, I will tell you how it comes about. An immigrant comes over here of Irish derivation, and one of his daughters marries a Mr. Smith, who has been living here a long time; whereupon the Irish put Smith's children down as "Irish-Americans." Then the oldest boy of Smith, still named Smith, marries a German; whereupon the Germans and Irish both put down the second Smith's son as a German-American and as an Irish-American—thus he is counted twice, although he is not twins. The next generation one of the family marries an American Polack, whereupon this third man belongs to all three, and is counted three times, although not triplets. Meanwhile, the English-derived Smith—poor, old, unhyphenated fellow—has been completely forgotten and left entirely out of account. That is about the way it occurs.

Mr. President, I have no objection to the people who came from Ireland or to the people who came from Germany or to the people who came, like the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON], from Norway, or the gentlemen who came from Sweden or anywhere else. As the Senator from New York has said, the only truly native American is the North American Indian. We are all derived from somebody who came from somewhere in Europe except this native American.

The Senator made a little mistake about my great grandfather coming from Wales; it was his grandfather; but that just throws it all a little further back along the tide of time and makes very little difference. However, I do object to his saying that the Welsh and the English and the Scotch have had nothing to do with the building up of this country. As to the Scotch-Irish, what I said to him is true. They are not racially Irish. For 300 years they were engaged in murdering Irishmen and outraging their women, and the Irish for 300 years were engaged in reciprocating.

Yet every Scotch-Irish man in America is claimed as an Irishman. The Irish are just as good as the Scotch-Irish—every bit—but they are not racially the same stock; they are of Scotch and English racial derivation, settled as colonists in the north of Ireland.

Some time ago I picked up a book which undertook to prove that the success of the American Revolution was entirely due to the Scotch-Irish, not to the Welsh, nor English, nor Scotch, not even to the Irish, but the Scotch-Irish, who mainly came from the lowlands of Scotland and went over to Ireland as conquerors and oppressors, and were then, as they are now, the greatest enemies that the Irish race have, while the Irish, upon the other hand, are the greatest enemies that they have to-day,

as they have been for hundreds of years, with a blood feud almost always formerly existing between them, striking away back to the days of Elizabeth and Cromwell. Many of the so-called Scotch-Irish are not Scotch at all, but were English who came over under Elizabeth—some even under Henry VII—and came over with pretty much the same view as the Cromwellians did—of robbing and exploiting the native Irish, which they proceeded to do. The native Irish, under Charles I, having an opportunity to return the compliment, returned it in full measure.

Those of us who are of English and Welsh and Scotch descent have as much right to be proud of our European derivation as any German-American or Irish-American in America. Yet when we speak of it somebody immediately suggests that we are more or less Tories, or, from the mere reference to it, at any rate, very near to being Know-Nothings.

Mr. President, just think a minute. This claim that over 50 per cent of the patriots in the American Revolution were Irish comes upon me rather unexpectedly. I have not time to run it back exhaustively; but in New England Hancock, Otis, the Adamsses, Gens. Warren and Putnam, all those men whose names are household terms, were of English derivation.

In Virginia the Washingtons, the Lees, the Masons, and all that numerous host of men who made the Old Dominion then, as it was during the Civil War and as it is now, one of the greatest Commonwealths that ever existed were of English derivation. The Randolphs were Scotch of the Scotch. Thomas Jefferson and Gen. Daniel Morgan were Welsh of the Welsh. Gens. Lincoln and Greene were of English derivation; Nash of North Carolina and Davidson of North Carolina, one of them Scotch, the other English. Col. James Williams, who laid down his life at the foot of Kings Mountain, was also of Welsh derivation, and Col. John Sevier, from Tennessee, who did more than anybody else to win the Battle of Kings Mountain, was of French Huguenot extraction. Isaac Shelby was not an Irishman. He brought to Kings Mountain the hardy Kentucky or, as it was then called, the Southwest Virginia contingent. Francis Marion, of South Carolina, was of French Huguenot extraction. Col. Hamilton, a brave officer leading one wing of our Army at Yorktown and who afterwards became better known as Alexander Hamilton, the father of the Treasury system of the United States, was Scotch, and Col. Monroe, and a host of them that a man might name, had not a drop of Irish blood in his veins, so far as I know or have ever heard. I doubt if 5 per cent of the population of America at the time of the American Revolution were of Celtic Irish birth or racial extraction. Mr. Galloway, whose testimony before Parliament was cited, either lied or was very ignorant.

Now, let every man, whose ancestors came from Ireland or from Germany or from Scandinavia, make due praise to those from whose loins more or less remotely he is derived, but I for one am not going to forget that the Welsh in America—and, by the way, there are no Welsh-Americans; they either remain British subjects or they become American citizens—the Welsh in America have furnished some of the artists, some of the poets, some of the statesmen, and some of the soldiers of this great Republic. If along the line remotely one of them intermarried with a German or an Irishman later on they did not cease to be half Welsh, and if the son of that union married with one of some other race they did not cease to remain half Welsh.

This America of ours is a great melting pot. The man who first used that phrase invented a phrase that fits the situation to a nicety. Everything is thrown in here, boiled together commercially and politically, and out of it comes that great composite result, the American citizen.

Here I stand of Welsh derivation. Behind me is a gentleman of Irish derivation; not very far from me is one of English, and a bit farther one of Scotch derivation. I daresay either one of us is as good an American as the other, provided that down in the bottom of our hearts we do not recognize anything else in the world as superior to Americanism in its call on us. And if we do, then every man who does it, whether Scotchman, Irishman, Dane, or Saxon, or what not, though he may be otherwise the best man upon the American Continent, is disloyal to America, disloyal to the land of his adoption—he ought to go back to the country whence he or his ancestors came.

Here comes a boy who joins the United States Army. His original derivation is Norway. He makes a good soldier. His people honor him afterwards in many, many ways. He now sits among us in this august body. I dare say that the Searcher of Hearts, who can look down into him, will find that the time has long since passed when he thought he owed any allegiance to Norway or any love or service that approximated even, much less exceeded, that which he owes to his adopted country.

I am getting a little bit tired of hyphenated Americans. Let a man remain a British subject or become an American citizen; let him remain a French citizen or become an American citizen; let him remain a subject of the Czar of Russia or become an American citizen; but let him not come here with allegiance to his native country or with the enmities and hates transplanted across the Atlantic to inject them, whether sentiments or enmities, into American politics and poison its body politic.

Of the two the man who allows his sentiment and his affection for the Government of his native land to control and direct his action here in relation to foreign affairs or in relation to domestic affairs, even in the drawing of a tariff bill or anything else—the man who allows his sentiment and the warmth of his heart to mislead him stands on an infinitely higher plane than the man who allows hate and enmity to misguide him.

If the Russian Jew comes to America, oppressed as he has been through years and years, let him leave behind him upon the shores of Europe the hatred and the enmity that have been passed down from generation to generation; or if he can not but feel it in his own heart, as, perhaps, he can not, let him at any rate make up his mind that that shall not influence his conduct as an American citizen or an American voter. Let the Pole or Alsatian from Germany, the Irishman from the British Empire, do the same thing.

I tell you now—and it is for this purpose mainly that I have sought the floor—if any man or set of men or coterie of men, however numerous they may be, shall enter into American politics for the purpose of accomplishing a European racial or governmental result, for the purpose of influencing American domestic affairs or foreign relations, so that they may be shaped and molded to suit some foreign power or to insult and hurt some foreign power—the two things mean the same—either he or they will hear from the American people.

No movement has ever taken place in this country yet for the purpose of emphasizing a European desire or a European hate, under whatsoever hyphenated or other name, that the American people have not visited upon the authors of it and the organizers of it their punishment at the polls, and they will do it again.

If any man hopes in this campaign to have tied to him, however many votes there may be, some organization whose purpose is to further some European Government's wish or want or policy or interest, or the hatred of some European people for some European Government whose subjects they have been, then I say before this campaign is over that that candidate will be praying to God, "Remove from me, O God, this body of death," for it will be like the punishment meted out in the olden time to certain criminals. It was to carry around with them on their backs the victim while the victim rotted, and the prayer of the punished man was "Remove from me, O God, this body of death."

Now, we are all Americans. We all say it; let us all be it. Who cares whether the ancestors of the O'Gorman family were Irish or whether the ancestors of the Williams family were Welsh, or whether the ancestors of the Hokes and the Smiths were English, or whether the Fletchers were English, or whether the ancestors of the Owens were Welsh? Who cares, provided you do your duty as American citizens?

If you are proud of the bards of Wales and of the sweet singers of Ireland, or, if you come from Germany, of Goethe, Schiller, and Lessing, or, if you come from France, of Racine and La Fontaine and Molière and Béranger, or, if they have come from England, if they be proud of that galaxy of English literary lights that has never been equaled in ancient or modern times by any people who ever existed, then be proud of them, and of the race which produced them. The world has had but one Shakespeare, it has had but one Milton, it has had but one Tennyson, it has had but one Chaucer, and in the world of science it has not had many men like Darwin and Huxley and Tyndall and Newton and Herschel, and men like that.

In warfare it has not had very many men—though it has had some—far superior to Prince Hal and the Duke of Marlborough and the Duke of Wellington, or their descendants in America, Greene and Lincoln and old Daniel Morgan. Let the Irish be proud of Moore, the sweet singer, of Burke, the prince of philosophers and orators, but unless they are very ignorant they will not forget and can not despise that galaxy of Englishmen, nor Scottish Burns, nor Sir Walter Scott, nor that American muniments of liberty and American law were born in Great Britain.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. WILLIAMS. In one moment, if you please. Let us boast about them, if you please, let us take a loving interest in what they have contributed to literature and law and com-

merce and the sciences, and in the battles for freedom which have taken place in the world, but let us not forget that in this great melting pot we have turned out a composite citizen who is the equal if not the superior of those from whose various loins he has been derived.

Mr. OWEN. I appeal to the Senator to allow the Senate to dispose of the question. We have only a short time left before 12 o'clock.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I was just about to sit down, but I do not quite appreciate the courtesy of the appeal.

Mr. OWEN. I think the Senate is entitled to some courtesy in the transaction of its business.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; the Senate is entitled to some and each Senator is entitled to some, and this particular Senator has consumed very little time lately, and this is a matter of about as much importance as almost anything else. It is of great importance to the cause of Americanism and a broad spirit of patriotism in which Americans shall not be divided in America by racial lines. Nothing worse could happen to the American Republic than to have political parties and factions founded upon the European racial derivation of the men who compose it.

Now I am through, Mr. President.

Since making the above remarks in the Senate I have undertaken to ascertain as nearly as possible what the percentage of English, Scotch, and Irish were in the Colonies at the time of the first census—1790—soon after the Revolution. The Welsh are, I think, included in the table with the English; the Scotch-Irish with the Scotch. I obtained the figures from page 116 of a publication of the Census Bureau entitled "A Century of Population Growth, 1790 to 1900." The totals were compiled in 1909 from the census of 1790, by the classification of the population enumerated in 1790 according to their names. Some Scotch and some Irish may have been mistaken for one another because of the "Mac," which is common to both the Highlanders of Scotland and to the Celtic Irish. As the report says, such classification is obviously in the nature of connection by blood, or what may be termed "nationality strain." The census of 1790 itself did not contain amongst the questions asked of those who were enumerated what was the place of their birth or of their parents' birth.

Taking what were then the two main sections most active in the Revolution, I quote: "Virginia, settled by the British in 1609, had at the first census but 6 per cent non-English population, and of these 5 per cent were what are known as 'Valley Dutch'—that is, Germans who had emigrated, through Maryland, from Pennsylvania." "New England was almost as English as old England, the lowest proportion, 93.1 per cent, being in Maine, and the highest, 96.2, in Rhode Island."

I find that the percentage of Irish population in each Colony was as follows: In Maine, 1.4 per cent; New Hampshire, 1 per cent; Vermont, seven-tenths of 1 per cent; Rhode Island and Connecticut, each seven-tenths of 1 per cent; Massachusetts, 1 per cent; New York, eight-tenths of 1 per cent; Pennsylvania, 2 per cent; Maryland, 2.4 per cent. Maryland was a Catholic Colony, and the comparatively large percentage of people of Irish racial stock is accounted for there because of that fact. Virginia, 2 per cent; North Carolina, 2.3 per cent; South Carolina, 2.6 per cent.

The German population, although it was less in most of the Colonies, especially in New England, than the Irish, was so large in a few of the Colonies that the average almost equaled that of the Irish. The percentage of Germans in Pennsylvania being 26.1 per cent; Maryland, 5.9 per cent; in Virginia, 4.9 per cent; in North Carolina, 2.8 per cent. In the Colonies named nearly all the Germans in America lived.

The percentages of the total population which the English constituted were in Maine, 93.1 per cent; New Hampshire, 94.1 per cent; Vermont, 95.4 per cent; Massachusetts, 95 per cent; Rhode Island, 96 per cent; Connecticut, 96.2 per cent; and in New York, even, which had only recently ceased to be a Dutch colony—although there had been a heavy inflow of population to parts of the colony from New England even while it was a Dutch colony—the percentage of English stock in 1790 by the table is 78.2 per cent. In Maryland it was 84 per cent; in Virginia, 85 per cent; North Carolina, 83.1 per cent; and in South Carolina, 82.4 per cent. The smallest percentage of English population in any colony was in Pennsylvania, where they constituted only 59 per cent; still, even there, considerably over half.

The percentages of Scotch were in Maine, 4.3 per cent; in New Hampshire, 4.7 per cent; in Vermont, 3 per cent; in Massachusetts, 3.6 per cent; Rhode Island, 3.1 per cent; Connecticut, 2.8 per cent; New York, 3.2 per cent; Pennsylvania, 11.7 per cent;

Maryland, 6.5 per cent; Virginia, 7.1 per cent; North Carolina, 11.2 per cent; and South Carolina, 11.7 per cent.

It seems, therefore, if all of the Scotch enumerated in the census of 1790 were counted as Scotch-Irish, and the Scotch-Irish were all counted as Irish, and the Irish and Scotch added together, that the total number of all—Irish-Scotch and Scotch-Irish—would be less than 10 per cent of the total population. The Irish themselves, as may be readily seen by the figures, did not average 2 per cent of the entire population. Of course, the Irishman fought in the American armies during the Revolution; he fought well, as he always fights; but with less than 2 per cent of the entire population he could not have constituted over 50 per cent of the armed forces of the united Colonies. It is equally incredible that the English and Welsh derived Americans constituting 83½ per cent of the total population could have furnished so few as one-fourth of the Revolutionary armies. Of course, very many of the Scotch, in fact, most of them, were Lowland Scotch, the most thoroughly Teutonic population in all Great Britain, because the Danes kept coming to southern Scotland and northern England long after they had quit their invasions elsewhere.

With the permission of the Senate I have added these figures and this analysis of them to the remarks which I made in the Senate in confirmation of what I said about the small percentage of Colonial population that the Irish constituted, because taken by surprise at the time I did not have the figures before me and was not able to get them until after I had concluded my remarks.

Mr. WILLIAMS subsequently said: Mr. President, I made some remarks in debate this morning concerning the percentage of racial stocks in the United States at the time of the Revolution. I did not have the figures before me then. I rise now for the purpose of asking unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by placing at the end of them certain figures derived from tables given on page 116 of a census special report, entitled "A century of population growth in the United States from 1790 to 1900," which figures, I think, will support one of the statements that I made this morning, together with an analysis of the figures and a statement of their bearing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. O'GORMAN. Mr. President, I have no objection to the request of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] being granted; but I take advantage of this opportunity to say that the tables which he offers to read into the Record are entirely untrustworthy. The official who prepared them states, and states in the article which precedes the tables, that in 1790 and in previous years no census was taken of the inhabitants of this country; but that recently some employees in the Census Department undertook to create a census for 1790, and adopted a method of classification according to names. The name of the head of a family was interpreted by the employee as belonging to one nationality or another.

Of course, according to that method of classification some names prominent in recent Irish politics would undoubtedly be put under the list of English. For instance, Mr. Pearse, who was the provisional president of the Irish republic, would undoubtedly be put down in that list as English. Mr. Sheehy Skeffington, who was an editor in Dublin, and who was shot down without a trial (the military officer who was responsible for his death escaping responsibility upon the plea that he was insane at the time of the killing of Mr. Skeffington and two other editors), and Mr. Clarke, who held a conspicuous position in the recent insurrection in Ireland, would be put down as English. Sir Roger Casement, of course, would be put down as English. Mr. Redmond, the leader of the Irish Parliamentary Party, would be put down as English. So also would Mr. Parnell, who for so many years was the leader of Irish thought. Lord Kitchener would be put down as English.

With these observations, I doubt whether much attention should be paid to this experimental creation of a census a hundred years after the time indicated.

Even according to the figures given—it is stated that there were upward of 60,000 Irish in the colonies, and upon the theory that nearly every Irishman took part in the struggle and that no Irishmen were found among the loyalists or the tories—even the introduction of these tables will not be found inconsistent with some observations that I had the honor of making this morning.

To illustrate the utter unreliability of the classification employed, it should be remembered that many Irish immigrants bore English names imposed upon them by British statutes which required the inhabitants of certain sections of Ireland to take "an English surname of one town, as Sutton, Chester, Cooke, Kinsale; or color, as White, Black, Brown; or art or science, as Smith or Carpenter; or office, as Cooke or Butler."

It should also be remembered that Gen. Washington at no time during the War for Independence had an army under his command exceeding 15,000. When he was at Valley Forge his army was reduced to 3,000. The Senator from Mississippi intimated that perhaps I was in error when I said that the compiler of those statistics fixed the number of Irish inhabitants in 1790 at 60,000. If he will look two pages beyond the page which he desires to put in the Record, he will see the statement to which I have referred.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; I did not intimate that. The Senator is mistaken about that.

Mr. O'GORMAN. But the statement is found even in that paper.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Just one word more, and I am through. I merely wish to state what the tables are.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I desire to know what is before the Senate?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, as I understand, this special report was drawn up in 1850. It is an analysis of the census of 1790 made by employees of the Census Bureau. Of course it is worth just what it is worth. I ask to publish the figures, together with an analysis of them and the statement of the nature of the report at the end of my remarks this morning.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, permission to do so will be granted.

Mr. POMERENE and Mr. STONE addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I ask the indulgence of the Senate for a very few minutes. Preliminary to what I wish to say, however, I desire to move that the resolution offered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINE], the amendment thereto offered by the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN], and the substitute for both of those resolutions which has been offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING] be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. President, the original resolution offered by the Senator from New Jersey was referred to the Foreign Relations Committee. I am a member of that committee, and I know that it was the sentiment of the members of that committee that the subject matter of the resolution was of such very grave importance and of so delicate a character, involving, as we believed, matters of such grave international importance that it ought not to be reported out, and we voted accordingly. Later a motion was made to discharge that committee from the further consideration of the resolution, and in the course of the discussion of that motion it developed that the resolution itself was offensive in character, and it was withdrawn by the proponent of the resolution.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, may I simply state that the resolution was not withdrawn, because I felt that it was in ill taste or untrue. I withdrew it because I felt that perhaps I could not get it through the Senate; in fact, I saw that I could not get it through the Senate.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I am not particularly concerned about that at this moment.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Well, I am.

Mr. POMERENE. Suffice it to say, that two other resolutions bearing upon the same subject matter were presented to the Senate. Those resolutions are now under discussion, and the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING] offers another resolution, broader in its scope. All of these resolutions affect, and affect seriously, the foreign relations of the great American Republic.

My sympathies in this matter go out not only to Sir Roger Casement, but they go out to the hundreds of thousands of Irishmen who are under the British flag in the trenches. Aye, more, my sympathies go out to every Frenchman, to every German, to every Russian, to every Austrian, to every Italian—aye, to every soldier who is in the trenches, whatever his nationality, creed, or color.

I wish that it were within my power to draw a veil over that European contest and to blot it out from the memory of the human race.

I can not do that; but let me suggest to Senators that there are brought up here for consideration and disposition by the United States Senate this morning three resolutions, grave in character, involving the foreign relations of this Government; and since when has the Foreign Relations Committee determined that it is not going to further consider matters of this character, but is going to let them be proposed and disposed of on the floor of the United States Senate, without any considera-

tion or any recommendation by any member of the committee, at least not by the members of that committee in formal session?

Mr. President, does any member of the Foreign Relations Committee or any Member of the United States Senate know what the attitude of the State Department of this Government is with respect to this subject? I care not, for the sake of the argument, whether you are for or against this resolution, or any of them. I care not whether you are willing to abide by the judgment of the State Department or not. That is neither here nor there; but it does seem to me that the United States Senate owes it to the State Department, which is charged with responsibility for our foreign affairs, to at least get the opinion of the State Department with respect to these resolutions before taking final action. Have Senators studied each of these several resolutions so as to be able to satisfy themselves that they are going to assume the risk of so involving this Government in its relations with foreign nations that we are going to ignore the judgment of the committee which was specially organized for the purpose of giving careful consideration to these matters?

I have been a Member of this Senate now for five years and a little more, and this is the first instance in my short experience in which it has been attempted to take up a matter of this character—which may or may not be grave—and to dispose of it without reference to the Committee on Foreign Relations, so that we may have a hearing, if that be thought advisable, and may have the judgment, at least, of that committee.

For myself, I have conferred incidentally with one or two Senators on this side of the Chamber and with one or two Senators on the other side of the Chamber. I may have views—they may be mature, or they may not be—as to what disposition we ought to make of these resolutions; but I do know that in matters of this character, as well as in other matters, I have very often changed my preconceived notions; and I may do that now after we have considered this subject and discussed it around the committee table.

But I beg of Senators not to permit themselves to be carried away by any emotion, by any special sympathy that they may have for one man or for another; but let us deliberate upon this matter as becomes Senators, and let these resolutions take their usual course through the committee. Then, after they are voted out, or after the committee has had time to consider them, let the Senate determine what ought to be done.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I understand the question now before the Senate to be the resolution proposed by the Senator from New Jersey—

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; the question is—

Mr. STONE. Well, let me state it. Perhaps I am not stating it exactly correct; but the situation, let me say, of the matter before the Senate is this: The Senator from New Jersey calls up the resolution he offered on a former day. To that is presented a resolution proposed on the same general subject by the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] as a substitute; and the immediate question would be upon the substitute. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING] now proposes, by way of amendment to the substitute, the resolution which he has sent to the desk. It seems to me that, in view of this latter resolution offered by the Senator from South Dakota, which very much broadens both the other resolutions pending—and in view of that situation I rose to address the Chair simultaneously with the Senator from Ohio with a view to making the motion which he made—I think in the circumstances now that the whole question had best be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. The committee meets to-morrow morning. I do not know what the committee will do; but, so far as I am individually concerned, I shall favor reporting one resolution or the other of these resolutions, or a resolution by way of a substitute, on behalf of the committee.

As the matter has been discussed here so much and has been brought up in the manner in which it has, I am of the opinion that it should be disposed of by the Senate. Really if the matter was resting here upon the two resolutions, the one offered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINE] and the other offered by the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN], I could see no reason why, since one resolution on the subject has already been referred to the Foreign Relations Committee, the matter might not as well be acted upon; but the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING], by his resolution, has broadened this inquiry or this consideration, and I think, with the Senator from Ohio, that the whole matter had better go to the Committee on Foreign Relations, so that that committee may consider it to-morrow morning and take some action upon it.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President—

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

Mr. STONE. I do.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. May I say that that course is entirely agreeable to me. I consent that the resolutions go to the Committee on Foreign Relations. Great Britain seems to dictate terms to the Senate. She dictated terms in connection with the Panama Canal; she rifles our mails and violates all the principles of international law, she blacklists our merchants and manufacturers, and I think we are now helplessly waiting for the next thing to come.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I decline to make any reply to that observation; it is hardly worthy of one. I hope the motion to refer may be submitted to the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] to refer all the resolutions to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. O'GORMAN. Mr. President, heartily as I am in favor of the sentiment contained in either one of the two resolutions, the one introduced by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINE] and the other introduced by the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN], I recognize the strength of the suggestion made by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE], supplemented by the remarks of the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. STONE]. If we had to choose between the resolution proposed by the Senator from New Jersey and the resolution proposed by the Senator from California our task would be an easy one; but the situation becomes more or less complicated by the introduction of the third resolution offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING]; and in view of those circumstances I think the wiser course is to have all of these resolutions go before the Committee on Foreign Relations to-morrow morning. As one of that committee, I am quite confident in stating that there will be no delay in a formal report being presented by the committee with respect to the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] to refer the resolutions to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The motion was agreed to.

ADDRESS BY CONTINENTAL CONGRESS TO THE PEOPLE OF IRELAND.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I desire to present to the Senate a remarkable document, which has never heretofore been published and to ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD. It is a copy of an address to the people of Ireland by the Continental Congress of America, making an appeal to the Irish Parliament in Dublin, dated Philadelphia, July 28, 1775, and signed by the immortal John Hancock.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that the matter be referred to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Very well; I shall not object to that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The matter presented by the Senator from New Jersey will be referred to the Committee on Printing.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL RESERVE ACT.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 13391.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Oklahoma.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13391) to amend the act approved December 23, 1913, known as the Federal reserve act, by adding a new section.

Mr. OWEN. The amendments of the Senate committee have all been read and agreed to, with the exception of one additional amendment which I desire to present to the Senate. The amendment is on page 20, and I call the attention of the Senator from Minnesota to it. I move to insert, in line 8, after the word "branch," the words "in either case referred to in this section," so as to preclude the possibility of misunderstanding that the limitations of the section apply to both cities and counties in the case of branch banks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In the original bill, on page 19, line 3, after the words "that no such branch," insert "in either case referred to in this section."

Mr. OWEN. That completes the committee amendments.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me—

Mr. OWEN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will ask the Senator if he received a brief note from me inclosing a memorandum regarding the pending bill?

Mr. OWEN. I will reply to the Senator that I did, and that every item referred to in the memorandum has been included in the amendment.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is the question I was going to propound to the Senator.

Mr. OWEN. Yes; and I so advised the Senator yesterday in writing.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am very much gratified to get that information.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Oklahoma.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, when the Senator from Oklahoma has exhausted his amendments and yields the floor I wish to make some remarks on this bill.

Mr. OWEN. I yield to the Senator now.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I noted the other day when this bill was under consideration that the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP] criticized the haste with which it was being considered and suggested that the Senate should have further information on the subject. This whole legislation, while it is based on sound principles, is in some degree experimental, because it is necessary to adjust it and adapt it to the special and peculiar conditions which exist in this country. We could not take the system of any other country, however well it was working there, and apply it directly to our particular conditions. Therefore when this legislation was originally adopted there was no one, no banker and no legislator, wise enough to know exactly whether it was going to be right or wrong in every particular; and no one contended that it would not be necessary from time to time to make such changes as the experience obtained under the operation of the law determined as desirable.

We have a Federal Reserve Board, which has been serving now for very nearly two years. Five of its members are removed from any political considerations. They may be called experts on this subject at this time, I think, without any stretch of facts. I objected at the time the original bill was passed—and the objection has been proven to have been entirely valid—to members of the administration being a part of this board. I think it has hindered the operations of the law. I think it has prevented State banks from coming into the system, and I regret that the action of the Senate was not followed at that time. But there are five members of the board who have been giving their time to this subject intelligently, and I think they have come to certain conclusions relating to it which should be followed.

There is not any Member of the Senate and there is not any man who has not been connected with the operation of this law who can pass on many of the details which are proposed in these amendments and do so intelligently, because it has required a year or two years' experience to bring to the attention of the board those facts which have justified them in suggesting the changes on which we are about to act.

I say this, Mr. President, because we are not indulging in haste in adopting these amendments. We are following the best and, in fact, the only experts on this subject that we have in this country. It must be remembered that these members of the board not only have their own experience to fall back on but they have also the judgment of the advisory board, which is made up of some of the best bankers of the country; and, more than that, they have the advice, solicited or otherwise, of all bankers. So that in this case we are getting expert opinion—an opinion which, I think, unless there is some palpable reason to the contrary, should be followed in such amendments as are proposed here in this bill.

With the exception of those amendments which are proposed on pages 18 and 19 of the bill which is before me, and which relate to branch banks, I think there is every reason for permitting the establishment of branch banks by national banks or by member banks in those States where the State laws permit similar action to be taken by State banks or trust companies. We have got to broaden the field of national banks or else there will be a lessening of the number of member banks instead of an increase of the number. One of the fields in which they can not successfully compete with State banks is in those States where the State banks have the right to establish branches in the municipality where the parent bank is authorized to do business; and this is what I want to bring to the attention of those Members of the Senate who are honoring me by listening.

We have built up in this country an independent banking system, and that is one of the reasons which has given us such good results in a banking way in the past. We have not countenanced branch banks. This proposition, or at least the second paragraph of it, proposes to permit the establishment of branch banks not only in the municipality where the parent bank is chartered to do business but within a radius of 25 miles of that center. In other words, if it is logical to establish branch banks outside of the municipality where the parent bank is

doing business for a distance of 25 miles, it is logical to carry the branch 50 miles or 100 miles, and we would have a general system of branch banking in this country.

Let me take the locality where I live. There are a million and a half people within 25 miles of the center of the city of Boston; perhaps very nearly 2,000,000 people. There are four counties within that radius. The large Boston banks are those which, if this proposal were to become a law, could establish branches in no less than 20 different cities where banks are now being operated. It would provide a competition to those local banks under which, in my judgment, they could not survive. It would be a serious mistake for us to permit the establishment of branch banks beyond the bounds of the municipality where the parent bank is chartered to do business.

I do not know of any State which now gives the right to State banks or trust companies to do business outside of the municipality where the parent bank is located. Therefore there is no reason for the second paragraph of this amendment other than to gradually drift into a branch banking system. It is of so much importance that I wish every Senator could give the matter consideration.

I am in agreement with the original provisions of this bill. I am in agreement with the provision which enables member banks to establish branches in the municipalities where they are operating, in States where the State laws make similar provision. But when we go beyond that there is no logical stopping place except branch banks all over the United States.

This is not asked for by anyone. I do not know a banker or anyone else conversant with banking matters who has asked Congress to pass that kind of legislation. I do know that there have been protests against it from all sections of the country; and if the banking fraternity and business men generally knew the step that we were taking in that respect there would be a protest so loud that the proposal would not be given any consideration whatever.

Therefore, Mr. President, I am going to move to strike out that portion of the bill—the bill which I have before me is, I think, the last print—commencing on line 21, page 18, down to and including line 10, on page 19, and the amendments which have been adopted. The Senator from Minnesota calls my attention to the last print of the bill, in which the amendment would be, on page 20, all from line 1 to line 19, inclusive.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In the original bill it is proposed to strike out all included between line 21, on page 18, and line 10, on page 19.

Mr. WEEKS. In the last print of the bill, which has been handed me, I think—

Mr. OWEN. I should like to have the Senator use the last print of the bill.

Mr. WEEKS. It is on page 20.

Mr. OWEN. What is the motion?

Mr. WEEKS. The motion is to strike out all from the first word in line 1 to the word "bank," in line 19.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary can not use anything but the original bill.

Mr. WEEKS. Then, Mr. President, my motion stands as originally stated.

Mr. SMOOT. It is the same provision, however, that appears on page 20.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question. Would not the effect of the last part of this amendment—the part that the Senator moves to strike out—be to drive the small State banks out of business in the various counties, especially in the agricultural districts?

Mr. WEEKS. Why, Mr. President, undoubtedly it would drive small banks out of business. Take the territory to which I have referred: There are probably 100 to 200 independent banks of comparatively small capital operating in those municipalities. If I wanted to serve one of the great banks of Boston to the detriment of an independent banking system, I would be in favor of this amendment, because they, with their large capital, can very easily go into the surrounding towns like Cambridge and Somerville and Newton and Brookline and establish branches, and undoubtedly compete successfully with the small independent banks that are located there, many of which are State banks.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, before the Senator takes his seat I should like to ask him a question.

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

Mr. WEEKS. I yield.

Mr. REED. As I understand the bill in its present form—that is, as amended by the committee—it is provided, on page 20, that no branch "shall be established outside of its State or

of its Federal reserve district, or in any State whose statutes do not specifically authorize branches for banks having State charters." Now, I thought that safeguarded all those States against the very evil the Senator suggests, except the States that have voluntarily permitted State banks to maintain branches.

Mr. OWEN. The Senator from Missouri is correct.

Mr. WEEKS. No; the Senator is wrong about that. If he will turn back to page 19 of the print which he has in his hand, he will find there a provision for branch banks within the municipality where the parent bank is doing business.

Mr. REED. What section is it?

Mr. WEEKS. That is in section 25a. Then, if the Senator will turn to the next page, he will find that if the provision on that page becomes a law a parent bank may establish a branch within 25 miles of the location of the parent bank.

Mr. OWEN. Only in those States which permit the State banks to do that.

Mr. WEEKS. That is quite true.

Mr. OWEN. It is to put national banks upon a parity with State banks in the States which permit State banks to have branches. That is all.

Mr. WEEKS. But the Senator from Oklahoma can not cite a State where a State bank is permitted to do business outside of the municipality where it is chartered to do business. That is what I object to. I say that we ought to permit the member banks of the Federal Reserve System to establish branches in the municipality where they are operated in those States where the State laws give a similar power to State banks and trust companies; but we ought not to go an inch beyond that, and that is what this provision would allow us to do.

Mr. OWEN. The Senator did not, perhaps, hear the amendment which I proposed and which the Senate accepted—on line 8, after the word "branch," to insert "in either case referred to in this section." It confines it to the States where the State banks have the right to establish branches. If there be no State that does permit branches, then this would not have application; but if the State should pass in the future an act giving this right to the State banks, then the right would automatically extend to the national banks, which I think is only fair.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, there is not anything in that whole part of the provision on page 20 from line 1 to line 19 which is vital or which has any force not carried by the part of section 25a at the bottom of the previous page except the power to do business outside of the municipality where the parent bank is chartered.

Mr. OWEN. I am willing to leave it to the Senate. We have only five minutes of the morning hour remaining.

Mr. WEEKS. Yes, Mr. President; but this is a vital and important principle that is involved here, and I do not care whether I have five minutes or five hours; the Senate ought to understand it, and they ought to pass deliberately on the question of whether we are going to take a step in the establishment of branch banks which has been opposed by our bankers and those skilled in that subject from the very beginning of our national-banking system.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Massachusetts for once is in error in regard to the method of carrying out his own idea. The part of section 25a which will remain if the Senator's motion prevails will read as follows:

That any member bank located in a city or incorporated town or village of more than 100,000 inhabitants and possessing a capital and surplus of \$1,000,000 or more may, under such rules and regulations as the Federal Reserve Board may prescribe, establish branches, not to exceed 10 in number, within the corporate limits of the city, town, or village in which it is located.

Mr. WEEKS. Now, Mr. President—

Mr. REED. One moment.

Mr. WEEKS. Just a moment, because I think that will answer what the Senator is going to say. I propose to offer an amendment to that proviso that this power shall be exercised only in those States where a similar privilege is granted to State banks and trust companies chartered under the laws of said States.

Mr. REED. If the Senator intends to offer that amendment—

Mr. WEEKS. I do.

Mr. REED (continuing). And if he had offered it as a part of the amendment to strike out, his provision would be very clearly stated. But if we were simply to strike out the language covered by the Senator's motion, and not do any more, then we would have branch banks established in every State in the Union. Now, I suggest to the Senator that he change the form of his motion—if he will permit me to make a suggestion—and that in his motion to strike out he include "and

substitute therefor the following language," and then insert the language he has just read.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I think the Senator from Missouri is in error. The part that he proposes to amend is the part not stricken out.

Mr. REED. Exactly; but the Senator's motion as it is now made is not to strike out and insert the part that he has offered, but simply to strike out. Therefore I suggest to him to change his motion so that it will be to strike out the language on page 20 and to insert in lieu thereof the language he has just read, in which event we would then authorize the establishment of branch banks only within the cities in those States where, under the State laws, State banks have a similar privilege.

Mr. WEEKS. I will state that if the original motion which I made prevails then I will offer the amendment which I have just read to section 25a.

Mr. REED. Why not make it one motion and vote on all?

Mr. OWEN. Question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion to strike out. [Putting the question.] The ayes seem to have it.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning hour has expired and the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is House bill 16460.

Mr. REED. Let it be temporarily laid aside.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I am willing to let the unfinished business be laid aside for half an hour.

Mr. OWEN. That will be abundant time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Army appropriation bill will be temporarily laid aside.

Mr. GRONNA. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I ask that we proceed with the consideration of the Army appropriation bill.

Mr. WEEKS. I ask that the amendment that I have just sent to the desk be printed and lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That course will be taken. The Chair will state for the information of the Senator from Massachusetts that the motion to strike out was not agreed to.

Mr. WEEKS. There was no opposition to it.

Mr. OWEN. There was.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota rose before the Chair made any announcement, and the Chair had to recognize the Senator from North Dakota, and did not decide it.

ARMY APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 16460) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next amendment passed over will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 8, at the instance of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN]. The amendment proposes to strike out, in the item for the Signal Service of the Army, on page 8, line 5, "\$3,775,000" and to insert "\$14,827,156."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBINSON in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. SMOOT. I think it is proper to ask that this amendment be passed over until the Senator from North Carolina can reach the Chamber. He has been sent for, and I ask that it may go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be temporarily passed over. The next amendment passed over will be stated.

The SECRETARY. The next amendment passed over is on page 9, where the committee proposes to strike out the House text from lines 11 to 16, inclusive, as follows:

Purchase of land in the State of California for aviation-school purposes: For the acquisition, by purchase or by condemnation, of a site or sites in the State of California for an aviation school and training grounds of the Signal Corps of the United States Army, not to exceed \$300,000.

And to insert:

The Secretary of War is hereby authorized to accept for the United States from any citizen of the United States a donation of a tract or tracts of land suitable and desirable, in his judgment, for the purposes of an aviation field and remount station, the terms of the donation also to authorize the use of the property donated for any other service of the United States which may hereafter appear desirable.

Mr. WORKS. I offer the following amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from California will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Insert in lieu of the words proposed to be inserted by the committee on page 9, beginning at page 17, the following words:

Purchase of land for aviation-school purposes: For the acquisition by purchase or condemnation of a site at Coronado Heights, San Diego County, Cal., as recommended by a commission appointed to select such site, and approved by the Secretary of War, and described as "site No. 2, located at Coronado Heights," in the report of said commission in House Document No. 687, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session, \$300,000.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, during the last Congress, in conformity with the wishes of the Secretary of War, I introduced a bill in the Senate providing for the purchase of a site for an aviation school near San Diego, and appropriating \$200,000 for that purpose. Later on I offered an amendment to the Army appropriation bill to the same effect. That matter was referred to the Secretary of War after the bill was introduced, and he wrote the following letter to the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, January 18, 1915.

The CHAIRMAN COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS,
United States Senate.

Sir: The department is in receipt of S. 7046, a bill providing for the purchase of lands for an aviation school near San Diego, Cal.

The necessity of a permanent establishment for the aviation section of the Signal Corps is self-evident. The country in the vicinity of San Diego Bay, San Diego, Cal., owing to atmospheric conditions, varied nature of the terrain, and the presence of a large body of water, is better adapted to the establishment of an aviation school than any other part of the United States.

The school is at present located on North Island, where it is a tenant at will through the courtesy of the Coronado Beach Co., and where, owing to the impracticability of obtaining a lease, it has been undesirable to erect any but the most temporary structures.

The department approves this measure and recommends its enactment into law.

Very respectfully,

LINDLEY M. GARRISON,
Secretary of War.

Later on, as I have stated, the same proposition was offered as an amendment to the Army appropriation bill. It passed the Senate and went into conference. The conference committee amended the act in such a way as to provide for the appointment of a commission to investigate the whole matter and make its report to Congress. That commission has performed its duty and has made its report. It will be found in House Document No. 687, of the Sixty-fourth Congress, first session. The Chief of Staff transmits this report to Congress, and in his letter says:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, February 12, 1916.

The SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Sir: I have the honor to inclose herewith the report, with accompanying appendices, of a commission composed of officers of the Army, which was appointed on March 31, 1915, under a proviso contained in the act of Congress approved March 4, 1915, entitled "An act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916," which proviso reads, in part, as follows:

"The Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to appoint a commission of not more than three Army officers, whose duty it shall be to report upon the advisability of the acquirement by the United States Government of land near the Bay of San Diego, San Diego County, Cal., and elsewhere on the Pacific, Gulf, and Atlantic coasts, for an aviation school and training grounds of the Signal Corps of the United States Army, and said commission shall ascertain and report what would be the probable cost of acquiring such land; and the sum of \$1,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated to defray any expenses incurred by the said commission in the performance of the duties herein imposed upon it."

In accordance with a recommendation of the commission, the department has approved the acquisition of a site at Coronado Heights, Cal., for use as an aviation school and training grounds for the Signal Corps, and an estimate has been prepared for submission to Congress, providing for an appropriation of \$300,000, for the purpose.

Very respectfully,

H. L. SCOTT,
Major General, Chief of Staff,
Acting Secretary of War.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, December 29, 1915.

From: Lieut. Col. Samuel Reber, Signal Corps.

To: The Adjutant General of the Army.

Subject: Report of commission appointed by letter of The Adjutant General of the Army, dated March 31, 1915.

1. The following report is respectfully submitted.

2. The act approved March 4, 1915 (an act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916), reads, in part, as follows:

"The Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to appoint a commission of not more than three Army officers, whose duty it shall be to report upon the advisability of the acquirement by the United States Government of land near the Bay of San Diego, San Diego County, Cal., and elsewhere on the Pacific, Gulf, and Atlantic coasts, for an aviation school and training grounds of the Signal Corps of the United States Army, and said commission shall ascertain and report what would be the probable cost of acquiring such land; and the sum of \$1,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated to defray any expenses incurred by the said commission in the performance of the duties herein imposed upon it."

3. In pursuance of the foregoing a commission was appointed by the following letter:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
THE ADJUTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Washington, March 31, 1915.

From: The Adjutant General of the Army.

To: Lieut. Col. Samuel Reber, Signal Corps, through the Chief Signal Officer, Washington, D. C.

Subject: Commission to locate aviation school and training ground for Signal Corps.

1. Under a provision in an act of Congress approved March 4, 1915, the Secretary of War appoints a commission to consist of Lieut. Col. Samuel Reber, Signal Corps, and Capt. Richard C. Marshall, Jr., Quartermaster Corps, to report upon the advisability of the acquirement by the United States Government of land near the Bay of San Diego, San Diego County, Cal., and elsewhere on the Pacific, Gulf, and Atlantic coasts, for an aviation school and training grounds of the Signal Corps of the United States Army. The commission will ascertain and report what would be the probable cost of acquiring such land.

2. As the special appropriation of \$1,000 to defray the expenses of the commission will not become available until July 1, 1915, the commission will, by correspondence and otherwise, make such preliminary studies and preparation for its subsequent work as may be feasible and practicable before that date.

By order of the Secretary of War:

P. C. MARCH, Adjutant General.

4. The commission met from time to time and made visits of inspection of sites in the vicinity of the following places: San Diego and San Francisco, Cal.; Portland, Oreg.; Seattle, Spokane, and Tacoma, Wash.; Morehead City, N. C.; Charleston, S. C.; Savannah, Ga.; and Pensacola and Tampa, Fla.

5. Previous to the initiation of any of the above-mentioned journeys public notice of the creation and object of the commission was given to the press of the country. The secretaries of the chambers of commerce at the above-mentioned places were advised of the date of the arrival of the commission and its readiness to inspect sites in the vicinity of the places named. These officials were asked to give public notice of the approaching visit of the commission and to notify all persons interested to be present at the public hearing held and to present such sites as they might desire. On the arrival of the commission at the various places a public hearing was held and the various suggested sites inspected. At most of the cities visited the various chambers of commerce, through their committees, had the matter thoroughly systematized and greatly aided the commission in its investigations. A large amount of correspondence passed between the commission and those interested, all of which is indexed and filed in the office of the Chief Signal Officer of the Army.

6. The site for the aviation school of the Signal Corps should possess certain geographical, climatological, and topographical characteristics. The site should be located on an ocean or bay and in close vicinity to existing railway lines, with easy access to them. The climatological characteristics should be such as to give the greatest number of working days possible throughout the year, with suitable air, moisture, and temperature conditions, while the topography of the terrain in the vicinity should be such as to contain many accidental features with good landing places. The flying field itself should be a fairly level tract of land, free from obstructions, and the landing beach should be easily accessible, both from the land and water sides, without a great expanse of tide flats, with fairly deep water close to the shore line.

7. The terrain in the vicinity of San Diego Bay, Cal., fulfills the foregoing conditions better than any other section of the United States. A study of the climatological data of the locations visited by the commission, which was compiled by the Chief of the Weather Bureau at the request of the commission (data hereto appended marked A, A 1, A 2, A 3, A 4, and A 5), clearly indicates that the littoral of San Diego Bay contains the best sites for the establishment of an aviation section, as far as weather and air conditions are concerned. The rail and water connections at San Diego are ample for the purposes of transportation and communication. The country in the vicinity of San Diego, as indicated by the accompanying map (hereto appended, marked B), shows terrain of every description, from level land to mountains, and possesses characteristics that can be found in no other part of the country—the ocean on one side and the quiet waters of the Bay of San Diego on the other side, with a long peninsula connecting North Island and Coronado to the mainland.

8. The five available sites on the Bay of San Diego are indicated by numbers on Appendix B.

No. 1 is North Island, where the Signal Corps Aviation School is temporarily located, and which has been occupied, through the courtesy of the Spreckels Cos., since the middle of 1913 without expense to the Government. The Spreckels Cos., in a letter dated December 1, 1915, copy of which is hereto appended, marked C, has requested the Signal Corps to vacate this tract of land as soon as practicable after March 31, 1916. North Island is the best possible site for the location of the aviation school.

There were five different sites submitted to the commission for consideration. They have numbered them in this report from 1 to 5. In respect of No. 2, which they selected as the one best suited for the purpose, they say:

Site No. 2 is located at Coronado Heights and contains approximately 616 acres (plan No. 5 in letter of the Spreckels Cos. to the Chief Signal Officer, dated Mar. 22, 1915, hereto appended, marked D). This site is admirably adapted for the location of the school.

The other sites are commented upon, as follows:

Site No. 3, in Chula Vista, contains 294 acres. It is traversed by the right of way of two railroad companies and is crossed by telegraph and telephone pole lines. The shore line is marshy and the water shallow.

Site No. 4, in National City, contains 408 acres, the larger portion of which is low, submerged land that will require the filling in of approximately 30 per cent of the area from a depth of 18 inches to 2 feet to bring it above high-water mark.

Site No. 5, known as Dutch Flats, contains approximately 232 acres, a portion of which is below extreme high-water mark and another portion swampy. In order to render the area available approximately 50 per cent of the total area would have to be filled in.

Sites Nos. 1 and 2 are the only ones that could be occupied immediately upon obtaining possession.

9. When the Spreckels Cos., which control sites Nos. 1 and 2, was requested to quote prices on these sites the vice president and managing director verbally advised the commission that site No. 1 is not on the market, and the prices in his letter of March 22, 1915 (Appendix D), were those at which the companies hold the land.

When his attention was called to the fact that the selling prices quoted were far in excess of the assessed value of the land and that, in the opinion of the real estate men in San Diego who are qualified to pass on land values, the prices were too high, he referred the commission to the president of the companies. The president of the companies advised the commission verbally that he would not consider an offer for the sale of site No. 1, as it was not on the market, and that the figures quoted in Appendix D are the minimum that the companies would consider for site No. 2.

The San Diego Land Corporation, in their letter of August 4, 1915 (hereto appended, marked E), offered sites Nos. 3 and 4 for \$85,631 and \$124,000, respectively.

The San Diego Securities Co. offered site No. 5 in their letter of September 2, 1915 (hereto appended, marked F), for the sum of \$250,000.

10. It having come to the attention of the commission that there is a doubt as to the validity of the title to land on the littoral of San Diego Bay, a request was made on the Judge Advocate General of the Army that the question of these titles be investigated. A preliminary report, a copy of which is hereto appended, marked G, was received on the 29th of this month. The final report dealing more extensively with the question of title can not be submitted prior to March 15, 1916. The nonarrival of the preliminary report before the date mentioned has caused the delay in the rendition of the report of the commission.

In this preliminary report the opinion is expressed that the United States has, for defense purposes at least, a title, or color of title, to land on the littoral of San Diego Bay.

At the close of their report they make this recommendation:

11. It is recommended that in case it is finally ascertained that the United States has title to North Island the Signal Corps Aviation School be located thereon.

I think, Mr. President, that there is no probability of ever establishing any title to North Island in the National Government.

In case the United States does not possess title, it is deemed inexpedient to recommend the purchase of a suitable area on North Island, owing to the excessive cost. In case the United States does not hold title, it is recommended that site No. 2 be acquired by purchase, if necessary, through condemnation proceedings. A study of the assessed value of site No. 2 and the views of those in San Diego who are qualified to pass on the question of land values lead the commission to believe that \$300,000 is a fair and equitable value for site No. 2.

SAMUEL REBER,
Lieutenant Colonel, Signal Corps.
R. C. MARSHALL, JR.,
Captain, Quartermaster Corps.

Mr. President, I know something about the different tracts of land that were offered to this commission. When I was in San Diego last year I went over the various tracts myself for the purpose of satisfying my own mind as far as I could as to the best place to locate the school and the respective values of the different tracts. I am probably a good deal more familiar with the situation there than any member of the commission, having been a resident of San Diego for 11 years and being perfectly familiar with the situation and all the surroundings. This property that is offered is one of the best, if not the best, except that of North Island.

One of these tracts is on the southern side of the Coronado Hotel, which I have no doubt most of the Senators have visited, and the other is on the south side. The lands on North Island are the most valuable in that section, and it would cost the Government an enormous amount of money to acquire title to a sufficient quantity of land there to serve the purpose of the Government in this respect.

The land that is recommended by the commission is probably a mile south of the Coronado Hotel. It borders on both the Pacific Ocean and the Bay of San Diego, lying directly between the two. It is peculiarly adapted to the purposes that are provided for in this amendment, and from my knowledge of the situation, I am satisfied that the amount that is asked for the land is a reasonable compensation for land of that kind.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President—

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

Mr. WORKS. I do.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I inquire of the Senator whether his proposition is to insert what he has offered instead of what the committee has recommended?

Mr. WORKS. Yes; that is my amendment.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I suggest to the Senator that we could insert what the committee suggests between lines 17 and 23 without interfering with the proposition as submitted by his amendment, because his proposal could be added to what the committee proposes. The committee proposes to open a way whereby they might accept all land for this purpose, whereas the Senator's proposal is to provide for the purchase or condemnation of a site. So the amendment offered by the committee could be adopted and the Senator's amendment could be added if the Senate saw fit to do so after that action was taken.

Mr. WORKS. I have no objection at all to so modifying my amendment as to provide that if the land is not donated under the provisions as inserted by the committee, then this land shall be purchased.

I do not quite understand why it was that this clause was stricken out after all that had taken place, the commission having been appointed and having made its report, in the first instance the Secretary of War recommending the purchase of this land and in the second instance the Chief of Staff recommending the purchase under the report of the commission.

Mr. FLETCHER. If the Senator will—

Mr. WORKS. Pardon me just a moment. Certainly we need training grounds and we need them in that locality. There is not, as the Secretary of War says, a better place in the whole United States for the work that is to be done by a school of this kind. Nearly every day in the year can be devoted to the work, and it would be a good deal better for the Government to pay \$300,000 for a location like this than to take a donation of land in other localities, where probably less than half the time could be devoted to the work of using these flying ships. Now I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. FLETCHER. I was going to suggest to the Senator that it seems to me that under the appropriation the committee had in mind the donation might be made of the site proposed in the House provision. They are entirely distinct.

Mr. WORKS. I understand that.

Mr. FLETCHER. The committee provision is a distinctive piece of legislation and has reference to sites elsewhere than in California.

Mr. WORKS. I understand that perfectly.

Mr. FLETCHER. Could there be any conflict in the Senator's mind between a provision allowing the Government to accept the donation of a site elsewhere and a provision such as he proposes that we shall acquire one in California?

Mr. WORKS. No; I should have no objection to that at all.

Mr. FLETCHER. It seems to me the very best action to take would be to adopt the proposal by the committee, striking out and substituting, and then if the Senate desires to add the further provision by the Senator from California it can do so.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, in view of the suggestion made by the Senator, I will modify my proposed amendment by not seeking to strike out what is contained in the committee amendment, simply adding to it the amendment providing for the purchase of this particular piece of land. Would that meet the suggestion of the Senator from Florida?

Mr. FLETCHER. I think so. Let it be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add, at the end of the proposed amendment of the committee, on page 9, line 23, after the word "desirable," the following proviso:

Provided, That in the event no suitable tract or tracts of land are donated for the purpose, then the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to acquire by purchase or condemnation a site at Coronado Heights, San Diego County, Cal., as recommended by a commission appointed to select such site, and approved by the Secretary of War, and described as "Site No. 2, located at Coronado Heights," in the report of said commission in House Document No. 687, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session, at a price not to exceed \$300,000.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. May I ask if this is what is termed North Island?

Mr. WORKS. No; it is not. The commission report that the cost of the land on North Island would be excessive, and therefore they have reported against the purchase of that particular tract, which I think is wise on their part. The other tract, which is on the other side of the Coronado Hotel, with which the Senator is familiar, is south, probably a mile away, and it would serve the purpose just as well and be much less expensive.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I will say that I was very much interested in the project when I was there, and I was very much edified with the aerial business I saw while there. I was impressed with the fact that it was wise to select that as an adequate site, but if the Senator says there is another site near by that is less expensive, of course, that should be given the preference.

Mr. WORKS. It should be borne in mind that we have already located at that point on North Island, where the Government is merely a tenant at will, an aviation school that is in actual operation.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President—

Mr. WORKS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. As the Senator has modified the amendment so as to be an addition to the Senate committee proposition, so far as I am concerned I am willing to accept it.

Mr. WORKS. Very well, then I will submit the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask the Senate to disagree to the Senate committee amendment, on page 90, beginning in line 20, and ending at line 5, on page 91, wherein the Senate committee amendment strikes out the House provision. It refers to the so-called time-clock or Taylor system. I am unalterably opposed to the so-called Taylor system. It seems to me to be utterly inhuman and contrary to the true American spirit. I can tolerate a time watch on a race horse or some mechanical contrivance—

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I rise to a question of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts rises to a question of order, which he will state.

Mr. LODGE. I understood that we were taking up passed-over amendments of the committee. We were on page 9, and now we are on page 90.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I thought we had finished the amendment on page 9.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state to the Senator from Massachusetts that the Secretary has not reported the next amendment that was passed over.

Mr. LODGE. I only hope that we will proceed in some order, that is all. I have an amendment that comes early in the bill that I have been waiting for.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained, and the Secretary will report the next amendment passed over.

Mr. LODGE. I did not want to interfere with the Senator from New Jersey in his amendment, except to proceed in order.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I had no desire to break in. I thought I was in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will report the next amendment passed over.

The SECRETARY. The next amendment passed over is on page 12, where the proviso beginning in line 10, pay of enlisted men, was reserved.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I ask that that particular amendment be passed over for a few minutes, and that we take up the amendment on page 13, because if the amendment on page 13 that I want to offer is adopted I would not be interested to offer the amendment on page 12.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maryland? Without objection, that order will be pursued. The amendment passed over on page 13 will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 13, line 7, the amendment for pay of enlisted men of all grades was reserved. The committee proposes to strike out "\$7,750,000" and to insert "\$23,000,000."

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I reserved this whole subject because of an amendment that I want to propose providing for the maintenance of the dependents of the men who have answered the call of the President and who are now on the border.

Mr. President, I am going to offer in a few minutes an amendment which, I think, is not open to a point of order on this subject. The Vice President decided on the question, of order—I read from page 12991 of the RECORD proceedings of July 18:

The VICE PRESIDENT. Notwithstanding the rule of the Senate to the effect that general legislation may not be attached to an appropriation bill, still when the House of Representatives opens the door and proceeds to enter upon a field of general legislation which has to do with a subject of this character the Chair is going to rule, but of course, the Senate can reverse the ruling of the Chair, that the House having opened the door the Senate of the United States can walk in through the door and pursue the field.

That was a very reasonable ruling. So in this case the House has opened the door. It made a provision here on page 19 that all enlisted men and officers of the National Guard who have been enlisted and who responded to the call of the President for service, and so forth. I want to deal in my proposed amendment with men of the National Guard who responded to the call of the President in connection with this question of pay. The amendment I propose to offer will read as follows:

On page 13, at the end of line 12, insert:

"And provided further, That all enlisted men of the National Guard who have heretofore or shall hereafter respond to the call of the President for service"

Following exactly the wording that the House has already put in the bill—

"shall, in case of those who have dependents that the enlisted man shall be shown to have supported before so responding, be entitled to extra pay in the nature of an allowance, to be paid out of said sum in such amount and in such manner as the Secretary of War shall direct for the support of such dependents for the time of such service, but in no case shall the total of the pay of such enlisted man and the amount of such extra-pay allowance for his dependents exceed the total of the pay and similar allowance now paid to or for privates by the Canadian Government and as set forth in the report of the United States consul general at Ottawa, Canada, to the Department of State, dated July 3, 1916." (RECORD of July 3, 1916, p. 11971.)

Mr. President, that report shows that the Canadian soldiers are paid as follows:

PAY OF CANADIAN SOLDIERS AND ALLOWANCE TO THEIR DEPENDENTS.

JULY 3, 1916.

Message from United States consul general at Ottawa, Canada, to the State Department:

"Canadian Government pays privates \$1.10 per diem and clothing, equipment, maintenance. In addition, separation allowances \$20 per month to dependents, meaning wives, children, or widows, if girls under 16, boys under 14, and widowed mothers, if son unmarried and sole support. Higher allowances to dependents of sergeants and officers."

Of course, Mr. President, the Secretary of War rules on this subject, and the whole matter could be disposed of equitably under his rules and under his supervision.

This is a very important question. There is not a country in the world that does not provide for the dependents of the men who are summoned to the colors.

Mr. LODGE. May I ask the Senator a question? Is there a country in the world that provides for the dependents of only a part of the men? Does it not provide for the dependents of all the soldiers?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Certainly.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator is proposing to provide for only a part of them.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. No; I have another amendment to take care of them all. I want to press this one first and then the other will come up. I think both forces should be treated alike.

But the Senator from Massachusetts is technically correct, and I welcome his interruption, because it shows what we ought to do for both forces. But as a matter of fact, Mr. President, it will not demoralize the regular troops to any great extent, even if we should fail to provide for the dependents of the regular soldiers, for this reason: It is an unwritten rule of the Regular Army that they will not enlist a man with dependents. I see what the Senator is going to say. On the second enlistment they sometimes enlist men with dependents, if they are particularly desirable men, and of course some of the noncommissioned officers, and so forth, but I think with the Senator from Massachusetts that there ought to be provision for both classes as long as you let them enlist at all.

With reference to the National Guard, if the Senator from Massachusetts or the Senator from Oregon or anybody else objects to paying these dependents, he should reflect that it is only a temporary proposition. The Secretary of War has complete power under the act of June 3 last to pass on rules for the National Guard.

Mr. WARREN. Has he not already ruled upon this question?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. No, sir.

Mr. WARREN. That a National Guardsman with a dependent family should not be accepted?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Quite the contrary.

Mr. WARREN. I saw it in the newspaper within a week, and it had all the features of being direct from the department.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. The Senator from Wyoming may be correct, so far as the time from the present on, but so far as having men in the National Guard with dependents is concerned, they were enlisted with the full knowledge of the Federal authority and have been for years. The Senator from Wyoming knows that as well as anybody.

Mr. WARREN. That is true as to earlier years, but now the orders have gone out to commanding officers to send home those men who have families dependent upon them and to enlist no more such.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I want to come to that a little later. They were enlisted with the full knowledge of the Federal authorities. They were mustered into the service, they were passed through every examination that the War Department suggested, and, more than that, they were sent to the Rio Grande, and their fares were paid all the way down there.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Yes.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator will pardon me for saying so, I do not think the statement that very few soldiers who have enlisted in the Regular Army have dependents is any answer at all. There are soldiers in the Regular Army with dependents, though they may not be married. It is not the practice to enlist married men, but some of them marry after they enter the service and others who are married reenlist. Those men are fighting for their country just as much as are the National Guard, and I think we ought to make provision for the dependents of all our soldiers. I can not understand why the particular champions of the National Guard think it necessary, in order to promote the interests of the National Guard, to injure

the Regular Army. Is it not possible to do everything for both? The members of both arms of the service are American soldiers, and their dependents have just as much claim on us, the one as the other, and the granting of this privilege only to the National Guard and refusing it to the Regular Army seems like an attempt to destroy the Regular Army. I do not see why it is necessary, in order to benefit the National Guard, to destroy the Regular Army.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I want to ask the Senator a question. The Senator has interposed a speech here, so I merely wish to ask him a question.

Mr. LODGE. I shall not interpose any more speeches, but shall take the matter up in my own time.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Good. I am very glad to have the Senator advance all the fallacies that I can possibly answer before I take my seat.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator finds any fallacies, he is at liberty to answer them.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I hope the Senator will not leave the Chamber because I attempt to expose them.

Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts suggests that this is a discrimination in favor of the National Guard. Can the Senator point to a single instance where the Secretary of War or The Adjutant General has authorized the regular soldier to be sent home because he has dependents? The Senator knows, as well as he knows that he sits there, that there has been gross discrimination against the National Guard.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator knows nothing of the kind. The Senator from Maryland may make his own statement of his own knowledge, or lack of knowledge, but he must not put statements into my mouth.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I am giving the Senator the facts, and knowing and realizing is a question of open-mindedness.

Mr. President, we have two forces on the border. One is a small force, the Regular Army; the other is a large force, the National Guard. With reference to that small force—the Regular Army—there has been no attack made upon its discipline from behind; nobody has come in and given any soldier the right to be excused from his duties, the right to impair the discipline of the command to which he belongs by putting up a plea that he has a dependent at home. Nobody has attacked the discipline of the Regular Army in that way; but the gentlemen who sympathize with the attack upon the militia have somehow or other managed it that these dependents can not be compensated. The man who may be unruly, the man with a little yellow streak in him, can go to his commanding officer and say, "I have a dependent at home; I am tired of this discipline and work down here, and I want to be excused."

Mr. President, that kind of an attack upon the discipline of the militia has been facilitated, but it has not been made upon the discipline of the Regular Army. If the dependents of the Regular Army are a negligible number—and that is the very truth of the matter—if the Senator wants to insist on equality, why does he not insist on equality in both ways? Why not excuse your private or noncommissioned officer in the Regular Army if he can show that he has a dependent at home?

The truth is the excusing men with dependents often misses the most worthy soldier, because he prefers to suffer rather than forsake his comrades and command facing against a foreign country.

Mr. WARREN. That is exactly what the department does under its present rules. If a noncommissioned officer or an enlisted man has those dependent upon him who are suffering, and application is made through proper channels, he is excused from service. That is the rule. That is not only the rule now but it has been the rule for years.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. The simple fact is that the Regular Army will not take men if they have dependents; but I am willing to take up the idea of the Senator from Massachusetts, and provide that, if there are a few men in the Regular Army who have, by the misfortunes of nature inherited obligations to support somebody, those men should have help. That can be very readily done here in this bill. That can be done just the same for the Regular Army, under the item of pay for the Regular Army, as it can be done under item of pay for the National Guard. I do not know but that it might be open to a point of order. That, of course, however, would have to come from the Senator's side.

This other question, though, is not open to the point of order, because the House has opened the door wide to legislate about all the men who have responded to the call of the President. The House has dealt with this question of how these men are to be treated in this exchange and when they have responded to that call.

Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts said a little while ago that all the countries at war provide for all of their

troops. That may be so, but would it not be a great deal better for us to provide for 74 per cent of our troops than to neglect the whole of them?

Information has been printed in the Record in the shape of a report from the Information Bureau of the Library of Congress, showing that every country in the world makes a similar provision to this. The only country of which I know that does not make such provision is Mexico; and, of course, the government of Mexico is de facto and in other respects in a distressed condition. I have here a dispatch which appeared in the Baltimore Evening Sun of July 20, written by William G. Shepherd, from San Antonio, Tex., and it is headed, "What about my family? is chief worry of Guardsmen on border." The writer says:

Not one soldier that I rubbed elbows with in all the armies of Europe in the last two years ever worried as some of these American soldiers along the edge of Mexico.

These Americans I refer to are worrying about their families back home. They do not know whether their wives and children have enough to eat. Such a deplorable situation could not possibly exist in any European army—

Here is the important part of it—

for European Governments care for the families of their soldiers.

Now, here is another pertinent statement. I think it is exactly accurate; the fact is I know it is accurate and the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Massachusetts know it is accurate.

The Mexican Government doesn't and we don't.

The United States and Mexico are in accord on one subject, and that is in making no provision for the families of the soldiers who are in the field. Mr. President, that is a phase of accord that I do not want to see go on as between these two Governments. I think we ought to follow the example of all the rest of the world on this subject. I put into this resolution a reference to the pay of Canadian soldiers, because the pay of Canadian soldiers is the pay and maintenance allowance of our next neighbor and also the standards of living in Canada are pretty much the same as are the standards of living in the United States.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I do.

Mr. GRONNA. I am in sympathy with what the Senator from Maryland has proposed, but I am opposed to putting in a provision here allowing a foreign Government to legislate for the United States. I think that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Maryland should be amended. I think we ought to be more specific as to what the law of this country should be and not refer in it to a foreign country.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I will send the Senator from North Dakota a copy of my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair desires to ask the Senator from Maryland whether or not he has yet offered his amendment?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I have not yet offered it, but I am talking about my proposed amendment. I will send it to the Senator, and he can see the part that refers to the pay of enlisted men as provided for privates by the Canadian Government.

Mr. President, I was speaking just now about the attitude of this country and of other countries on this subject, and I should like to go a little further with this article. I should like to show what Gen. Funston is saying about this thing; but I believe that there are not enough Members of the Senate here really to dispose of this important proposition, and so I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland 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:

Bankhead	Harding	Nelson	Smith, Ariz.
Beckham	Hardwick	Norris	Smith, Md.
Brandegge	Husting	Oliver	Smith, S. C.
Broussard	James	Overman	Smoot
Chamberlain	Johnson, S. Dak.	Page	Sterling
Chilton	Jones	Penrose	Thomas
Clapp	Kenyon	Pittman	Tillman
Clark, Wyo.	Kern	Polindexter	Townsend
Culbertson	La Follette	Pomerene	Underwood
Colt	Lane	Ransdell	Vardaman
Dillingham	Lee, Md.	Reed	Wadsworth
du Pont	Lippitt	Robinson	Walsh
Fall	Lodge	Shafroth	Warren
Fletcher	Martin, Va.	Sheppard	Weeks
Gallinger	Martine, N. J.	Sherman	Williams
Gronna	Myers	Shields	

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, I desire to announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] and the Senator

from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] are absent on the business of the Senate.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. SMITH of Michigan], and state that he is paired with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. This announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. KERN. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. TAGGART]. This announcement may stand for the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President, I was discussing the opinion of an Army officer as expressed in this interview on the subject of excusing from duty men in the National Guard who have dependents at home. Of course compensation for their dependents would do away with the necessity of excusing them from duty. This article of Mr. Shepherd's makes a quotation from an alleged interview with Gen. Funston, which I will read:

"Can a man be a good soldier and do good work if he's wondering whether his family at home has enough to eat?" I asked Gen. Funston after leaving the jitney and making my way to his hot office.

The General, whose perspiring head was leaving patches of dampness on the leather back of the huge chair in which he sat, leaned forward, saying earnestly:

"Of course not. I permitted 14 men to return home yesterday because their dependents were suffering, and I have so many requests for relief on like grounds that it will prove necessary to release several thousand within the next few weeks."

These men are given 3½ cents mileage homeward. Money which has been spent in bringing them to the border, feeding them, and outfitting them, and then, after two weeks, sending them back home, isn't wasted. It is our payment for the lesson that in our new Army plan we must provide well for the care of soldiers' families if we are going to insist on taking men away from their families into the Army. "What about my family?" is the biggest question in all militia camps along the border.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. In view of the fact that there is not any war at the present time, would not the Senator agree to the suggestion that it might be a good idea to return to their homes all the soldiers on the Mexican frontier who have dependents?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I think not. That is what I am arguing against at present, and I think if the Senator looks with the same earnestness as I do upon the general question of preparedness he would be willing to make any provision of money or otherwise in order that the 100,000 National Guardsmen shall get the benefit of the actual military and disciplinary experience that is open to them on the Rio Grande. Their discipline ought not to be attacked here from behind by relieving any man who alleges he has dependents at home.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, there may be something in that, although I apprehend they could get some training at home, as they have always had it, more or less; but why on earth we are holding so large an Army on the frontier when we have not any war with Mexico or with any other country, and we are now taking so much interest in those who have dependents at home, surpasses my comprehension. I would send them home or refuse to enlist married men in the National Guard, precisely as we do in the Regular Army.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I do not want to discuss with the Senator a question that affects the politics of a presidential campaign.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have no such purpose.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. The Senator is not going to agree with me as to the goodness and wisdom of President Wilson's policy, but I want the Senator to agree with me as to this: Here are 100,000 militiamen on the Rio Grande, and we all know that the Swiss system or any other system of citizen soldiery commences with a preliminary period of discipline.

Now, setting aside the Presidential campaign—I hope the Senator will let that get out of his mind for a minute—and just taking up the opportunity of getting a citizen army that is thus presented to us, we have these men in camp now, and ought not that discipline to go on earnestly and honestly for the benefit of the preparedness of the United States? I am sure the Senator agrees with me about that.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, the Senator is unduly exercised over my desire to interject politics into this matter.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Not at all.

Mr. GALLINGER. I care nothing about the political situation at all, and I have always carefully refrained from criticizing the Democratic President, as the Senator knows. I have not been in the habit of doing that, and I am not going to engage in that now; but I still feel that sending to the front men who leave families and who leave gainful occupations, and holding

them in a hostile country, so far as climate is concerned, when there is not any war or any immediate prospect of war, is rather an absurd thing to do.

The Senator constantly quotes the Swiss system, and I notice in the Senator's amendment that he refers to what Canada has done.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. The Senator ought not to object to that.

Mr. GALLINGER. I do not think we ought to be governed to any very great extent by what other countries are doing in these matters, especially a little Republic like Switzerland, or a dependency of Great Britain like Canada. Let us legislate for ourselves.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President, the great genius of ancient Rome along military lines and general lines of law was based on the fact that that great Government had the good sense to pick out the good things in the laws of all the nations she came in contact with, and I am amazed that the Senator from New Hampshire, himself a Canadian by birth, if I am correctly informed, should say that we ought not copy a good thing from the laws of Canada.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I do not object to copying it, but I do object to putting it in our statutes in the way the Senator proposes.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I refer to it respectfully.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes; but it is in the Senator's amendment, and the proposition is to put it in the law, which certainly ought not to be done.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Certainly; but it is a respectful reference, and a limit, of course, is provided. It is no insult to the American eagle to refer to the amount that Canada pays to her soldiers. As to the Senator's remark with reference to Switzerland, I desire to say that Switzerland is a Republic; she is an armed Republic; and she perfected the development of her militia on such a basis that the Swiss Republic is safe.

The great thing for us to do is to protect our republican form of Government. The most precious thing we have is our republican form of government, and I do not want any centralizationist who has an imperial yearning in his soul to come here and modify our National Guard system or abolish it—and that is about what was aimed at by some proposed amendments to the military law—in the interest of great military centralization in the hands of the Executive of the United States. Let us preserve our republican system; let us preserve our local self-government; because this great republican system is the best thing we have among all our precious things.

Mr. President, that is why I am struggling here in the Senate to-day for this opportunity for discipline for the National Guard. I think the dependents of our soldiers ought to be looked out for; but the main thing, looking through the course of years, is that our system of Organized Militia should be preserved.

I am perfectly willing to agree with the Senator from Massachusetts that the Regular Army should be provided for in like manner, and I have an amendment drawn up designed to give the same kind of support to the dependents of members of the Regular Army; but I can not offer that under the item relating to pay for the militia, as it would be obviously out of order. However, I am going to offer in a few moments the other amendment which I have been discussing under the item providing pay for the militia, and I shall offer it on the theory that the House has opened wide the door by dealing with the question of the members of the guard who have responded to the call of the President and giving them a compensation for so responding. The House has very properly put this question under the pay item, because it is all a question of pay.

Now, Mr. President, before offering the amendment, I call attention to another very pertinent thing; and I hope I will have the attention of the Senator from New Hampshire, because I believe he is in favor of some preparedness. We have two forces, the United States Army of about 90,000 men, and the National Guard, which on the call of the President more than doubled, so far as personnel is concerned, our Army on the border. I voted here in the Senate, probably with the Senator from New Hampshire and probably with the Senator from Massachusetts, for 250,000 Regular soldiers.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Certainly.

Mr. PENROSE. The Senator's remarks are very interesting; but I apprehend they would be more enlightening if the amendment could be read to the Senate.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I read it once, probably before the Senator came in.

Mr. PENROSE. If the Senator will offer his amendment and permit it to be read, we would have a better understanding of his remarks.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I am going to read it into the RECORD, whether it is ruled out of order or not.

Mr. PENROSE. Well, let it be read.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I will read it for the benefit of the Senator. The amendment is: On page 13, at the end of line 12, to insert the following:

And provided further, That all enlisted men of the National Guard who have heretofore or shall hereafter respond to the call of the President for service shall, in case of those who have dependents that the enlisted men shall be shown to have supported before so responding, be entitled to extra pay in the nature of an allowance, to be paid out of said sum—

That is to say the appropriation that goes before—

In such amount and in such manner as the Secretary of War shall direct for the support of such dependents for the time of such service, but in no case shall the total of the pay of such enlisted man and the amount of such extra pay allowance for his dependents exceed the total of the pay and similar allowance—

I have erased from the amendment at that point the words "amounting to \$54 a month"—

now paid to or for privates by the Canadian Government and as set forth in the report of the United States consul general at Ottawa, Canada, to the Department of State, dated July 3, 1916. (RECORD of July 3, 1916, p. 11971.)

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, just an inquiry at that point. Would the Senator have this amendment providing for the dependents of soldiers in the National Guard—and I am heartily in sympathy with the idea of providing for their dependents—apply to those members of the National Guard who have never left home? Information was given the other day to the effect that there was not a South Atlantic State whose National Guard had left the borders of the State outside of the National Guard of Virginia. Would it not be well to insert a proviso restricting the provisions of this paragraph to those members of the National Guard who are actually doing service on the Mexican border?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. No, Mr. President, for the reason that if the National Guardsman has left his home and is not taking part in his usual industry and is not getting his usual pay or income he is just as much without means to support his dependents if he is in a camp in Ohio, say, as he would be in a camp on the Rio Grande. The whole thing is a question of responding to the call of the President. There are 19 regiments that have not been called out. Those 19 are at home, and, of course, they would not be included under this amendment, and the men in those regiments, as the Senator will readily understand, are pursuing their usual daily industry and are in a position to take care of their families as ordinarily.

Mr. President, I was going to go on and say that it is a question of importance to the discipline of the National Guard. Those who have been soldiers, for instance, like the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON], will recognize how important it is that this great force of men, 100,000 or more, now on the Rio Grande should have this opportunity of 90 days' discipline. The companies of the National Guard are being combined with the companies of the Regular Army and drilled as units; they are being combined for patrol and other purposes, and the co-operation between these men and their officers and the officers and men of the Regular Army at the front is sincere, honest, and efficient, and is having a wonderful effect upon the development of the discipline of this large force of American soldiers.

Mr. President, that ought to go on. It ought not to be interrupted by excusing any man from the service, one here, one there, one there, until it runs up into the thousands, disrupting this process of discipline and development of this great body of citizen soldiers. The dependents should be cared for and the soldiers relieved of all anxiety on the subject. As I said a little while ago, I voted for an Army of 250,000 regular soldiers if you could get them, but you can not get them. I have the returns right here that I got from the department the other day, dated July 14. It seems that in 121 days 16,000 men have been enlisted out of the 20,000 that were authorized by Congress 115 days ago.

Why, Mr. President, the Regular Army is going forward to-day at the rate of only 1,000 men a month, and that is all. The net increase of the Regular Army, as the Senator from Oregon doubtless knows, is only 1,000 men a month. That is the net result of the enlistments over and above the losses. I have that from The Adjutant General himself, and it is a matter of public knowledge.

Thus you are getting your Regular Army built up—this force for the protection of the United States that you are all talking about—at the rate of only 12,000 men a year. Twelve thousand men a year is all that it is going ahead. These may be hard

times to get enlistments, from the standpoint of the industrial activity of the country, but from the standpoint of the warlike excitement that we have just gone through, these are easy times for enlistments. So I think on the whole they are probably average times for enlistments in the Regular Army; and you are only going ahead 1,000 men a month, and it costs you nearly \$20 for every one you get. Nineteen dollars and some cents is the cost of enlisting these men in the Regular Army, for advertisements and all these other items of expenditure. The average price of getting the men to sign the enlistment docket is between \$19 and \$20, and you are getting 1,000 men a month ahead by that process.

Are you for preparedness, or are you against it? That is the question. We have this great army of citizen soldiers down there on the Rio Grande. Why not take care of their dependents? As the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] just now said, it has already been arranged that we are not going to enlist any more men in the National Guard with dependents, so you are going to have no future trouble about that. The evil effect of letting these men with dependents come home now is the disruption of the discipline of the National Guard. Gen. Funston has described it as to the numbers involved, and from other sources of information I am informed that it is a very serious handicap in some of the commands.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, how many are there with dependents?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Nobody knows. The Senator has asked a very pertinent question; but this article which I quote from says that Gen. Funston said that he would have to release several thousand in the next few weeks. Now, it is estimated that anywhere from 10 to 25 per cent of the National Guard are involved in this disruption of discipline, because that is really what it amounts to in the long run; and it may be serious or it may not be serious. I have hoped all along, Mr. President, that the patriotism of our men in the National Guard would leap over this barrier, this tendered temptation to go home. The six-year enlistment clause was put up to every man that went into the National Guard, doubling their terms of service; and yet, Mr. President, they leaped over that barrier, resolute upon their patriotic duty. The new law was no help to the guard at all from the standpoint of this mobilization. Their development to the date of the call was under the old Dick law. Yet this body of men have done this through the discipline that came from their armory training and outfitting them with arms and clothing and sending them to camps occasionally in the summer and occasionally to rifle ranges. It was rather occasional. One of the best regiments in Maryland, the First Maryland Regiment, had not seen its colonel for three years until this mobilization took place under the President's call. Why? Because Congress had not provided for the disciplining of the National Guard, and the money was so scant that they had to send out regiments to the shooting ranges in battalions; and the commander of that regiment, an excellent officer, had not seen his regiment as a whole for three years until he met them, under the call of the President, at Laurel; and that was the kind of provision that Congress had been making for this important subject!

Mr. President, we have got them all together now. The dispatches of yesterday say they are having extra time on the shooting ranges. As I said just now, they are being disciplined with the Regular troops.

I think the Thirteenth and Thirtieth Regiments of United States Infantry are at Eagle Pass. Those regiments have probably not more than 40 men in a company. The National Guard of Maryland average about, say, 90 men in a company; and by making a combination of these two forces—Company A with a Company A and a Company B with a Company B, and so on—you get something like a full war-strength company, and for the first time possibly some of your Regular officers are handling full-strength war companies.

Let us not stop this process. Let us go on in the interest of the preparedness of the United States, and let us do the fair thing by the National Guard. Let us do the fair thing by the men who were willing to leave their daily vocations and their daily income and answer to the call of the President. We will not discuss whether the call was wise or not. We will not enter into that question with our friends on the other side. We will simply ask them to recognize the fact that the Guard is on the frontier and this is the opportunity to give them a genuine military experience.

Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment of the Senator from Maryland.

The SECRETARY. On page 13, at the end of line 12, it is proposed to insert the following proviso:

Provided further, That all enlisted men of the National Guard who have heretofore or shall hereafter respond to the call of the President for service shall, in case of those who have dependents that the enlisted man shall be shown to have supported before so responding, be entitled to extra pay in the nature of an allowance to be paid out of said sum, in such amount and in such manner as the Secretary of War shall direct, for the support of such dependents for the time of such service; but in no case shall the total of the pay of such enlisted man and the amount of such extra-pay allowance for his dependents exceed the total of the pay and similar allowance now paid to or for privates by the Canadian Government, as set forth in the report of the United States consul general at Ottawa, Canada, to the Department of State dated July 3, 1916.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President, I will withdraw the latter part of that amendment, reading "but in no case shall," and so forth, and leave the payments entirely to the discretion of the Secretary of War.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I desire to make a point of order against the amendment, for the reason that it is new and substantive legislation and no estimates have been made for it.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I do not care to discuss the point of order. I merely did not want to have a false impression left.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is ready to rule upon the point of order.

Mr. LODGE. All right; I will wait until the ruling is made. I can speak just as well then.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I call the attention of the Chair to the ruling of the Vice President.

Mr. LODGE. If there is going to be discussion of the point of order, I do not yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is ready to rule on the point of order.

The Chair has had his attention called to the case to which the Senator from Maryland has already referred. The Chair thinks that the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland is plainly obnoxious to Rule XVI and that the case presented in his remarks did not comprehend the overruling of a point of order against an amendment where that amendment provided something not germane to the House provision. The provision which the House inserted in the bill relates solely to members of the National Guard who, at the time they respond to the call of the President, are Government employees, and it provides that they shall be restored to the positions occupied by them at the time of the call. The proviso offered by the Senator from Maryland relates to extra pay for members of the National Guard, and, in the opinion of the Chair, is clearly general legislation and obnoxious to Rule XVI.

Therefore the point of order is sustained.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I desire to speak for only a moment.

I wish to say, in regard to the amendment of the Senator from Maryland, that I think from what he said my position or what I intended to say may have been misunderstood. I am not against providing for the dependent families of members of the National Guard called into the service. On the contrary, I am in favor of it; but I do not think it is wise or just to give that assistance to one part of your soldiers and not give it to all. It does not matter whether there are many soldiers in the Regular Army who have dependents or whether they are, as the Senator from Maryland says, negligible. If there is one man with dependents who is at the front in the Regular Army serving his country in time of war or disturbance, he ought to have the same provision for his dependents as the National Guard while they receive it; and if the amendment had not been ruled out of order I should have offered an amendment to it that whenever such payments were made for the benefit of the dependents of members of the National Guard similar payments should be made to take care of the dependents of the regular soldiers in service at that time, so that the provision for the dependents of the regular soldiers would cease and determine when those for the National Guard ended.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts allow me to make a suggestion?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. NELSON. I think that wherever an allowance is made to the families of dependent soldiers it ought to be paid to the families and not to the soldiers.

Mr. LODGE. I quite agree with the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. The Secretary of War could do that, of course. He would attend to that.

Mr. LODGE. Not only in England and Canada, where I know it is done, but I think among all the belligerents engaged in the present war, provision is made, by direct payment to dependent families, for their support during the absence of the husband or father or brother who had hitherto supported them; and I think that ought to be done by us when the National Guard is called out into service. We are told that we have not

a war in Mexico or on the border, but we apparently have fighting, and we have called out the National Guard—for what military purpose it is not easy to see. I am not going into that side of the question at all; but I do want to make it perfectly plain that I favor the care of the dependents of our soldiers. I can not draw this line, as some Senators seem to desire to draw it, between the man who fights in the Regular Army and the man who fights in the National Guard. It seems to be thought necessary by the friends of the National Guard here to oppose everything for the Regular Army.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. One moment. I do not say the Senator from Maryland is doing that, because he said he meant to offer an amendment in that direction, which he said was out of order before he announced that he was going to offer it. But when the Army bill was up everything was done for the National Guard that could be done in that bill. Everything they had asked was done; and yet the committee have devoted their entire strength, and successfully, to preventing the United States from having volunteers. I do not mean the National Guard did this, but the little group of adjutants general down here did. I am happy to say that nobody of the National Guard from my State urged it. They were too broad-minded, too truly patriotic to do so.

Now, I am ready to do everything possible for the National Guard, but I want also to care for the Regular Army. I wish to protect the United States; and I can not, for one, draw these discriminations. I wish to provide in every way for the National Guardsmen now on the frontier, and where there are dependents I want to have them taken care of, and I want the dependents of the regular soldiers taken care of at the same time. If we are a just Nation, as we are a generous Nation, it will be done.

Mr. REED and Mr. LEE of Maryland addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President, I want it understood that I had claimed recognition from the Chair with a view of appealing from the decision.

Mr. REED. Very well.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I will waive that right, of course, until the Senator from Missouri has spoken.

Mr. REED. No.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. The Chair recognized several other Senators, but I am sure he did not intend to cut me out of the right of appeal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair did not understand that the Senator wished to take an appeal. The Chair will preserve the right of the Senator to take an appeal.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Will the Senator from Missouri go ahead, then?

Mr. REED. No; I will wait.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has sustained the point of order made by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN]. From that decision the Senator from Maryland [Mr. LEE] appeals. The question is, Shall the ruling of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I have no disposition to debate the appeal; but in justice to myself I want to say to the Senator from Maryland, and to anybody and everybody who may be interested in my position with reference to the matter that has been under discussion, that I am in favor as much as anybody of taking care of the dependents of those who have been called into the service of the Government in a military capacity. I did venture to suggest that I thought we might with propriety send the men who had dependents to their homes, in view of the fact that there were no hostilities of which I had any knowledge on the Mexican frontier or elsewhere. The Senator from Maryland took occasion to suggest in a very pointed way that I was not in favor of preparedness. Why, Mr. President, the votes I have cast will speak for themselves. I have been in favor of a policy of very liberal appropriations for the Army and Navy. I have sometimes thought I went beyond prudence; but no one can charge me fairly with having failed in my duty in that regard. I expect to continue in the same frame of mind, and to support the committees of this body, the men who are charged with these great appropriations, in following their recommendations to a large extent, and favoring liberal appropriations both for the Regular Army and for the National Guard.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President, may I be heard on the appeal?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will hear the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President, in your absence this question has been discussed twice in the Senate, and on each occasion the Chair has held that where the House enters upon

a subject matter the Senate could pursue the same subject matter and legislate, and that it was not obnoxious to the rule requiring estimates or prohibiting general legislation, for the simple reason that the Senate could not be precluded from legislating on the same subject on which the House had legislated, generally speaking.

Mr. President, I want to get into the RECORD the fact that we have had two cases here affecting two classes of Government employees, and that in both of those two cases the House has legislated, but that here, in a case where the House has legislated in reference to members of the National Guard, the point of order is sustained. In two cases where the House legislated, one with reference to dentists and one with reference to employees in navy yards, as to the hours of leave, the Vice President held, and the Senate sustained him, that the Senate could go on and proceed to legislate, because the House had already entered that field.

Now, Mr. President, when we come to another class of citizens who are Government employees, and the most patriotic class of citizens in this country, let us say, the men who have answered to the appeal presented to them in the call of the President—and when they answered it looked very much like war—we find the doors closed for the relief of defendants by this ruling, even though the House has legislated in this bill and in this item as to another item affecting members of the militia answering the call.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I do.

Mr. WORKS. As I remember the ruling of the Chair in the case to which the Senator refers, it was held that the subject matter of the legislation was a reorganization of the Navy, and that therefore anything that affected that reorganization was germane and not separate and distinct legislation. I doubt whether the Senator can stretch that ruling to cover this case.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. But it applied to the naval Dental Corps, and in this case it applies to the National Guardsmen who have responded to the call of the President. That is the language of the House. The House legislated with reference to National Guardsmen responding to the call of the President.

Mr. WORKS. Yes; but, Mr. President, the subject matter of this legislation is appropriations. It is an appropriation bill pure and simple.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Why, the whole thing was on an appropriation bill, Mr. President. Both of those items were on appropriation bills, and it was general legislation that the House had attached to an appropriation bill.

Mr. WORKS. It was an appropriation bill, but the particular portion of it involved was practically a reorganization of the Navy; and it was upon that theory, as I remember, that the Chair ruled.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I will refresh the recollection of the Senator by reading a little from the remarks of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA], at page 12991:

According to the ruling of the Chair on that particular day, I believe the Senator from Nevada is right. I believe we have as much right to accept the amendment offered by him as we had to accept the amendment that was under discussion the other day. I wish to read the ruling of the Chair on that occasion:

"The VICE PRESIDENT. Notwithstanding the rule of the Senate to the effect that general legislation may not be attached to an appropriation bill, still when the House of Representatives opens the door and proceeds to enter upon a field of general legislation which has to do with a subject of this character the Chair is going to rule, but, of course, the Senate can reverse the ruling of the Chair that the House having opened the door the Senate of the United States can walk in through the door and pursue the field."

In this particular case in which I have appealed from the decision of the Chair we are pursuing the particular field of members of the National Guard who have responded to the call of the President as to whom the House has legislated.

Mr. SMOOT. That is correct.

Mr. GRONNA. This amendment, then, is simply pursuing that particular field.

Mr. SMOOT. The field that is to be pursued under this amendment is to increase the leave of absence for certain employees of the Government, and the House did not legislate upon that subject directly or indirectly.

Mr. GRONNA. It affects every employee in the Navy Department. Mr. SMOOT. The House has not inserted in the bill one word about increased leave of absence, and that is the subject before the Senate at this time. What the Chair has to rule upon is whether the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada is general legislation, and if it is changing existing law it is general legislation upon an appropriation bill.

Mr. President, we have general legislation here affecting the status of members of the National Guard who responded to the call of the President—general legislation of a very broad sort. The House has opened the door, and the ruling that I have appealed from closes the door to the Senate.

Mr. OLIVER. I should like to hear the amendment read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. On page 174, after the amendment heretofore agreed to, after line 21, insert the following:

"That each and every employee of the navy yards, gun factories, naval stations, and arsenals of the United States Government is hereby granted 30 days leave of absence each year, without forfeiture of pay during such leave: *Provided*, That it shall be lawful to allow pro rata leave only to those serving 12 consecutive months or more; *And provided further*, That in all cases the heads of divisions shall have discretion as to the time when the leave can best be allowed."

Now, this was the statement of the Senator who offered the amendment:

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, the other day the question before the Senate when this ruling was made by the Vice President which has just been read was on an amendment first introduced in this body in behalf of the members of the Dental Corps. It changed the law with regard to the Dental Corps.

Mr. President, I call your attention to the fact that this House provision changes the law in this appropriation with reference to members of the National Guard responding to the call of the President—a very much larger field of application.

It absolutely changed the law affecting dentists. There was a provision in the bill for doctors as it came from the House, there was a provision in the bill for a Hospital Corps as it came from the House, but not for dentists, and the Senator therefore introduced this amendment.

I will read only a line or two, but it will give the Chair the object of the amendment.

Then he goes on to quote from the amendment as to the naval Dental Corps. Then the Senator from Nevada proceeded:

Now, it goes on for two pages enacting entirely a new law with regard to these dentists that was never taken up in the House at all.

Now, then, the very skillful Senator from Utah, this wonderful parliamentarian, was the other day maintaining a stand, I believe, if my memory serves me right, just the opposite from what he is now taking. He was contending, as I recollect it, that because the House had permitted general legislation with regard to medical officers, it opened the door for a consideration of the whole subject by this body.

So let me repeat, it has been decided twice by your predecessor in the chair, and in the last few days, that when the House opens the door by legislating on an appropriation bill with reference to a given class, the Senate can proceed. For that reason I make this appeal, and I hope that the Senate will proceed consistently with reference to the most patriotic class that has come before it lately for its legislative consideration.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I did not think that the ruling of the Vice President was correct the other day in the terms in which he stated it. The language which the Senator from Maryland has just read from the RECORD, used by the Vice President at that time, seems to me to be altogether too comprehensive for any practical application to be made of it. To attempt to decide whether a specific amendment is general legislation or not, using such general terms as the Vice President used when he stated that when the House opens the door the Senate might walk through it and pursue a field, can not, I think, be any accurate guide in drawing the line of distinction between what may be considered general legislation and what may not, or how far the Senate can deal with the matter which the House placed in the bill. It seems to me that the true inquiry should be, What is the field that the House has entered upon? What is the specific proposition that the House has placed in the bill which is general legislation?

The provision here, to be specific, is that the officers and enlisted men of the National Guard, Government employees, who respond to the call of the President for service, shall at the expiration of the military service to which they are called be restored to the positions occupied by them at the time of the call. That is general legislation. The House having entered upon it, I think the Senate without violating its rule as to placing upon general appropriation bills matters of general legislation could make such changes as it chose in relation to the proposition of restoring members of the guard to their positions in the Government employ. To say that when the House attempts to do that the Senate can place upon a bill, relating to the same subject matter and the same specific proposition, a new provision of law providing how the Secretary of War shall compensate the dependents of the National Guardsmen who have gone to the field is to place upon the bill a piece of legislation relating to an entirely different subject and by no construction or stretch of language or imagination can it be considered to be dealing with the same subject which the House dealt with, except to say that they both concern the National Guard, and, of course, that would include any legislative proposition no matter how remote or different from that entered upon by the House.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President—

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. The Senator is entirely mistaken. I wish to call his attention to the fact that it deals with the enlisted men who answer to the call of the President and nobody else, and the same class exactly that the House dealt with. In-

cidentally there is an effect upon the dependents, but the pay is to the enlisted man who responded to the call of the President.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. For the purpose of my argument it is perfectly immaterial. The House provision attempts to deal with the offices which the enlisted men—the Government employees—have left. The legislation proposed by the Senate committee amendment proposes to deal with the compensation of the enlisted men, increasing their salaries, which is a subject entirely remote from that dealt with by the House.

So I think the ruling of the Chair is perfectly correct.

Mr. REED. Will the Senator from Maryland allow me to make this suggestion? As to an amendment embodying the same principle covered by his amendment—indeed, an amendment which, I think, was an exact copy of the bill passed by the House—notice has been given that it will be offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE]. Notice of a motion to suspend the rules was also given. That motion can be taken up to-day, a day's notice having been given. I simply make the suggestion in the interest of saving time. The Senator knows I am in favor of the principle contained in his proposition. I am also in favor of going further and providing for additional pay for these men. I make that suggestion in order that we may possibly save a long debate on this field. I say to the Senator frankly that I am in favor of his amendment, but I can not convince myself that it is not obnoxious to the rule, although I should like very much to do so if I could. But we can get at this question, and get at it directly, under the notice given by the Senator from Wisconsin. I gave a similar notice with reference to a kindred measure last night. The chairman of the committee very kindly consented to an adjournment instead of a recess in order that the notice might become effective to-day.

Now, to save the time and get this matter to a vote, would it not be well to just waive any further insistence upon the point of order and to take the matter up in the manner I have suggested?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I should like to agree to the suggestion of the Senator from Missouri, but there are two grave reasons why it should not be done. The ruling has been clearly made here that where a subject matter is open the Senate can pursue it. I stick absolutely in this amendment to the subject matter of the members of the National Guard who responded to the call of the President. There is no change from that subject in a word of that amendment.

Mr. President, I should like to yield to the suggestion of the Senator from Missouri, but he takes the matter up in an entirely different way. He handles it aside from any action by the House as a new bill and a new subject, and he enters upon the domain of this relief handicapped by having to have two-thirds of the Senate to set aside the rule. So his proposition as it stands is practically hopeless, I fear.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. With great pleasure.

Mr. WORKS. I thought the Senator had yielded the floor.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I will yield the floor to the Senator from California.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I am not very favorably disposed toward general legislation on an appropriation bill. I think the rule of the Senate in that respect should be rather strictly construed. I took a very slight part in the discussion that took place after an appeal had been taken from the Chair in the case referred to by the Senator from Maryland. I believe in that case that the ruling of the Chair was correct. I think so yet. But for myself, I based it upon the theory that the legislation in that case as it had come to us from the House was intended to reorganize entirely the Army. The Senate determined that in order to complete that reorganization it was necessary to add another bureau, and that seemed to me to be strictly within the rule of the Senate. It was general legislation of the very same kind and connected with legislation that had already taken place in the House, simply adding to it. But I do not think that can be appealed to as justifying the position taken by the Senator from Maryland now. I think the ruling of the Chair is perfectly right myself.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I will not discuss the late ruling of the Vice President made on that occasion, which I confess was something of a shock to me. I rise simply for the purpose of making an illustration as to where a ruling of that kind may lead us. Rule XVI which deals with general legislation deals with another matter, and that is that no salary can be increased or appropriation increased for any purpose unless it is estimated for.

Now, let us suppose in the District appropriation bill, which probably contains salaries for 500 people, more or less, the

House increased a salary that had not been estimated for. Does anyone suppose that the House having opened that door the Committee on Appropriations could have taken 100, or 200, or 300, or 500 other salaries that had not been estimated for and increased them on the hypothesis that the House had increased one salary and thus opened the door for the Senate to pursue it?

I simply cite that as an illustration of the danger of the proposition involved in the idea that when the House opens the door we can pursue it to the end.

I rarely ever dissent from the opinions of the Vice President, because I think that he is very accurate, as a rule. When I read that opinion I thought it was a dangerous proposition; and certainly, Mr. President, it would become extremely dangerous if the Senate, pursuing the matter after the House had opened the door, should undertake to place upon the bill provisions that were not germane to the matter that the House had inserted. It seems to me that this is a case where that suggestion applies with a great deal of force.

I feel that the decision of the Chair was absolutely correct, and will take pleasure in voting to sustain the Chair in the decision that the Chair announced.

Mr. WARREN. There is not any doubt in my mind about the correctness of the ruling of the Chair. Without reference to what may have occurred the other day on other matters, the rules governing appropriation bills are very plain, and they have been generally followed for a great many years.

The proposition of the Senator from Maryland is obnoxious to almost every feature of the rules regarding appropriation bills. It of course proposes legislation; it has not been estimated for; it has not been reported here from a standing committee. Besides this, it increases an appropriation. It has not been put in here as an amendment one day before being printed and sent to a committee, as the rule provides.

So, starting from the very first, it is against the rules. The facts are that it increases an appropriation without an estimate. It increases it without law. It entirely changes law.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Will the Senator permit an interruption? There is no increase whatever in this appropriation by this amendment. It does not increase a single dollar.

Mr. WARREN. That is entirely evading the question. If the Senator reflects a moment, he will know that, because the whole provision under discussion is specifically the pay of soldiers. Now, whether they are National Guards or whether they are regular soldiers, the money goes into one fund, and soldiers must be paid their regular stipend under the law, regardless of whether their accounts are short or long. If the money provided for that purpose is expended for another purpose, the salary or regular pay of troops must be paid just the same. So, really, it is a direct addition to an item of appropriation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the decision of the Senate? [Putting the question.] The ayes seem to have it. The ayes have it. The decision of the Chair stands as the decision of the Senate. The question now is upon the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment passed over will be stated.

The SECRETARY. The next amendment passed over is, on page 12, line 10, after the numerals "\$23,000,000," to insert the following proviso:

Provided, That hereafter one of the enlisted men detached from the Army at large for duty at each of the recruit depots under the provisions of the act of June 12, 1906, shall, while so detached, have the rank, pay, and allowances of a regimental sergeant major.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SECRETARY. The next amendment passed over is, on page 16, beginning at line 14. It was passed over at the request of the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] and proposes to insert the following:

Hereafter headquarters clerks shall be known as Army field clerks and shall receive pay at the rates herein provided, and after 12 years of service, at least three years of which shall have been on detached duty away from permanent station, or on duty beyond the continental limits of the United States, or both, shall receive the same allowances, except retirement, as heretofore allowed by law to pay clerks, Quartermaster Corps, and shall be subject to the rules and Articles of War.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, since asking the amendment to go over I have discussed the amendment with a number of officers of the department. The amendment on page 16 I have no objection to, but I wish to refer to the amendment beginning on page 17, reading as follows:

Hereafter headquarters clerks shall be known as Army field clerks and shall receive pay at the rates herein provided, and after 12 years of service, at least three years of which shall have been on detached duty away from permanent station, or on duty beyond the continental

limits of the United States, or both, shall receive the same allowances, except retirement, as heretofore allowed by law to pay clerks, Quartermaster Corps, and shall be subject to the rules and Articles of War.

I have received hundreds of protests from clerks in the Quartermaster Corps against this proposed amendment, and perhaps it will be as well for me to read one of those protests in the shape of a letter, as all the others are along the same line. The letter is as follows:

As a citizen of the State of New York and as a servant of the United States continuously since August, 1889, I beg you to consider the following individual petition:

1. Senate amendment to Army appropriation act for fiscal year 1917, on page 17, lines 1 to 9, provides for the creation of a corps of field clerks from clerks in the Quartermaster Corps who shall have had a total service of 12 years, 3 of which shall have been away from permanent stations within the continental limits of the United States.

This corps of 200 field clerks will be entitled to commutation of quarters, to heat and light, to free medical service for themselves and families, and to purchase of subsistence and other supplies from the Quartermaster Corps of the Army, all of which is worth approximately \$600 a year. In addition, these clerks are now planning to have subsequent Congresses give them full pay of pay clerks and retirement privilege.

2. Without reference to efficiency it is proposed to reward a class of clerks for no other reason than that they have served three years away from permanent stations in the United States. This sole requirement for appointment as field clerk will bar a considerable number of deserving clerks of the Quartermaster Corps from the benefits conferred by the act.

3. There are many clerks in the large offices of the Quartermaster Corps occupying responsible positions of chief clerk, principal clerk, or clerks in charge of important work who never have been considered available for detached or foreign service because the officers under whom they served did not want to be deprived of the services of these clerks. Now, when they feel that they had a right to hope for an even chance with the other clerks of the corps on account of long and appreciated service they find that this very service has debarred them from advancement.

4. Being one of the clerks thus debarred from getting any part in the liberality of Congress I most respectfully request that the amendment be phrased to recognize ability and efficiency and to give these qualities an even chance with time service.

As I stated, Mr. President, this is only a sample of the many protests that I have received. It seems to me the amendment as drawn would do a great injustice to hundreds of clerks in the Quartermaster Corps.

I am told that the clerks who are considered most capable, the best qualified for the positions that they hold, are the ones employed in permanent stations, and they are held there at the request of the heads of divisions. Those clerks are not called out in the field and they have not been, as seen in the case of the gentleman writing the letter I have just read. He has been in the service since August, 1889, and under this amendment it would be impossible for him to receive any benefits.

Mr. WARREN. Will the Senator state what his salary is?

Mr. SMOOT. I have not looked it up, and I really do not know what his salary is; but I think if there are benefits to be granted clerks in the Quartermaster Corps by commutation of quarters, for light, heat, and so forth, the clerk writing me, if his statement is correct, is entitled to the benefits, and if he is denied them and they are allowed to others, he is discriminated against.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, as to that, the statement is not correct. The War Department computes it at \$338.

Mr. SMOOT. They compute the amount for computation of quarters and heat and light at \$300?

Mr. WARREN. Yes; and whatever the advantages are.

Mr. SMOOT. There are other advantages enumerated in the letter. I will ask the Senator whether they all enjoy the advantages to-day as named in the letter and are having free medical service for themselves and family.

Mr. WARREN. So far as medical service is concerned, the employees at distant points who desire the privilege have it, so far as I know.

Mr. SMOOT. Whether they are working at a permanent station or not?

Mr. WARREN. They do not have commutation of quarters. So far as buying of the quartermaster is concerned, I do not know that has ever been denied to anybody, either an enlisted man or officer or employee.

Mr. SMOOT. I judge from this that it has been or else he would not make the statement that he does. The clerk says—

Mr. WARREN. Three hundred and thirty-eight dollars is the amount which was sent from the War Department to the committee as being the benefit amount to each man.

Mr. SMOOT. Does that include the purchase of subsistence and other supplies from the quartermaster?

Mr. WARREN. It does not include it because there is nothing in that.

Mr. SMOOT. Then the statement made in the letter is not correct?

Mr. WARREN. I do not think it is. He does not say as to the specific amount. How are you going to tell what the amount is or what any man might buy of the quartermaster?

Mr. SMOOT. Of course he could estimate that amount, as far as that is concerned.

It seems to me, if there is the discrimination as is outlined in the letter, it is unjust to the great majority of clerks in the Quartermaster's Department. If there is no injustice, I, of course, have nothing further to say; but if there is an injustice the provision ought to go out of the bill.

I will withhold the point of order against the amendment until I hear what the Senator from Wyoming has to say in relation to the benefits of it or why it should be adopted.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, it is always a vexatious matter to undertake to adjust the pay or allowances of the clerks of the Government, as it sometimes is with the clerks of private parties. The Senator I presume knows, as we all do, that there has been agitation and attempted legislation for years about an old-age retirement pension for civil employees of the Government, and the Senator knows that those clerks have never been able to agree because each class is very liable to figure its own position without figuring the others. Hence no legislation at all, when it might have been had years ago had a broader and more unselfish spirit prevailed.

Here in this matter of clerks under consideration there is a wide and distinct difference between a clerk in the Quartermaster's Department who has his home either in Washington or New York or wherever he is permanently located and where he can live with his family as differentiated from the man who has to go here and there and yonder, everywhere, where he can not take his family, where he must support his family at home in one place and support himself at the same time in another place.

Take it on the Mexican border, for instance; there have been over 90 different quartermaster's clerks serving on the border before the National Guard was detailed for service there, and now that number is perhaps doubled. They have the expense down there of furnishing themselves quarters, light, heat, and food and all the necessities and then to take care of their families at home exactly the same as if each clerk were living with his family.

There has been for a long time a desire on the part of the department to have something done to cover the extra expense of these employees. They happen to be in two lines, those who are clerks to the General Staff, and field clerks, and those in the Quartermaster's Department, who have to go out from their homes and are subject to similar conditions. One of these classes is provided for in the regular annual Army appropriation bill, and has been for years, and a list given of the grade of the clerks and the salaries paid.

That is provided for again in this bill, but the quartermaster's clerks and The Adjutant General's in all the other departments are provided for as to salaries and the grades and numbers are given in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill.

The quartermaster's clerks go out and do exactly the same way as the headquarters clerks. They live away from home the same, and certainly ought to have the same privileges. I think the Senator will admit that.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator knows, of course, that there are clerks in some of the departments who are called in the field and they are generally allowed a per diem for the actual days they are in the field service.

Mr. WARREN. That is for a very short time usually.

Mr. SMOOT. But this it seems to me is broader than that. If they have served 12 years and 3 years of that have been spent in a foreign country they shall receive the same allowances heretofore allowed by law for pay clerks of the Quartermaster's Department with the exception of retirement.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator will notice that it is exactly the same as to this number of quartermaster's clerks—200—as to all headquarters clerks.

Mr. SMOOT. What I want to say to the Senator is that if these 200 clerks have served three years in a foreign country, with a total service of 12 years, and now are working in any permanent station, then they are granted the allowances provided for in the amendment. The other clerks, who have always been compelled to work at a permanent station—not because they wanted to do so, but because they were so qualified for the work that the heads of the departments required them to serve—and who have served 27 years at a permanent station, are not entitled to this allowance. That seems to me to be unjust.

Mr. WARREN. The clerks who are serving at those places have had the increase of their salaries from time to time without this—away from extra expense. They are a class that are not on the move all the time. Taken altogether, it is considered by the department—and we felt that it was just—that

the extra compensation and allowances, by and large, year after year, during a whole service for these transitory clerks, if I may term them such, did not more than make their places equal to those who have permanent quarters.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the trouble in it is, as I understand, that it gives to a clerk who is stationed to-day at a permanent station an allowance if he has served 12 years, and 3 years of the 12 years have been served outside of the country, whereas there may be clerks working in the same office who have worked twice as many years as has this clerk, and one of them would draw an allowance and the other would not. It seems to me the amendment ought to be so worded that that discrepancy should be avoided. I can not help believing that it is a discrepancy and that it is unjust to the clerk who has served during a longer number of years.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, the letters which have come to the Senator from Utah are very similar to those which have come to the committee and which have come to me. The clerks who have a local station, an abiding place, who live with their families, desire to receive everything which other clerks who are differently situated receive; and I suppose it is natural for them to want everything there is in sight. It is that competition—I might say that jealousy—that requires that each man shall claim the most that any other man receives, regardless of contingent circumstances.

The men who are on the go, the men who have to go to different points of the United States, have not the same opportunity to rise in the way of promotion, because their time is broken and their efforts scattered, while the men who are in service here in Washington or over at Philadelphia or New York are under the eyes of the chiefs of divisions; their work is examined in comparison one with another, and the deserving ones get promotion and receive a higher rate of salary than the man can possibly claim who goes from post to post and from field to field. Does the Senator from Utah think that the man living here in Washington or living in New York with his family, with no extra expense for his own living, should have the same pay as the man who, against his will, is required to go down on the Mexican border and in the towns there to take whatever may come, and who may have to pay two or three prices, perhaps, and, at the same time, to support his family at home? Does the Senator think that would be just?

Mr. SMOOT. If this amendment applied only to the Mexican border and was entirely an emergency matter, it would be a different question; but this is to continue forever hereafter unless it be changed by a subsequent law.

Mr. WARREN. It applies only to the number that are doing this extra work.

Mr. SMOOT. It will apply to the clerks who are in the Philippine Islands; it will apply to the clerks who are in the Hawaiian Islands; it will apply to the clerks who go from the State of New York to any other State. It seems to me that it would be an injustice to have this change apply hereafter, as a clerk who is living in New York must pay his rent; he must pay for the food he eats; and he must pay all expenses attached to his living. I will admit that, perhaps, there is a little more expense in traveling than there would be if living at home; but that is not all there is in this amendment.

For instance, a clerk called upon me the other day who had served in the Philippines for four years and he had also served somewhere in Europe—I have forgotten now where—for a number of years. He is now located at a permanent station. Under this amendment he says he will be allowed the same as is now allowed to the pay clerks in the Quartermaster Corps. He further says that working beside him in the same office is a clerk who has served as a clerk in the quartermaster's office twice as long as he, but that clerk will not receive the benefits under this amendment.

Mr. WARREN. That is not a fair statement.

Mr. SMOOT. That is the statement that he made to me.

Mr. WARREN. Doubtless that is so; but the reason it is not fair is that this provides for only 200 clerks out of the number the Senator has stated and only provides for those that are on the move. For instance, I mentioned 90 clerks on the border. The addition of this guard has called for sixty-odd men more. There are one hundred and fifty-odd men there. There is continually a call for more; but there is about an even 200 in the various places. For instance, if there is a camp anywhere, or if anything is going on at any point, no matter where, in this country or in any other country where clerks are required, they draw from this number who get this extra compensation. It only provides for that number—200.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, perhaps it would be just as well to allow this matter to go to conference and thrash it out there; but I am quite sure that there will be a discussion of the

question between the conferees. The Senator from Wyoming knows that I do not want to do an injustice to any clerk in the Government service, and he also knows that I do not want any discrimination between the same class of clerks.

Mr. WARREN. I understand that.

Mr. SMOOT. The only reason I have in bringing the matter to the attention of the Senate is that it does look to me as though there is a discrimination here between the clerks of the Quartermaster Corps.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Utah is proceeding in the right way about it. I have not the slightest interest, and the members of the committee have not the slightest interest, except that which the Senator has, to do justice with and between the clerks.

As the Senator says, the matter can go to conference. We do not know exactly what the House wanted, and for this reason: The House Military Committee undertook to handle this question, but the proposed legislation was ruled out on a point of order in the House. The rules there are somewhat different from what they are here. So the only thing the House could do was to put in the old number of clerks for the department and the field clerks together, which the department does not want. It wants them separated, and it wants a good many more in number and some of them to have larger salaries. We have got it in such shape, if the Senator please, that it may go to conference—the whole subject—and if it shall appear that the provision would work any injustice it can be remedied in conference. If the Senator himself would suggest something different I should be very glad to see it considered in the conference, for there is no favoritism in this case; certainly, none is intended.

Mr. SMOOT. It may be that none was intended, Mr. President, but I am sure on the wording of the amendment that there is favoritism.

Mr. WARREN. I shall be glad if the Senator's wisdom will suggest a remedy. It is a matter that we have studied over for many and many a month. If there is anything wrong, we want to know it, but we can not take alone merely ex parte testimony from interested clerks a long way from here, who state their opinions, erroneous as they must be oftentimes. We do not want to accept that alone. We are willing to consider all of that, but we want to consider the entire matter, and we should be very glad if the Senator from Utah, when the subject goes to conference, would suggest any way to better it.

Mr. BRADY. Mr. President, the committee gave this section of the bill very careful consideration. The chairman then appointed the Senator from Wyoming and the Senator from Tennessee as a subcommittee to look into the matter, which they did very thoroughly, and they reported back this section as it now reads. After some discussion it was adopted.

I think there is one point that the committee had in view which the Senator from Utah does not take into consideration, and which will doubtless be brought out in the conference, for we all know that the Senator from Utah does not want to do anyone an injustice. The thought of the committee in considering this matter was, after the passage of this bill, to make these 200 field men who have served that length of time, field clerks. They will then spend all of their time in the field and not be called back to their homes, as the Senator suggests.

If that is the construction which the conference committee will place upon the provision, it will certainly do no injustice to the clerks in the office, but will be doing an act of justice to the clerks who will be required to be in the field all the time. The plan is that there shall be 200 field clerks in the field constantly, and that those 200 field clerks shall receive this allowance. The provision is fair to the field clerks and does not do an injustice to the department clerks. I hope the Senate members of the conference committee will be able to retain the provision in the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the only question in my mind about that is that the quartermaster may call, and no doubt will call, these 200 clerks into the field, and they thereafter will be classified as field clerks, as the Senator has said; but, if my information is correct, the clerks who will be called for this service are not the clerks who are best qualified as clerks in the Quartermaster Corps. Most of the clerks best qualified for the work are the clerks who have never had a chance to go into the field, who have never been called into the field, because the heads of divisions have wanted them to stay in the positions which they have occupied at the permanent station. That is my information. Whether it is true or not, I do not know; but that is one of the complaints made by the clerks who are not going to receive any benefit under this amendment. There must be at least a thousand of them, are there not, I will ask the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. WARREN. There are some seven hundred and odd, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. That is, there are a thousand altogether?

Mr. WARREN. I do not think there are so many.

Mr. SMOOT. There are not far from that number.

Mr. WARREN. There are about 700 altogether.

Mr. SMOOT. And the 200 here would make 900 clerks.

Mr. WARREN. No; I repeat there are about 700 altogether.

Mr. BRADY. My information leads me to believe that the best clerks are sent into the field. I may be mistaken about that; but I think when the department sends men out on special service they try to get men who are entirely competent. I think the Senate, on investigation, will ascertain that these clerks do not want to be sent to the field; that they would prefer to stay in the office and take the office allowance rather than to leave their homes and go to the field.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I think it is a fact that the Quartermaster General tries to send into the field the single men, men whose physical condition will allow them to stand the travel and hardship incident to going wherever they are sent. I think that is the truth of the matter; but so far as the qualifications of the clerks are concerned, I think the information I have is correct, that the very best clerks in the Quartermaster Corps are kept in the permanent stations because of the fact that the heads of divisions must have competent clerks to do the work that is required in the office.

Mr. WARREN. And they are of the class now receiving the highest pay.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I understand the Senator has very kindly consented to withdraw the amendment and to leave the matter to the conferees. I desire, however, to ask that the amount in line 13, on page 16, be changed from "\$19,650" to "\$53,742," and that the amount in line 11, on page 17, be reduced from "\$151,000" to "\$67,600," making quite a reduction in the two items.

I move, first, in line 13, on page 16, to strike out "\$19,650" and to insert "\$53,742."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Then, in line 11, on page 17, I move to amend the committee amendment by striking out "\$151,000" and inserting "\$67,600."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment to the amendment is agreed to.

The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 17, beginning in line 1 and ending in line 11, as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the next amendment passed over.

The SECRETARY. On page 43, line 20, it is proposed to amend the committee amendment by striking out "\$20,280,000" and inserting "\$16,000,000."

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I ask that that be acted upon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment to the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 66, in the item relative to "ordnance stores, ammunition," in line 13, after the word "manufacture," to insert "and purchase."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 90, after line 19, to strike out:

Provided, That no part of the appropriations made in this act shall be available for the salary or pay of any officer, manager, superintendent, foreman, or other person having charge of the work of any employee of the United States while making or causing to be made with a stop watch or other time-measuring device, a time study of any job of any such employee between the starting and completion thereof, or of the movements of any such employee while engaged upon such work; nor shall any part of the appropriations made in this act be available to pay any premium or bonus or cash reward to any employee in addition to his regular wages, except for suggestions resulting in improvements or economy in the operation of any Government plant.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINE] are interested in that amendment. I see the Senator from New Jersey is present.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] is interested in that amendment. I do not like to suggest the absence of a quorum, but I think the Senator ought to be here when the amendment is being considered.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I think he will be here in a moment.

Mr. THOMAS. Very well.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I trust that the amendment of the Senate committee striking out the provi-

sion in the House bill on page 90, beginning in line 20 and ending in line 5, on page 91, will not be agreed to. The amendment of the Senate committee striking out the language of the House would make possible the installation of the so-called time-watch system in factories operated by the Government. Of course we can not prevent the installation and operation of such systems in private institutions, in mills and plants operated by private parties, but to me the whole thought is so barbarous that in my opinion our Government should have no connection with it, but should spurn it and drive it out of every plant under its control. I refer to the system known as the Taylor system.

Mr. Taylor, I believe, at one time was a laborer. He found it wise, for purposes of his own or for the profit of his employer, to inaugurate the so-called Taylor system, which is a time-watch system. We can all tolerate—I can, I know—a time watch being held over a race horse to find out what he may accomplish in a given time; but to have an officer of the Government hold such a watch over a workman in the employ of the Government, a workman who is doing his honest best for his employer, I feel is most humiliating and belittling and contrary to the spirit of American institutions.

I do not believe that the God of humanity breathed the breath of life into man that he should live to work, but that he should work in order to live, and there is a very wide difference between the two.

There was a time in my life when I believed there was no limit to human force. I was thrown upon my own resources very early in life. I was blessed with good health and a fair physique, and I thought there was no limit to human strength. I used to find myself fatigued almost to the limit, but I had the idea—God knows where I got it—that when I was tired I must still persist in toil and get a little more tired. I felt that that was a proper method of disciplining the human frame and disciplining my muscles. I have since learned that I did all that sort of thing at the expense of my general physical health. I believe I was foolish in indulging that thought. I believe there is such a thing to-day as human life wearing out. I used to think it was like a sort of storage battery, that it kept supplying itself; but I have come to realize that that is not the case. I feel that it is an absolute belittlement upon the part of the United States Government to employ a system under which one man shall stand over another man with a time watch in his hand, measure his every movement, and ascertain just how long he may take to put his shovel in a pile of sand and how long it may take him to flit it around in some other direction.

This system, which has been in vogue in some establishments for some time, has come to be denominated "the speeding-up system." That speeding up is desired in order to make dollars, mayhap for an employer, and in some cases the employer may be the United States Government. As I have said, we can not prevent the use of such a system in private institutions, but to speed up a man almost to the verge of collapse I feel is a crime against God and humanity.

An instance came to me within the past few weeks, Mr. President, of a man who has been employed by the Government for the past 20 years as a mail-bag repairer or maker. He was an efficient man and well satisfied with his employment. Finally he was placed under a time watch and was driven on to see how much he could accomplish. The result was that he suffered a mental collapse and was taken to the asylum. I can imagine just such a condition as that. I believe they have worked this system down to a science—

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I am very much interested in the last statement of the Senator. Can he give the name of the employee?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I can not give his name, but that fact came to my notice in the past two or three weeks.

Mr. THOMAS. Can the Senator give the source of his information? I think if anybody is being worked to that extent in any of the Government plants the facts ought to be known.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I can not give it now offhand, but I think I can supply that information to the Senator. The employee, as I have said, was driven to the verge of mental collapse and was taken to an asylum.

Mr. THOMAS. Can the Senator say whether that employee was working at Washington or somewhere else?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. He was working for the Government in the manufacture and repair of mail bags.

Mr. THOMAS. In the city of Washington?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I can not say with certainty as to that; but I understand that mail bags are manufactured and repaired for the Government nowhere else than in the city of Washington. It was such an alarming proposition to me, so cruel and so brutal, that I felt I must mention it.

The idea of Mr. Taylor, embraced in what is called the Taylor system, has been worked down to a science. There are

concerns in the United States which will for money install in any factory or organization the Taylor system. It has been so perfected, I believe, that they compute a human being, a man, as being one-tenth of a horsepower. I think they have succeeded in reducing it to that exactness; and with this process of eternal drill and drive, timing every movement and every action, they force to the last degree the muscles and sinews of men until they become completely worn out.

I believe it is well to accumulate money; but, great God! there is something more than money in human life, in flesh and in blood; and while individuals concerned may utilize such a system, I pray that it may never be employed by the Government of the United States. I can not believe that the Senate will indorse this hateful and inhuman method. When intricate and complex machinery of steel and iron gives out you send it to the scrap heap and melt it up in the melting pot and make a new machine, but when the human organism, when flesh and blood wear out and are brought to the verge of distraction by the steady grind in our furnaces and our mills—when the breadwinner gives out what, I ask, is to become of his family—his wife and his dependent children?

I read with very great interest some little while ago an address delivered, I think, by the cultured Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Lodge]. I was wonderfully impressed with it; I felt that there was much force and argument in it; but I feel there is nothing in favor of this system except to grind out from the human frame additional dollars. That you may accomplish something more in the way of the production of wealth I will not deny; but you do it at the sacrifice of humanity; you do it at the sacrifice of human strength; and I pray to Heaven that the Senate will disagree to the amendment proposed by the committee, as I have indicated. And I move that the Senate committee amendment, beginning on line 20, on page 90, and ending on line 5, page 91, be disagreed to.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, if the picture which has been held up before us by the Senator from New Jersey were true—

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I think the Senator can not question that it is true.

Mr. WEEKS. If the Senator will do me the honor to listen to me I think I can demonstrate to him that it is not true. If it were true, I assume that there would not be a vote in the Senate in favor of continuing a system such as the Senator has described.

I live within a few miles of the Watertown Arsenal, where the Taylor system was first installed in a Government plant. That system, by the way, is only one of many efficiency systems to-day installed in various plants throughout the country. The Senator has described, first, the holding in the hand of a stop watch to see how much work a man can be forced to do by timing his every move. I will admit that if it were such a system as that, or anything comparable to it, it would be inadvisable from every standpoint; but the stop watch is only an incident in trying to develop a system of doing work which will give greater efficiency and pay the employee more money. It in no way harms him, but decreases the cost of production. That is what I believe is the result of all these systems, and it can be so demonstrated.

The truth of the matter is, Mr. President, that the stop watch is only used to time what a man is doing in a particular movement to try to determine how long it should take an average man to do that particular piece of work. Any of us who will go into a shop or a manufactory and watch workmen will see how easy it is to get greater efficiency from a man in many cases. For example, if a man were going to put a piece of metal in a machine in front of him, and he turned around to the left and picked up that metal and then turned completely around to put it in the machine, it would take more time than if the metal were placed by his side and he could do it in one motion. The watch is used to determine how long a time it takes to put that piece of metal into the machine in the most direct way.

I went through the Ford shops in Detroit not very long ago. They are a marvel of industrial efficiency, I should say. There was one thing particularly which I noticed; that is, that most of the men, or very many of the men, stood at a machine and simply started and stopped it. They did not have to change their positions in any way. The operation was so developed that a man did one thing, and generally he did not have to move more than a foot or two in order to do that thing, especially when they came to assemble the parts of the cars; the material never stopped from the time it was placed on a traveling sidewalk, as you might call it, until somebody jumped into the seat of the car and off it went under its own power. Everything was so systematized that there was not a lost

motion, and I should say there is not a lost motion in that manufacturing establishment. This arrangement makes a tremendous saving in the cost of manufacture; that is exactly what the people at the Watertown Arsenal, and I think now at one or two other arsenals, have undertaken to do in behalf of the Government.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. WEEKS. I do.

Mr. JONES. I just wanted to ask the Senator whether they have ever had the stop-watch or the so-called Taylor system in use in the Ford establishment?

Mr. WEEKS. I do not know. I have not any information about that.

Mr. JONES. The chances are that they got this efficiency without the use of that system.

Mr. WEEKS. Whether they use that system or not, there are several similar systems. "Taylor" is but a name. He was an efficiency engineer who died a few years ago. He was the one to develop the first general system of efficiency. You might call him a pioneer in it; but as systems are applied now to the many manufacturing establishments of the United States, that is simply a name which applies to some particular system.

In all cases, however, an attempt is made to get at the time in which an ordinary man should be able to perform a piece of work, and then the average man is asked to perform that work in that time. If he does it in less time, he is given a bonus. In many cases that bonus has amounted to a very considerable amount. In the case of the Watertown Arsenal, Gen. Crozier's report last year shows that practically one-third of the men in the arsenal were receiving bonuses. For instance, the molders received bonuses amounting to 27.62 per cent. Now, the wage in the arsenals, as it is in the navy yards, is based on the average wage in the community about the arsenal or navy yard. So that these men are not getting less pay than are other men in the same employments, but they are getting the same base pay.

Now, mark the benefit which this bonus system brought to the workmen in the Watertown Arsenal. Molders received 27 per cent more; machinists, 24.13 per cent more—164 machinists, or more than one-fourth of all the men employed there; machinists' helpers, 22 per cent; blacksmiths, 19 per cent; blacksmiths' helpers, 21 per cent; molders' helpers, 33 per cent; and so on down through the list. Every single employee, with the exception of one plumber's helper, who was working under the bonus system, received an excess which averaged about 25 per cent more than the average pay of men in his employment in that neighborhood.

Now, you may ask, Why is there opposition to this? The opposition comes very largely through the activity of certain labor leaders.

I think, if I were an artisan, I would belong to the union. I have not any doubt that the union has been of benefit in promoting the interests of laboring men, but I do not think the union labor leaders are always wise, any more than other men are always wise.

They originally opposed the introduction of machinery, or many labor men did, on the theory that it would limit their employment. They opposed the adoption of the piece system in manufacturing, although now I think they agree that it is fair and wise. They oppose this bonus step very largely, in my judgment, because it promotes individualism at the expense of collectivism. It gives a man the benefit of his skill and industry, which no one can deny he should be given.

All men are not born equal. All artisans and all employees of that character are not born equal. One man may have 50 per cent more capacity than another in the same employment. Under those circumstances, why should we say to the better man, "You shall not earn more money, but you must earn exactly what the man who is not your equal earns"?

In our Government employment we encourage men in other ways and in other places by giving them some kind of a premium. For example, we give a prize for excellence in gunnery; we give a prize for target practice and for efficiency in steaming. We give a prize in the shape of some kind of additional compensation in the Post Office Department if a man develops some time-saving apparatus. This is comparable to that general system which we are discussing to give efficiency some reward.

I remember, when I was mayor of the city of which I am a resident, that an attempt was made to determine a scientific scheme for cleaning the streets. Men had been employed in groups in doing this work. It seemed to me that if a man were given charge of a section and made responsible for the care of that section, it would benefit the city and would not add any-

thing to the burden of the men. So we took several men and had them do a section, practically timed them, to determine how much street space an average man could keep clean. After doing that we did not take space cleaned by the best man; we took space cleaned by the average man as a basis. Then we divided the city into sections, and each man kept his section in order. Some men would do it in seven hours. It took some men seven and a half hours to do the same amount of work, and other men eight hours; but there was no injustice or unfairness, any more than there is in this system employed at our arsenals. There is no complaint made that there is injustice or unfairness. The only complaint made is that we are introducing a system which will reduce the cost of production by using the best methods.

Now, what kind of a position are we going to be in when this European war is over, Mr. President, if we are to say to our people, "You shall not adopt efficient methods"? We know that Germany, for example, has developed itself and its people enormously, because they have done just that thing. At the end of the war we are going to see millions of thoroughly trained men return to industrial pursuits, in addition to the competition which we are meeting to-day; and I believe that if the very leaders in labor circles who are in favor of this general legislation known as the Tavenner bill would take into consideration the broad problem of competition with European workmen they themselves would be in favor of the adoption of this system as it has been carried out at Watertown.

When the system was new in Watertown, living near the arsenal, and the arsenal being located in my congressional district, I frequently used to hear from the men in complaint of this or that other item in its operation. Many of those complaints were corrected. I still live in the same place near where the arsenal is located, and yet I do not think I have had a complaint from the men employed there for three years, and there never was any complaint that there was any unfairness shown to the men, but there was a fear that they were going to be worked beyond a normal capacity. I think that feeling has entirely disappeared.

I have letters here, which I will read or put in the Record, from employees of the arsenal, in which they say that they are entirely satisfied with what is being done, and they believe that the great majority of the men there, if they were left to themselves, would express satisfaction and gratification. The manufacturing interests of the whole country, the engineering interests of the country, the trade organizations of the country, are unanimously opposed to the injection into legislation of this so-called Tavenner bill. The only opposition comes from the source which I have suggested.

As I have said, the pay of the men thus employed has been increased from 25 to 30 per cent. It is not possible that all men can work on the bonus system, because all kinds of work can not be so subdivided that it can be done. Only about one-half of the men at the Watertown Arsenal work on the bonus plan.

Last year there was a petition from the Frankford Arsenal, located near Philadelphia, signed by some 400 workmen who were employed under this system, urging that legislation should not be passed to destroy it. I have just been speaking about European competition. I happened to see in this morning's paper a statement by Mr. Secretary Redfield, in which he talks about a reduction in the cost of living. He says:

It should be understood that the price of each particular article, whether food or other material, is governed by its own peculiar conditions. While the summit has been reached on all the articles, I think, the drop in prices will be more rapid with some than with others.

There is a general tendency, I find, among the manufacturers of the country to install methods of greater efficiency, which, of course, tends to produce more. With greater production, therefore, it must follow naturally that there will be a reduction in cost.

In other words, the Secretary of Commerce, who himself was a member of a congressional commission to investigate this condition at the Watertown Arsenal, and who reported that it was inadvisable to discontinue the system then in vogue, says that the manufacturers of this country have installed such methods of efficiency in their plants that they can reduce the cost of living, thereby benefiting all the citizens of the United States. I remember that in a political campaign a year or two ago he came into New England and criticized manufacturers for asking for protection, saying that if they would adopt the efficiency methods which prevail in Europe, in his opinion, there would be no justification for asking for protection. Of course, I do not subscribe to his protection theory; but now he tells us that there have been such efficiency methods introduced that it will result in a lessening of the cost and bring an increase of production at the same plant.

I have suggested, Mr. President, that there is universal approval of this efficiency system in all other walks of life than those represented by a few labor leaders. That includes engineers, manufacturers, and business men of all kinds. Let me read three or four of these opinions, just as an example view which these people take of efficiency methods. I will not bore the Senate by reading many, but I have several hundred letters here relating to this subject, all of the same general tenor.

Here is one from Mr. Elmer A. Sperry, a member of Secretary Daniels's Naval Consulting Board. He says:

I have received yours of the 19th with inclosures calling my attention to the Tavenner and Van Dyke bills. To my mind these measures if carried into effect would work great harm and injustice. I have not only been an employer of skilled labor for 35 years, but I have always been a great admirer of skilled mechanics and good workmen, and have spent much of my life in close contact with them. My aim has always been to recognize and reward meritorious service in every line. Nothing gives me greater pleasure than to see my men advance and receive more remuneration in recognition of extra effort and devotion to their tasks. In my judgment all attempts, such as are represented in these bills, to smother and do away with proper reward for increased skill and efficiency are not only against all reason but pernicious in the extreme. I know by personal experience that proper incentive for achievement is a wonderful stimulus to performance, and I believe this to be true in the case of every man, regardless of his calling.

This is one from another of Secretary Daniels's Naval Consulting Board, Frank J. Sprague, one of the leading electrical engineers of the United States. He says:

I can conceive of no more objectionable or injurious legislation than that proposed by Tavenner bill, H. R. 8665, and Van Dyke bill, H. R. 8677, opposing scientific management and efficient operation in shop management.

These bills represent the most vicious type of class legislation. They are founded on an utterly false assumption as to the relative celerity of the American workman and the foreign one, and the inevitable result would be to augment the already excessive cost of Government-made products.

At this time, when the greatest war in history has been unduly prolonged, with all the resultant sacrifice of life and property by the early demonstrated inefficiency in production on the part of the allies, these bills represent the most serious blow against national efficiency and preparedness against national disaster.

Here is an interesting letter from the Clothcraft Shops, Cleveland, Ohio. It takes up various phases of this question as applied to the health and the happiness of the laboring man, and, incidentally, to the possibility of accident. It has been claimed that men were speeded up and machines were speeded up until the liability to accident was very much greater than under the methods which ordinarily prevail. I think I can show that that is not true; at least, I have the testimony of many employers here to the effect that just the contrary is true. As to the health of the employees, there are numerous letters in this collection which say that on the average the health of the employees operating under this system has been demonstrated to be better than under the system which prevails elsewhere. Therefore, instead of being a detriment to the happiness of employees and a detriment to their health or a possible breeder of accidents, that charge would seem to fall to the ground. This man says, speaking of the happiness of the worker:

The happiness of the worker: The happiness and contentment of the worker has been materially improved. The knowledge of not only unimpeded opportunity but also of definite standards and other conditions under which they work, and the sure and high rewards which they receive, together with the entire change of attitude from old order of things, has made for us a body of workers that are not only above the average in spirit but whose apparent happiness has been remarked about by everyone. Time and again it has been stated by investigators and visitors that the group of workers in this plant are the happiest and most contented group of people they have ever seen anywhere. This change of attitude has been due entirely to the principle of cooperation based upon the mutuality of interests. Unhappiness is only experienced at such times when the workers think that there might be a change of conditions under which they work.

Then he speaks of the matter of health:

The health of the worker is not only apparent but has improved under the new order of things to such a degree as to be almost remarkable. The healthy appearance has not only caused remark by everyone who has seen our workers, but carefully kept medical records of follow-up show that the average state of health is far above that of the average in the community. This is definitely shown by the record of absentees for the first six months of 1915; the total number of absentees per day from all causes whatsoever average only 1.4 per cent of the pay roll.

Accidents, while never of serious nature, formerly were quite numerous. They have been reduced to practically nil, chiefly by the improved methods of instruction.

The wages of the workers have not only gone up to a far greater extent than in otherwise managed organizations and in the trade in general, but have increased enormously under the present type of management, and directly due to a fair basis and fair standards of requirement, standards being made possible by means of stop watch and other modes of scientific research.

Now I want to call the attention of the Senate to two or three letters from those whose particular business it is to teach scientific methods. This is a letter from the director of the

Amos Tuck School of Administration and Finance in Dartmouth College, H. S. Person, in which he says:

I have never been in charge of an industrial plant, nor have I practiced management engineering; therefore what I have to say is not based upon that sort of experience. I have, however, in order to acquaint myself with scientific management for the purpose of instruction, visited many plants, talked with workmen, and made observations, particularly with respect to the effect of scientific management upon the workman. My conclusions are as follows with respect to the Taylor system of management, in which is used the stop watch for time study and in which is applied some form of premium or bonus wage payment:

(a) The happiness of the worker is greater than under conventional management.

(b) The health of the worker seems to average better than under conventional management.

(c) The statistical record of accidents shows that they are less under the Taylor system of management.

(d) Wages are greater for a given expenditure of time and energy.

(e) Hours of labor vary in different plants, according to the industry, but for any given industry seem to be less than for the average of that industry.

(f) The output is greater per hour of application of labor.

(g) The unit cost of the product is less than under conventional management.

(h) The quality of product is better than under conventional forms of management, for the reason that its method of inspection eliminates defective work.

I have a similar letter from the man occupying the same relative position at the University of Michigan and a similar letter from the Efficiency Society of New York.

Here is a very interesting letter from an electrical engineer with whom I am well acquainted, a neighbor of mine in Boston, relating to this subject. I want to read part of it, because it has some ideas which I have not noted in other similar letters.

So far as my experience goes in really scientific management, it is nothing more nor less than higher education of the workman, and makes him just as much more valuable to himself as scientifically directed exercise makes a man stronger physically, and to a greater degree than by any other modern invention the workman necessarily receives the greater part of the saving effected.

In relation to the stop watch and the general study for greater efficiency, it seems to me it would be easy to convince any intelligent and honest labor leader that the results of these studies are in every respect exactly the same as the employment of new labor-saving machinery.

It is just as sensible for the workmen to oppose scientific management and the stop watch for increasing production as it would be to oppose the use of any labor-saving machinery.

The one preponderating industrial advantage of the United States over the rest of the world and our ability to pay the highest wages is our greater use of labor-saving machinery and methods.

It must be self-evident to everybody if nothing is made there is nothing to divide, and it is generally true that the greater the amount of production the easier it should be for the workmen to get a reasonable share.

The effect of any restriction of the manner and methods of doing work in case of a great emergency—any limit of the speed of production—might be the determining factor of the contest.

The intense application and study of machinery and methods in my own experience have been known to increase mechanical productions a thousand per cent in a few weeks, and in every case this increased efficiency has gone hand in hand with an increase of the wages of the workmen on the job.

I hope that purely on the basis of the workmen's benefit that no legislation will be passed limiting in any way the employment of efficiency methods in Government work.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. May I ask who is the author of this letter?

Mr. WEEKS. Yes; the person who signed it is Norman Marshall.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Is he a machinist?

Mr. WEEKS. He is a practical machinist himself. He was employed as such as a younger man, as I recall. He is an electrical engineer now.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. He is not now engaged in the business? He is the boss of the shop, and not an employee?

Mr. WEEKS. He has run a shop. I think he is a consulting engineer now.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Yes; he is not a practical working mechanic to-day?

Mr. WEEKS. Not to-day; no.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. No; I thought that was the case.

Mr. WEEKS. But I will read some letters from practical working mechanics. I do not wish to take up much time, and I am afraid I am boring the Senate, but I want to demonstrate that there is not a syllable of opposition to this efficiency measure, except from the leaders in the labor field to whom I have referred.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President—

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. May I not answer that there is no opposition to my proposition except from a few wealthy employers?

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I am going to read some letters from employees in the Watertown Arsenal, and employees in

other plants where this system is in operation, in which they say that it gives entire approval.

Mr. REED. Will the Senator also, at the same time, read from the House report showing that Gen. Crozier practically extorted some of those letters?

Mr. WEEKS. I will not read that. I will let the Senator from Missouri read it, if he cares to, in his time.

Mr. REED. I shall be glad to submit it.

Mr. WEEKS. I do not believe Gen. Crozier ever extorted anything from anybody, but the House report may have so stated.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President—

Mr. WEEKS. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not think the Senator from Massachusetts is boring the Senate. I think he is giving his view of a very important subject, and it is much more fundamental than has hitherto been suggested. I want the Senator from Massachusetts to give the Senate some information along this line before he reads the letter that he has in view.

The Taylor system of efficiency, or any other system of efficiency of that character, embraces a great many other things than a stop watch or a bonus?

Mr. WEEKS. Yes. A stop watch is only an incident to the system.

Mr. CUMMINS. Now, I want the Senator from Massachusetts to tell the Senate just what the stop watch is used for and just how the employees secure the bonus or reward which is proposed to be prohibited by the House bill.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. The Senate bill.

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not think the laboring men of this country are opposed to systems of efficiency, but a great many of them are opposed to the stop watch used for the purposes for which it is used.

Mr. WEEKS. Let me ask the Senator right there what does he understand the stop watch is used for?

Mr. CUMMINS. I am asking the Senator from Massachusetts, and I would be very glad to have his view of it before I express my own. He is on the floor and I would like to have him expound the subject first.

Mr. WEEKS. I will do that, Mr. President, with great pleasure. Let us suppose that a man is making some kind of a machine tool and is employed in the Watertown Arsenal for that purpose. The raw material might be over in that corner of the room. One of the first studies made would be whether if that man walked to the corner of the room and brought his material to his machine and put it in the machine the loss of time in bringing the material there was sufficient to warrant the employment of a helper, a lower-priced man. Then there would be the manner of carrying the product after it went through his machine to the next machine in which it was treated, and then to the next machine, the locations of each of those machines so that there should be no turning back and no change in the general course of the material on the way to completion. All of those things are carefully studied out before the watch is used at all.

It takes much longer to stoop and pick up material and put it in a machine than it would if the material were placed on a level so that the employee would not have to stoop at all. All those things are matters that are included in the preliminary studies.

As an illustration, in a report made on this subject relating to women sewing, if there were a dozen sewing it might produce a saving if one expert woman threaded the needles, and, again, to determine how long the thread should be. Of course it goes without saying if at every stitch a woman takes she draws her arm to its full length, she would not take as many stitches as she would if the thread were 15 inches long or 18 inches long. There is some length which can be given that thread to get the greatest and most efficient result.

All those things are simply studies that are undertaken before the watch is used. Then, having worked out all these primary processes, Blank is selected to go ahead and do the process under the system which has been developed which would prevent any waste in time in the methods of handling material, and so forth. How long it takes Blank to do it is ascertained, and then another man is brought in, and there is where the stop watch is used. First A, then B, then C, then D, then E, will do that very same thing in exactly the same way.

Now, if they are average men, and it takes, we will say, 200 minutes for them to complete the process, it is assumed that 200 minutes is the fair time for the average man to do that piece of work. There the watch stops.

Let us suppose that F comes in and does the same piece of work in 170 minutes. Then F gets the benefit of the difference.

The only objection that I can see to the method used at Watertown is that the workmen did not get all the benefit over and

above what the average man can produce. For instance, as I recall it, we will say that 20 minutes of the time under 200 minutes is taken by the Government, and if he produced a result in 160 minutes then he got the bonus that went with the 20 minutes between 160 and 180 minutes. In many cases the reduction in time was very materially greater than that. In some cases the men added 50 per cent to their average wage under this bonus system.

But the stop watch is not used after they determine what an average man can do.

While I do not know, and I do not want to state it as a final proposition, I doubt if the stop watch has been used in the Watertown Arsenal for two years, or that there has been any occasion for it. It may have been used in some new process that was being undertaken. Practically speaking, it is not used, and I have related the only purpose it is used for.

It has been heralded abroad that the stop watch was used to find out what could be done with the man who may have the greatest speed, and then somebody stood over others with a watch to see if they could make that speed, and that that is the common practice. There is nothing of that kind done. It is simply used to determine the average time it takes an average man to perform a given piece of work.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Will the Senator permit me a moment?

Mr. WEEKS. Yes.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. The Ford operation the Senator instanced I saw carried out at the San Francisco Fair. That was an advertisement of the company to show that they could assemble machinery, I think, every 10 minutes. I saw them start with the wheels on a double platform, and one would drop out and another man would go on. It was an advertisement for the Ford Manufacturing Co., but that human flesh was strained to a degree in order to accomplish it no one could have stood by for a single moment without admitting it to be the fact.

Mr. WEEKS. I walked along with those men during the assembling of that car or the assembling of a dozen cars. I was tremendously interested in the manner of the assembling of those cars. It seemed to me to be about the finest piece of efficiency I had ever seen, and to say that any man was hurried is absolutely untrue.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I do not say they were hurried, but I think the Senator or myself with our rotund capacity would have been very much hurried.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

Mr. WEEKS. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED. The Senator is discussing the method of assembling the Ford car. I ask him if he means to say to us that the Taylor system is in vogue in the Ford factories?

Mr. WEEKS. I do not know that it is the Taylor system, or the Brown system, or the White system, or the Black system; but it is a system that takes account of the waste of a single movement.

Mr. REED. Does it appear that that is the method we are now discussing, or is it merely a method that has been devised in Mr. Ford's shops for the assembling of his cars?

Mr. WEEKS. I am sure I do not know what the name of the system is, but it is a system, an orderly way of procedure.

Mr. REED. Then the Senator is merely discussing the question of organized efficiency and not professing to tell us that the system in the Ford factory is the system it is proposed to prohibit or encourage, as the case may be, by this bill.

Mr. WEEKS. I am discussing efficiency. Mr. Taylor is dead. He went to his reward years ago. I do not know that his system is being used or where it is being used. I do not know anything about it. I am talking about efficiency.

Mr. THOMAS. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment? I should like to inquire of the Senator from Missouri whether the construction of the proviso which is under consideration is that it applies only to the Taylor system. My reading of it is that it prohibits the use of any system and all systems.

Mr. REED. My understanding is that the House amendment is intended to have a practical application to the conditions existing in at least one of the arsenals where a system that is either the Taylor system or a modification of the Taylor system has been installed by which some alleged expert determines how long it ought to take a man to do a particular piece of work, and thereupon he is set at that work and when the time has elapsed within which under the order of this expert the work shall be concluded, the watch that is keeping the time of the workman is stopped, so that he gets no credit for any time beyond that period. I understand that to be the stop-watch method, and that that method is in vogue in one of the arsenals, and to stop that the House put in the provision which the Senate committee proposes to strike out.

Mr. THOMAS. That is my understanding.

Mr. WEEKS. I have just stated, I do not know whether the Senator from Missouri heard me, that I doubt very much except possibly in some new study whether the stop watch has been used at the Watertown Arsenal for two years. I have not heard of its being done, though it is possible it has been done.

Mr. REED. Let me add, if the Senator will pardon me, if the stop watch is not being used in any of these arsenals, and if the bill as it came from the House provides that the stop watch shall not be used, it will change nothing if we leave it in the bill as the House wrote it; it will change no condition. There is manifestly an object in striking out the House provision, and there is likewise an object in the Senator's speech.

Mr. WEEKS. Undoubtedly; and if the Senator will be good enough to listen I will tell him what the reason is. New processes are undertaken all the time in arsenals, some new piece of machinery or some new tool is to be manufactured in a different form than the article that was previously manufactured. It is necessary to determine the time that it should require to manufacture it. So in that case a stop watch might be used.

Then again, this system has not been installed in the Rock Island Arsenal or in the Watervliet Arsenal, and only to a minor extent in other arsenals. If it works well at Watertown, of course, it is desirable that it should be installed elsewhere.

Mr. REED. The Senator has just said that they did not have it at Watertown.

Mr. WEEKS. I said to the Senator that they had had it at the Watertown Arsenal, and they had determined the time it will require to do these processes, and having done so it was not necessary to use the stop watch in those processes which had been examined and the time determined.

Now, I will yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. CUMMINS. I rose to remark to the Senator from Massachusetts, as far as the particular proviso is concerned in its relation to the stop watch it would have very little effect anyhow, because it simply suspends the pay of the officer holding the stop watch while he is holding it, and that would be a very immaterial matter. But I think the spirit of the proviso goes much further and is directed against the system. I want to consider it from that point of view rather than from the technical interpretation of the proviso itself.

Mr. WEEKS. I think it should be so considered. I think the stop watch has been worked overtime in the criticism of this system.

Mr. CUMMINS. The Senator from Massachusetts has about the same understanding I have of the office of a stop watch under this system. The evil, of course, if there is an evil, is not in the preliminary efficiency arrangement so that there will be the least possible movement or least possible unnecessary movement. The labor leaders with whom I am acquainted at least have no objection to efficiency in its most pronounced form. They have no objection to so adjusting all the parts of a factory that there will be the least possible loss of energy.

However, I want the Senator's opinion on this point, because I am really looking for light. The difficulty is in the erection of a standard for wages. It is in the attempt to arrive at an average man's work. I do not think that can be done. I think the whole purpose and effect will certainly be to hold every man to a higher standard than the average man is capable of reaching.

Mr. WEEKS. Now, let me ask the Senator a question. What does the Senator think of this as an answer to that proposition? Substantially every man who works under the bonus system at the Watertown Arsenal makes a bonus over and above what is considered an average man's work. The average increase is about 25 per cent; in some cases as much as 50 per cent. If the average man is overworked, how is it possible that all these people can earn more money?

Mr. CUMMINS. That might very easily be explained by the efficiency readjustment, scientifically arranging the work for the men.

Mr. WEEKS. That efficiency readjustment is made as far as possible before the time is set.

Mr. CUMMINS. Precisely, and therefore the stop watch is absolutely unnecessary to accomplish those reforms. It can be used and is used for no other purpose than to erect a high standard, which, I am told—I have no practical experience—no man can reach.

Mr. WEEKS. There is not a man in the Watertown Arsenal, except one or two plumbers' helpers, who does not get it.

Mr. CUMMINS. That is greatly to the credit of the superintendent. He must be a very humane man. That is not true, I am sure, generally where the system is in vogue.

Mr. WEEKS. Let me suggest this to the Senator from Iowa. Suppose he wants to determine how long it would take a man

to mow an acre of ground, how will he arrive at the time an average man would take to mow an acre of grass unless he uses a watch?

Mr. CUMMINS. There is no such thing as an average time it would take for a man to mow an acre of grass. If you would have two men and they would each mow an acre of grass, the same kind of grass and the same kind of ground, you could of course divide the aggregate time by two and get an average. If you employ 100 men or 500 men in order to get anything like an average time—

Mr. WEEKS. That is not an absolutely accurate statement. Half a dozen men would come pretty near it in the average time.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like, if the Senator will permit me, to ask the Senator from Idaho to what report he referred?

Mr. BORAH. I referred to the hearings before the Committee on Labor.

Mr. NORRIS. Is that the Committee on Labor of the Senate?

Mr. BORAH. No; the Committee on Labor of the House.

Mr. NORRIS. In what year?

Mr. BORAH. In the year 1916—under date of March 30 to April 1, 1916.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I am going to read some letters that I have received from employees, which other Senators may have received, and entirely without solicitation on my part. I do not know the writers of such letters in any case, with one exception; but I wish to read what they say about this efficiency system. The first letter I shall read is as follows:

90 PROSPECT STREET,
Somerville, Mass., April 28, 1916.

Hon. JOHN W. WEEKS,
United States Senator, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I take this opportunity to write you, hoping that in so doing I may be able to give you some information that will be of help to you when the honorable body of which you are a member is called to pass judgment upon it.

I refer to the bill about to be introduced in Congress by Congressman TAVENNER, of Illinois, seeking to abolish the system as applied at the Watertown Arsenal. To interfere in any way with the present existing conditions would be a serious blow, both to the management who, by the present system, is enabled to keep and refer to records, a privilege enjoyed by outside competing firms, and a great financial loss to the employees who benefit by it.

During the past year, out of 178 employees, 134 working on a premium basis received 27 per cent over and above their daily rate without any apparent effort other than would be necessary to perform a day's work without the system. While there may be some of the men who, through obligations placed upon them, by what some call "organized effort," do not want to go on record for or against, they sincerely hope that they will be allowed to enjoy the benefits made possible by the premium system.

Trusting that this matter will be considered from every angle, I remain,

Very truly, yours,

JAMES MCFARLAND.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Who is the writer of that letter?

Mr. WEEKS. He is an employee, I understand, at the Watertown Arsenal. I do not know him; I never saw him. Here is another letter, which is as follows:

16 LADD STREET,
Watertown, Mass., April 21, 1916.

Hon. JOHN W. WEEKS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In February of 1915 I took the liberty of addressing some communications to the Members of Congress upon the question of the abolition of the so called Taylor or premium system, then and at present in force at the United States Arsenal at Watertown, Mass., where I am now and for 20 years past have been employed as a machinist. The opponents of the present premium system were not successful in that attempt to abolish it, and we have continued to enjoy its benefits from that time to the present.

Another attempt, however, is now being made to deprive us of the benefit of this premium system, and it is for the purpose of enlisting your voice and vote in favor of the system and for the benefit of those of us, by far the majority of the employees of the Arsenal, who have prospered under the beneficent provisions of the premium system that I now address you.

Permit me, therefore, to briefly set forth some of the facts concerning the situation as I know it to exist at the Watertown Arsenal. There is at present employed about 178 machinists; of this number 134 are working under and are in favor of retaining the present premium system.

The balance of the employees are largely in favor of retaining the present systems, but for personal reasons do not wish to take an active part in an effort to retain it or to be openly identified as its supporters. A very small part of the present working force desire the abolition of the present system.

I am not going to state the reasons why this small minority runs counter to the wishes of the great majority of the employees. Their reasons for so doing might be ascertained.

In common with the others who are in favor of the present system, I have been able to earn an average of 27 per cent over ordinary wages, and that, too, without feeling that I have at all overworked myself. I desire, as do the other employees who desire that the present system be retained, to spend my time while in the shop in an earnest effort to render a good day's service for a good day's wage and to reap the benefit that comes to me as a result of the system now in vogue by continued, conscientious effort. I do not feel at all as if I were a slave driven to my utmost endeavor by a hard-hearted taskmaster; rather do I enjoy my work, conscious that by its fair performance and possibly

a little added effort I may win the prize which will more than compensate me for any extra care or diligence that I may exercise. I have been reaping these benefits since the installation of this premium system, and I desire for the benefit of myself and my family to continue to reap them in the future; and I feel, as does a great majority of my coworkers, that the right to earn these premiums should not be taken from us arbitrarily upon the invitation of a few men who are either ignorant or of entirely misinformed regarding this matter which so vitally concerns the interest of the workers at this Arsenal. There is, save for the discontent of these few men, a feeling of harmony existing at the Watertown Arsenal between those in authority and the workers which is unsurpassed, I believe, in any other governmental or private institution in the country. These relations will be shattered if the present system is abolished, and they ought not, I respectfully submit, to be disturbed.

Under the present system the records of the men are open to the inspection of those who have the right to see them, and each individual is assured that his earning capacity is limited only by the length of the working-day and his own faithfulness and diligence.

You will not find among those who desire the abolition of the present system any of the employees who have, by faithful work, earned and merited substantial premiums, but you will find among the agitators for the destruction of the present situation those who have not earned premiums and who are contented seemingly to do as little for their day's wages as they possibly can do and retain their positions. In these days "efficiency," which, after all, means common sense and skill applied to the task in hand and lack of waste in its performance, is a slogan of all industrial concerns. Private enterprises employ efficiency experts to advise employers, not so much on the question of speeding up the workers as of conserving the workers' energies and directing them intelligently to the end that greater production may be had. If the wishes of the opponents of the present premium system are heeded and the system itself abolished, the Government will find itself, in competition with private enterprises, unable to compete with them in the open market, because of the better conditions which obtain in private shops and the lack of incentive in governmental shops to the worker to give the best that there is in him, skillfully, energetically, and cheerfully.

We produce at the Watertown Arsenal under the conditions which now obtain in a manner and to an extent second to none under normal conditions. I predict that if the present system is abolished the best men, the ambitious men, will leave the governmental employ and will seek other fields where their skill and fidelity will be recognized and more worthily compensated. At the Watertown Arsenal we have no real grievances.

If the workers individually or collectively feel that they have a grievance they are encouraged by those in authority to make that grievance known. If it is a just one, it is remedied; if it is unjust, the injustice of it is pointed out and the men are ordinarily satisfied.

This spirit of helpful cooperation will be destroyed, in my judgment, by the abolition of the present system.

I have never known conditions, during my 20 years of service in the Watertown Arsenal, to be as satisfactory as a whole to the workers as they have been during the past four years, during which time we have worked under the premium system.

For these reasons I appeal to you to work to sustain and keep in force the present premium system of wages in the shops of the Government. The basis of the pending bill to abolish this system can not be an intimate knowledge of what it accomplished, and I respectfully submit that its passage would destroy the great benefits which we now enjoy, would take away from us the worthy ambition which we now possess, and would be a grave wrong, since it would, by reducing our income, seriously affect our future welfare, our happiness, and that of those dependent upon us.

Respectfully, yours,

JOHN DRISCOLL.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I ask to whom the letter which the Senator from Massachusetts has just read is addressed?

Mr. WEEKS. That letter is addressed to me, and the previous letter also was addressed to me. I do not know the writer of the previous letter at all. I have here some additional letters—

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. WEEKS. Yes.

Mr. GALLINGER. I took occasion a little time ago to print in the Record numerous letters from individuals, most of them employees, on this subject, and I have since then received other letters which I have not presented. Personally I have felt that the effort to abolish this system was a mistaken movement, along the line of making the least efficient man the standard for all the others; and I do not think that is good policy. I think the men who are opposing this are making a great mistake so far as the interests of the workmen are concerned.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, may I ask a question just on that point?

Mr. WEEKS. Yes.

Mr. CUMMINS. The letter which has just been read indicates a very emphatic approval of the bonus system; that is, these employees, I take it, are working by the piece?

Mr. WEEKS. Not by the piece at all, but by the bonus system, which is an entirely different process.

Mr. CUMMINS. I can not quite understand that, because if they are given a bonus it must be because they have turned out during the day more than the standard required.

Mr. WEEKS. The difference is that the piece system pays a man so much for doing a certain piece of work, for instance, making a tool or something of that sort, while the bonus system pays him a premium for completing a process within a particular time.

Mr. CUMMINS. Precisely, but when he finishes his day's work, according to the standard, he has accomplished so much; it does not make any difference whether you call it by the piece or not, and if he has done 27 per cent more than the standard requires, he gets 27 per cent more pay than has been fixed for the product of a day's work.

Mr. WEEKS. Yes.

Mr. CUMMINS. The Senator must see that the stop watch is not at all essential and necessary to the operation of a system like that.

Mr. WEEKS. I am not making any advocacy of the stop watch or any other particular part of this system, but I think the stop watch is one of the incidents which it is desirable to use in arranging the system.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, that system has been in force for 50 years to my knowledge—

Mr. WEEKS. The piece system?

Mr. CUMMINS. Without ever calling it an efficiency system; that is, paying a man according to the work he does during the day, instead of paying him a certain wage for the entire day. That is as old as the hills.

Mr. WEEKS. I think I will not take any further time to distinguish between the piece system and the bonus system, although there is quite a marked difference in the results obtained. I understand that organized labor does not object to the piece system as operated under the method which the Senator suggests he has known about.

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not want the Senator to misunderstand me. I recognize the difference between the piece system and the bonus system, although they are founded upon the same principle. For instance, my father was a carpenter, and when I was a young man I was a carpenter, too, but any man who hired the two of us would pay him more than he would pay me. Why? Because he could do more work in a day than I could do. That is the bonus system.

Mr. WEEKS. Did the Senator object to that?

Mr. CUMMINS. I did not.

Mr. WEEKS. Then the Senator ought not to object to this system. I do not know whether he does object or not, but he ought not to do so.

Mr. CUMMINS. That does not follow, because I hope we make progress as the years go on; but I am simply using that to illustrate the fact that there is no difference in principle in paying one man more than another, if he is more competent than another, and paying a man by the piece.

Mr. WEEKS. I have here, Mr. President, some other letters from employees. I will read half a dozen of them. These letters were not written to me; they were written to different people, one of them being the secretary of the Scientific Management Society, Mr. W. H. Gruel. The following letter was written to Mr. Ray B. Fraser. It is signed by S. F. Gilla, who, in expressing his views about scientific management, says:

With my experience in scientific management have found a betterment of conditions in S. C. Env. Co. very efficient in labor and produce. With my part of work at time study on task and bonus have found it very interesting and educating.

The old method of payment means just one pay envelope on pay day, while the bonus plan makes a willing worker and puts an extra red envelope into his hands with lots to gain and nothing to lose.

Here is a letter from Pearl Hoey, employed at Hamden, Conn., by the Acme Wire Co. The writer says:

I have been employed by the Acme Wire Co. for the past two years and where the bonus system is used, and I must say I like it very much, as it makes the work very interesting, resulting in increased production for the company and a higher rate for the employee.

It has not in any way interfered with my health, as the time limit is based on a fair average of the operator's skill.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. The writer of that letter is employed in a private plant?

Mr. WEEKS. Yes; in a private plant. Here is a letter signed by H. C. Hawes, who seems to be an employee of the Sewell-Clapp Envelope Co. In the letter he says:

There is no place in scientific management for the lazy man or any one looking for a soft job, but there are good positions made every day for the honest worker, whether he be a laborer or mechanic, and under the task and bonus-payment plan the extra recompense for his extra efforts. I would not have you think from this remark that you are driven or overworked, but, as in our factory, the improved conditions, due entirely to improvements made in the tools and equipment, make an increased production with less effort or work to the employee, whomever he may be; and not that alone, but it opens the way to better positions for men of every phase of employment who can handle themselves in positions of trust and authority.

I can speak without a possible chance of contradiction, of my own position, after showing the engineers that I could work under and with their plans, my position as a foreman under long hours was improved, and I was placed in one of the most responsible positions in our plant and my hours changed from nine and one-half hours to eight hours a day, and giving me the opportunity to increase my earning capacity and my future fixed if I continue to be honest and on the job.

Here is a letter from a man who styles himself a "gang boss." He is from New Haven, Conn., and writes as follows:

As gang boss for the past five years, I have had a very good opportunity to study the conditions of which an operator has to work under, both before and after this system had been installed in this factory, and I am glad to say that I have found every one of my operators to be better satisfied since working under this system. There has also been less strain on the operators and gang boss due to the fact that before this system was installed the gang boss would never know whether his operators were producing enough work to satisfy his employers, and the result would be that he would be pushing them for more work continuously, and as the gang boss has no way of telling just what an operator should produce, all he could do would be to use good judgment. But not so with the stop-watch and bonus system; it is different. The operator knows just what he has to do, and the gang boss also; there is no pushing for work, the operator has plenty of time to do his work in and plenty of fatigue allowance.

My operators also make more money and do not have to work so hard, and the result is that they are healthier, better dressed, and more prosperous, and thereby also become better citizens.

That letter is signed by John George Kries.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator what occasion there was for all these letters being poured in on him?

Mr. WEEKS. They have been collected by various people who are interested in preventing the Senate taking the foolish action which they fear it will take.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. In other words, they have been instigated by people who are interested in perpetuating the Taylor system?

Mr. WEEKS. They are sent here by people who are interested in building up efficiency management in this country.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. And in perpetuating the Taylor system?

Mr. WEEKS. I am not talking about the Taylor system. Some of them do not mention it.

Here is a letter from a man in Whitneyville, Conn. His name is Torvald Hoyer, and he works for the Acme Co. I will not read his entire letter, but just certain paragraphs of it, as follows:

I started to work for a concern that was putting in a bonus system (Taylor system) in 1912. When I started to work the shop was still on daywork basis, and all the jobs were daywork. I was at that time earning \$8 a week, but a few weeks later I was transferred to some part of the shop where they all worked on piecework. After a little experience I could here earn from \$11 to \$13, but when the whistle blew at night I would be all tired out because I started in full speed in the morning and kept it going as long as possible in order to get as big an amount done as possible, but I would always be too tired to go anywhere at night.

After a while the company was ready to put the whole factory on bonus basis, and I started to work after the new system, together with the whole room. At first we did not like it at all, but after a week had passed we all found out that we were not only making the same money and doing the same quantity of work but we never got tired out as we used to, because there was a certain time set to do the operation in, which made us start in with a speed that would enable us to finish the job in time, and by keeping it going with that speed all day we would most of the time produce more than we did after the piecework system without being tired out, and after the bonus system we would always be sure to get at least our day-rate pay, even if we had bad luck with the work or didn't feel good, as we were always paid our day rate even if we didn't make the job in bonus time (the time the operator is allowed for a certain operation). The bonus time was set by a time-study clerk who timed two or three medium operators with a stop watch. He did not only time the whole operation, but he also timed every necessary movement the operator did to do the operation, and by doing so he would get the exact time it would take any medium operator to do the job. On top of that was allowed a certain per cent for lost time, etc., so by any means this was the only fair way to set the time. It was fair to the operator because she or he could be sure that it was the right time for the operation, and it was fair to the company because they were sure to get the work done in the time it ought to be.

There is more of it, but I will not read more. I gave the name of the signer.

Here is a girl named Theresa Godino, who works for the Acme Wire Co., of Hamden, Conn. She says:

I have worked four years at machine work for the Acme Wire Co. The last three years under the Taylor bonus system I have made more money under better conditions than the first year I worked here.

I have worked on piecework in another factory, and I am better satisfied with the bonus system here.

Alma Wetherbee, of New Haven, Conn., says:

In regard to the use of the Taylor system, I want to say that I have worked under the said system for three and one-half years, and like it. As far as its being injurious to the health, I have not found it so; instead, find it gives one more ambition and makes the days shorter.

Hoping that the system will not be discontinued, I remain,
Yours, truly,

ALMA WETHERBEE.

Here is a girl named Nellie Miller, of South Brewer, Me. She writes this letter to Mr. Keppeler Hall. I do not know who he is.

In December of 1914 we began work under the "Taylor system." Of course, at first we did not favor the system, but I think we were justified, because at that time we were unable to understand its advantages. It was very difficult to figure the time correctly, and as we had been used to working piecework it was quite a matter to get the orders completed on time.

However, as time went on we began to appreciate the "Taylor system" inasmuch that we were able to turn out more work for the company and enjoy a better salary, thereby benefiting both the company and its employees.

Under this scientific management the service department was installed, which includes numerous benefits for us. The working hours have been shortened, the sanitary conditions are much improved, one of the main benefits being derived from a well-equipped hospital and trained nurse. A great deal of pleasure is gotten from the library and sport club, giving the advantages of good reading, wholesome exercise, and a social hour now and then.

I am not going to take the time of the Senate to read any more of those letters. I should like permission to put any of them that I think desirable in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARDWICK in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See appendix.)

Mr. WEEKS. I think I have enough communications of that kind, coming from various sources and all of similar tenor, to fill several CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS.

Mr. President, I have taken much more time than I intended in this discussion. I want to say that I have no interest in this matter except to further the Government's interests in the manufacturing enterprises which it undertakes. I think myself that it would be a piece of folly to prevent the Government's adopting the efficient methods which are being adopted by our own manufacturers and which have been so successfully used abroad. Here we are practically compelling the Government to do certain of its manufacturing itself. We have practically provided that it shall build its own ships, for example, at its own navy yards by providing ways and other equipment for that purpose; and if we adopt this proposition, preventing the Government using the methods which have proved efficient elsewhere, we are going to increase tremendously the cost of our Navy and the cost of everything we manufacture for our military establishment. We are not only going to add to the cost, but we are going to delay the obtaining of the material which the Government needs. It is a piece of folly from beginning to end, and I sincerely hope the Senate will not adopt the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. WEEKS subsequently said:

Mr. President, I ask permission to include in my remarks a table relating to the men employed under the bonus system in the Watertown Arsenal, and also the paragraph of the bill which was stricken out by the Senate committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, permission is granted.

The table referred to is as follows:

	Number employed on premium work.	Average premium over and above regular pay expressed as a percentage of the latter.	Percentage of all the work done which was performed under premium.
Molders.....	9	27.62	72.48
Machinists.....	164	24.13	55.15
Machinist's helpers.....	25	22.29	8.90
Blacksmiths.....	10	19.68	33.39
Blacksmith's helpers.....	11	21.32	30.34
Molder's helpers.....	8	33.16	6.46
Chippers.....	10	31.97	38.97
Laborers.....	31	28.61	22.95
Toolmakers.....	4	20.99	7.13
Machine operators.....	2	17.88	97.51
Screw makers.....	1	35.30	99.75
Machinist's apprentices.....	1	1.90	82.04
Furnace helpers.....	2	27.35	19.25
Apprentice molders.....	1	11.64	57.01
Core makers.....	1	33.33	2.01
Firemen.....	1	25.34	17.35
Steam-hammer drivers.....	1	24.11	39.58
Skilled workmen.....	6	26.98	27.94
Painters.....	4	23.21	31.29
Carpenter's helpers.....	1	43.12	5.75
Carpenters.....	2	27.95	15.78
Toolsmiths.....	2	33.39	18.56
Mason's helpers.....	1	35.97	30.42
Teamsters.....	4	31.26	97.48
Plumber's helpers.....	1	35
Riggers.....	1	32.14	47.28
Skilled laborers.....	1	32.38	14.12
Engineers, locomotive crane.....	1	32.36	47.12
Gang bosses.....	10	10.70	29.43

APPENDIX.

Hon. JOHN W. WEEKS. BIRD & SON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.
East Walpole, Mass., December 15, 1915.

MY DEAR MR. WEEKS: I hope you will exert your influence against the proposed enactment of a provision requiring the insertion in all Government contracts for material and other work, of a clause stipulating that no work shall be performed under the Taylor and other systems involving time study and premium plans.

Industrial organizations in the past have been largely autocratic. Industrial unrest is a protest against this autocracy of government. Scientific management is the first step toward making more fair and just the relation between the elements that make up the industrial organization.

The world is everywhere working toward democracy. Industrial organizations, somewhat more slowly, are tending the same way. In the political world we suffer from inefficient democracy; but we can stand the strain, and experience will finally show us the way to efficient democracy. In industrial management we have got to jump the period of inefficiency which unformed democratic control would bring. And it is through the application of the principles of scientific management that we are going to leap this gap.

The time study and premium plan of wage payment is an important principle in scientific management, and is a step in the right direction toward giving individuals greater liberty and opportunity to earn what their service demands. From this the inevitable development is toward industrial democracy.

To pass any such provision as is proposed is totally opposed to the spirit of our Government, which should place itself not in opposition to the development of a better chance for the individual in industries and furthering the idea of industrial democracy, but should do everything possible to support it and stand on the side of progress and enlightenment.

Yours, very truly,

CHARLES S. BIRD, JR.

SOUTH WEYMOUTH, MASS., December 24, 1915.

Hon. JOHN W. WEEKS,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We wish to enter our protest against, and express ourselves as flatly in opposition to, the bills which presumably will be introduced by the so-called friends of labor, and which will demand special provisions that all kinds of work, etc., placed by the Government, must be contracted for in establishments not conducted under scientific-shop management.

We represent about 325 satisfied employees who are trying to work cooperatively with us to better conditions through the application of scientific-management methods.

It is our belief that any action of the kind under consideration would be a distinct backward step.

Yours, truly,

THE STETSON SHOE CO.
A. C. HEALD, Treasurer.

HERMANN, AUKAM & Co.,
Lebanon, Pa., April 27, 1916.

Mr. JOHN W. WEEKS,
Committee on Military Affairs,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: England's recent bitter experience of industrial inefficiency and our own present needs inspire me to protest against the ill-considered efforts to hamper by means of congressional legislation the growth of American industrial leadership. I refer to the attempt to bar the use of stop watches, bonus and premium payment plans, and similar aids to the realization of scientific management from Government plants and Government work. Economic ignorance can be the only excuse for this ultimately futile attempt to turn backward the wheels of progress.

With our minds on the possibilities of our present delicate international situation, and with the knowledge that, scientifically organized and encouraged, American industry now has and will have the markets of the world at its feet, we would do well to reflect on the economic meaning of some of the following facts taken, for example, from the experience of Herrmann, Aukam & Co.'s Lebanon factory, manufacturing handkerchiefs: Production increased 150 per cent within two years, mainly through the application of bonus work and the establishment of standards by means of the stop watch; wages of employees increased in ratios varying from 25 to 150 per cent; continuous employment assured; individual capabilities watched and developed; working conditions bettered—surroundings made more sanitary and cheerful; just treatment of employees assured—possibility of discrimination and oppression eliminated; cost of product being learned and reduced; quality of product greatly bettered—better value delivered to the consumer; service to customers much improved.

The labor turnover among the employees affected by scientific management in our plant is much smaller than among those not affected, meaning that the employees themselves like it. There is a real demand in our plant for the extension of stop-watch methods.

Maximum production of high quality at low cost, going hand in hand with higher wages, good working conditions, and satisfied employees are the net results of scientific management. In their larger aspects these mean American industrial supremacy and freedom from the fear that an international crisis will find manufacturers unready and their workers unwilling, as was the case with England.

Very truly, yours,

D. J. WALSH, JR.

AMERICAN ELECTROCHEMICAL SOCIETY,
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
Niagara Falls, N. Y., July 13, 1916.

THE TAVENNER AND VAN DYKE BILLS.

The American Electrochemical Society, through its committee on public relations, wishes to present its earnest protest against the Tavenner bill—H. R. 8665—and the Van Dyke bill—H. R. 8677.

Humanity's progress and welfare are dependent in a great degree on the effective and economical utilization of time and of materials; the reduction of waste in human efforts and in material resources is therefore of first importance.

The watch for the measurement of time is no less important than is the balance for the measurement of materials, and to deprive any branch of industry of either of these instruments would be to place that branch under such a handicap that its welfare must necessarily suffer.

We therefore most earnestly request your best efforts in opposition to such legislation.

FRANCIS A. J. FITZGERALD,
Chairman.

EDWARD G. ACHESON,
LAWRENCE ADDICKS,
L. H. BAEKELAND,
CHARLES F. BURGESS,

HENRY S. CARHART,
CARL HERING,
F. A. LIBBURY,
WILLIAM H. WALKER,
W. R. WHITNEY,

Committee on Public Relations, American Electrochemical Society.

ROCHESTER, N. Y., July 5, 1916.

DEAR SENATOR: We are earnestly opposed to the riders attached to military and Post Office appropriation bills which forbid time study and bonus payments.

Everyone concedes that, in general, plants under scientific management (a) work shorter hours and (b) pay higher wages than others. The only real argument against time study and bonus payments apparently is the one that they injure the health of the workman. May we submit some very positive proof to the contrary?

Four and six years ago our employees submitted themselves to physical examination. We discharged no one because of poor health, but we did find a large number who were in very poor physical condition. Now, during these past four and six years we have been developing and extending scientific management. Of those in our employ who four and six years ago were in very poor health 52 were still in our employ in January, 1916, and at that time they were all re-examined. Our doctor, by our health records, is able to show and prove an actual improvement in the health of 51 out of the 52 above mentioned. This record seems astonishing, but it is true, and we have the evidence on file.

It is our sincere belief that scientific management is one of the greatest forces at work considering the real welfare of workers, and that the opposition to it is based on utter misunderstanding.

There has never been a time when efficiency was more needed in the country than now. Why pass antiefficiency legislation at this time? Surely, if bonus payments and time study really prove bad in the end, the Government can act later, as proposed, but why now?

We appeal to you on patriotic grounds and for the good of the workers of this country to oppose this legislation at this period.

Very truly, yours,

GERMAN-AMERICAN BETTON CO.,
HENRY T. NOYES, Treasurer.

KINAK MOTION PICTURE CO. (INC.),
New York, January 21, 1916.

A. W. KIMBER, Esq.,
Secretary Efficiency Society,
119 West Fortieth Street, New York City.

DEAR SIR: We understand that there is an aggressive labor lobby at Washington which would discredit scientific management and modern factory methods.

We believe that we personally sympathize more keenly with the employee than with the employer, and therefore are disappointed to see anything done that would be to the disadvantage of the employee. It certainly is to a man's own best interest to be paid for what he does; the abuses in our industrial system go back primarily to the fact that a man is not paid for what he does. The keynote to the efficiency plan of management is that a man should be paid for what he does, and next, what he does shall be increased to a larger aggregate and therefore to a larger advantage to himself merely by cutting out the lost motion due to lack of coordination of the parts. Unless the American and the American workman can learn the advantage of team play, he will be lost in the competition with the more efficient forces of the world, for we can never make something out of nothing. When men are brought together in groups the only protection that the individual has against abuses of favoritism, "pulls," and unjust treatment of every kind, is in an individual record of what he himself does, and in the enhancement of the value of his personal contribution by cutting out the wastes and lost motion which avail nobody. Such advantage as there may be in the individual pay roll is fully covered by scientific management.

Very truly, yours,

J. SHIRLEY EATON.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., July 18, 1916.

HON. JOHN W. WEEKS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: While I have no doubt that you can be depended on to use your influence in opposition to the Tavenner rider on the Army and Navy appropriation bill, I do want you to know that a great many of the Massachusetts manufacturers are watching this matter with keenest interest and are anxious that you should do everything you possibly can to prevent the passage of this un-American piece of legislation.

I am personally acquainted with a number of workmen at the Watertown Arsenal, and know that these workmen individually are very much in favor of the continuation of the scientific management at that plant, the reason being that they are getting considerably more money than they would under the other condition. The Government is also getting more for its money. In my opinion, this opposition to this method of wage payment is as futile as the breaking up of machinery in the early days of the introduction of machinery.

Yours, truly,

THE BLANCHARD MACHINE CO.,
WINSLOW BLANCHARD, President.

COMMITTEE OF TEN TO OPPOSE LEGISLATION
ANTAGONISTIC TO EFFICIENCY IN AMERICAN INDUSTRY,
New York, July 15, 1916.

HON. JOHN W. WEEKS,
The Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: In connection with the appropriation bills now under consideration, I would like to quote from a letter by Mr. John W. Higgins, president of the Worcester Pressed Steel Co., one of your constituents:

"My personal comment is this: This company has just completed contracts for over 1,000,000 4.5" British howitzer cases without one rejection, and more efficiently, expeditiously, and economically than any arsenal or any other plant in this country. The men earn double or treble their regular wages, through efficiency planning, stop-watch observation, and bonus payments. Twenty-four hours per day, two shifts, i. e. overtime payment, during strikes of five other local plants with 2,500 men out. When the agitators and hundreds of strikers gathered around our plant shouting '8 hours,' our men replied, '10 hours,' and wanted to drive the crowd away by force. We have used these efficiency methods for five years, to mutual satisfaction and freedom from all labor troubles. Our men would not give it up."

I will greatly appreciate if this matter can be called to the attention of the Senate in connection with the Tavenner rider to the naval and Army appropriation bills.

Yours, very truly,

W. HERMAN GREUL, Secretary.

NATIONAL METAL TRADES ASSOCIATION,
Boston, July 15, 1916.

HON. JOHN W. WEEKS,
Senator from Massachusetts,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In behalf of this employers' association, I would call to your attention two measures that are now before your honorable body.

The naval appropriation bill, H. R. 15947, as you know, contains that pernicious rider known as the Tavenner rider. The Army bill, H. R. 16460, does not now contain the objectionable amendment.

Regarding these measures which Tavenner and Van Dyke are trying so hard to put through in one form or another, I believe them to be a union-labor movement and thoroughly un-American.

I believe it is the purpose of these riders to prevent the use of the stop watch or other timing device in connection with Government work, and also to prevent the earning of any premium or bonus, in fact, nothing but the flat day wage. The effect of unionism in this direction you have already seen abroad.

Many have the idea that the stop watch is a speeding-up device pure and simple and its use is to drive the worker to the limit of endurance, but the fact remains that it has already increased production, lowered the cost, and increased the workers earnings. The increased wages are a component part of the plan that has made lower costs possible, and in this connection, I would refer you to our neighbor, the Watertown Arsenal, for the details of this statement.

This proposed prevention of the stop watch has a direct connection with the "preparedness" movement so popular and necessary at this time, since it is a fact that admirals and commanders of battleships have told us that the stop watch has been an absolutely essential factor in the improvement of the fighting efficiency of our fleet.

Further and in conclusion, it is a fact that the large sums of money now being made in the machine shops of the country is due to the operation of premium and bonus methods.

Will you do your best to prevent this unjust legislation?

Very truly, yours,

W. W. POOLE, Secretary.

BOSTON, July 11, 1916.

HON. JOHN W. WEEKS,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We understand that more or less legislation has already passed the House containing riders or other clauses forbidding the use of time studies or motion studies in the effort to promote effective operation on the part of the workman, rendered possible by a thorough knowledge of the requirements of the "job." These efforts have had to do with so-called "scientific management," but have also had to do with any intelligent study of any human operation.

In our business we make use of this to arrive at the probable time necessary to accomplish duties, and by it are enabled to set tasks well within the capacity of the employee and enable him by well-designed bonus systems not only to make more money for himself but to get more out of apparatus than ignorant, careless, untrained operation could possibly secure.

For the labor unions to interfere with the proper operations of shipyards, machine shops, foundries, and all other well-organized and well-run establishments is to increase the cost of all materials to the Government, to still further strengthen the hands of the labor unions to struggle against it, and, in general, to set back the hands of the clock as regards the intelligent utilization of time and apparatus.

We trust that anything that you can do to investigate this situation and oppose it when the bills are before you will be done in the interest of the manufacturing community of Massachusetts.

Respectfully, yours,

S. D. WARREN & CO.

PACKARD MOTOR CAR CO.,
Detroit, Mich., June 23, 1916.

HON. JOHN W. WEEKS,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The passage of bill H. R. 8665 will seriously affect the efficiency of Government work. The use of time study in industrial operations is not a hardship upon the worker; it does uncover the slacker and loafer, the drones of our social fabric; and therefore there will be a howl from this class.

Why should the people be taxed to pay men to work at less than their normal efficiency?

Times and rates must be established; why not determine them scientifically, instead of by guess?

Look at the conditions in England—thousands of men sacrificed in the trenches because of the slacker at home, and half of the story has not been told. This is what we face.

There is no function of scientific management that will injure the worker in the slightest degree.

Yours, very truly,

F. F. BEALL, Vice President.

WILLETT, SEARS & CO.,
Boston, April 14, 1916.

HON. JOHN W. WEEKS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I presume that it is entirely unnecessary to urge you to work against such legislation as is contained in the so-called Tavenner bill (H. R. 8665).

I have always been at a loss to understand why anybody in the community should be opposed to increased efficiency in our industries. It seems to me that to-day, more than ever in our history, efficiency is necessary if we are to accept the wonderful opportunities of industry and commerce which are before us. I think that it would be a serious mistake for Congress to ever pass any legislation which in terms or by implication would deter manufacturers from doing all things possible to increase the efficiency of their plants to the reward of their employees and the character of their product. The Tavenner bill is, I think, wrong in principle; and I can not resist so writing to you, although I assume, of course, that on this matter you and I agree.

Very truly, yours,

GEORGE F. WILLETT.

PITTSBURGH, PA., April 17, 1916.

Hon. JOHN W. WEEKS,
Committee on Military Affairs,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are almost afraid of assailing your manhood by even suggesting that you may vote for the enactment of such a measure, so destructive of efficiency as typified by Tavenner bill, H. R. 8665.

No greater blow could be given to American industry as would result from the enactment of such legislation or restriction of appropriation for efficiency.

Would you in your private life think of such restriction?

Scientific management increases output, lowers cost, and increases the pay of labor and reduces his physical effort. It is effort properly directed.

We will be pleased to have you advise us that you will oppose such scandalous legislation.

Very truly,

UNITED ENGINEERING & FOUNDRY CO.,
ISAAC W. FRANK, President.EASTERN MANUFACTURING CO.,
Bangor, Me., April 20, 1916.Hon. JOHN W. WEEKS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We understand that there has been presented in Congress a bill known as the Tavenner bill, which aims to make unlawful the use of a stop watch or other time-measuring device in making time studies of any job done by an employee of the United States Government; and prohibits the payment of any cash, premium, or bonus reward in addition to the regular wage.

We are also advised that an effort will be made to insert in the various appropriation bills clauses which would make these practices illegal. A rider to this effect was attached to the Army appropriation bill at the last session of Congress.

This legislation is, of course, aimed at scientific management and other efficiency systems. We realize that it is being urged by people who have the interests of labor at heart; but we know from our own experience and that of other concerns that, far from being inimical to labor, scientific management has achieved benefits in which employees have shared generously.

For the past two years we have been developing in our paper and pulp mills the Taylor system of scientific management. The results thus far obtained have been as follows:

1. Greater production.
2. A reduction in the hours of labor.
3. A large increase in the wages of employees.
4. A better mutual understanding and spirit of cooperation between management and the employees.

We feel that any legislation by Congress tending to curtail similar achievements in Government work is vicious in the extreme, and can only result through a gross misunderstanding of the principles of efficiency or a deliberate attempt on the part of some misguided individuals to hamper the industrial development of the Nation. At this particular time, so critical in many ways, all industry should be afforded every possible encouragement for individual and corporate efficiency as an essential part of national industrial self-defense.

We strongly urge upon you the vital importance of this subject, and trust that you will use your influence and your vote to defeat any measures of this nature that may come before you for consideration.

Yours, very truly,

G. R. OYER,
Vice President and General Manager.

BOSTON, April 20, 1916.

Hon. JOHN W. WEEKS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Our attention has been called to the Tavenner bill, bearing the number H. R. 8665, and now in committee, which is intended to forbid time studies, premiums, or bonuses among employees of the Government, and so to prevent what is known as scientific management. We are convinced that scientific management, rightly used, is a very important aid to efficiency in industry. If therefore Government shops are forbidden its use, not only will the Government be operating at a lower level of efficiency than private establishments, but it will be establishing and maintaining false and retrogressive standards.

We have not known of any evils connected with scientific management in the Government employ that should render advisable any such limitation of the freedom and efficiency of its operating heads.

We hope that your consideration of this subject will lead you to conclusions similar to ours and will cause you to oppose this bill.

Yours, truly,

W. H. McELWAIN CO.,
J. F. McELWAIN, President.THE HOLTZER-CABOT ELECTRIC CO.,
Boston, April 8, 1916.Hon. JOHN W. WEEKS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Boston Chamber of Commerce is taking a decided stand in opposition to the Tavenner bill, which will soon come to your attention in Congress, and which, if passed, will make it unlawful for any person in charge of Government employees to make use of any stop watch or other time-measuring device in connection with the work of such employees or to award a bonus or premium in addition to their regular wages.

The effect of this bill, if it becomes a law, will be so far-reaching and will deal such a blow to the economical administration of Government activities and also private concerns that I feel that I must add the protest of the Holtzer-Cabot Electric Co. against the passage of the bill.

To my mind the Tavenner bill is only a forerunner of an attempt on the part of certain labor interests to eliminate all efficiency methods throughout the country. If the present bill passes, next year an attempt will be made to prevent the Government from purchasing from private concerns which employ efficiency methods, which is, in effect, a prohibition of these measures throughout the country.

It is claimed that these efficiency methods result in harm to the workmen through excessive speeding up of their work. This claim is not substantiated by actual results. To verify this statement you may

ask almost any company which has installed one of the various efficiency methods how it has affected the workmen, and the reply will be that the men are turning out more work with less effort, and that they are earning more money for the same length of time of employment without in any way impairing their health.

If this is true, what is the object of the Tavenner bill? There can be only one explanation. The labor interests find that under the efficiency systems the workmen are able to earn more than union wages without undue exertion, and the workmen are therefore not interested in joining the unions. Naturally this reduces the power of the unions and embitters those men employed in plants which do not use the newer methods.

Do you think that the newer methods should be prohibited and business reduced again to the level of those companies who have not taken advantage of these methods? You will admit that such a step would be detrimental to American business and yet the Tavenner bill is leading in exactly that direction.

I do not believe that the thinking class of laborers desire the passage of this bill, and I most earnestly request that you will do your utmost to prevent its being passed.

Any action limiting the accuracy and economy of manufacture can not but impair the efficiency of work of the Government, and by reflection the efficiency of all manufacture. Such impairment of efficiency can not fall to be among the factors increasing the cost of production and living expense.

Very truly, yours,

C. W. HOLTZER.

BOSTON, March 1, 1916.

Hon. JOHN W. WEEKS, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We note that a bill has been presented to the House in Congress by Representative TAVENNER, of Illinois, designed to prevent the use of the stop watch and the payment of premium, bonus, or cash reward to any Government employee, and that another bill, H. R. 8677, has been proposed and referred to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, providing that the prohibition of stop watches and premiums in last year's Army bill be extended to all employees of the Post Office Department.

We have used stop watches for making numerous time studies in connection with our work for the past five years, and also set tasks and paid the corresponding bonus or premium to the workmen for doing the work in the time specified. In connection with this we have found that our men much prefer working under the task and bonus system than on day work. This shows that this system makes for the happiness of the worker. We have noticed no ill effects on the health of the worker, and in the majority of cases find it has been improved. Wages have been increased from 25 to 50 per cent, and the hours of labor reduced from 10 to 9 or even 8 hours, while the output has increased from 10 per cent to 50 per cent. In spite of the increase in wages and the reduction of hours, we find a much lower cost for our product, and no decrease in the quality.

In view of the above facts we are strongly opposed to any legislation being passed by Congress which will prohibit the use of stop watches and premiums on any Government work.

Very respectfully,

ABERTHAW CONSTRUCTION CO.,
By L. C. WASON, President.HOOD RUBBER CO.,
Watertown, Mass., February 16, 1916.Hon. JOHN W. WEEKS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have been sent the Tavenner bill, introduced by Representative TAVENNER in the House of Representatives.

Such a bill is a direct injury to employer, to employee, and to the public.

Such a bill makes Government work more costly to the Government, and such a bill if applied to us would affect us so adversely as to make it impossible for us to compete.

A manager, a foreman, and a so-called wage earner are all employees. I am an employee as well as an employer.

Every employee is a manager—or should be. Every employee, including myself, must learn or be taught to do his work—his particular job—efficiently, and the more efficient he is the more he earns for himself and his employer.

It's the waste that makes inefficiency, the lack of planning, which is management per se.

Now, every employee—whether bookkeeper, foreman, or wage earner—must be taught his particular job, and if he has to learn it by himself he goes through the same periods of waste and inefficiency that his predecessors have, and there can be no progress under such a system. Wasted effort is harmful to the cost of the job and hurts the earning power of the employee and his employer, and the public pays a higher price.

Time studies show up the waste. They don't increase the work to be done; they either decrease the work or let the same energy be spent in productive work.

The ability of some employees on exactly the same kind of work, paid on a piecework basis, to make \$14 a week while another makes \$16 and another \$17 does not necessarily mean that the \$17-a-week man works harder, but it usually does mean that the \$17-a-week man manages his work better, plans his work better, has his tools and work handler, and time studies help the \$14 and the \$16-a-week man to become a \$17-a-week man, for it is all a question of teaching a man how to do his work easily and efficiently, and the labor cost per cent of the \$17 is less for the employer.

This is plain talk, and when a battleship in a Government yard is only 8 per cent built and the same type of battleship is 30 per cent built in a private-owned yard in the same length of time it's no wonder that Government-built ships cost more (if the proper overhead cost is charged to the cost), and one can only imagine the waste and inefficiency of a Government-owned yard if the employee is not permitted to be taught, if the employee is not allowed to improve his skill, and if the employees are to be allowed to waste their time and strength and energy in producing waste.

A democracy can be efficient only if efficient business systems are installed by managers who manage to cut out the wastage and to teach their employees to cut out the wastage, and no obstacles should

be placed in the path of employer managers or employee managers to prevent a man learning how to produce efficiently and to improve his skill and to save waste.

I therefore protest against such legislation because—

1. Legislation of this character is opposed to best interests of workman and employer.
2. Time studies form the best known method of reaching a fair decision as to what constitutes a day's work and thus furnish an equitable basis for a fair wage.
3. Premium, bonus, and piecework payments are the best known methods of securing to the workman a wage proportional to the amount and quality of the work performed.
4. Its passage will result in higher cost of Government work by eliminating modern methods of management.
5. This will probably precede the effort to attach riders to the appropriation bills prohibiting efficient methods on work performed under the appropriations in shops of contractors for Government work.
6. This company would be unable to bid on any Government supplies.

Yours, very truly,

FREDERIC C. HOOD,
General Manager.

RIVETT LATHR AND GRINDER CO.,
Boston, Mass., January 20, 1916.

The Hon. JOHN W. WEEKS,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have been informed that there is a possibility that an effort may be made to enact legislation which will prohibit the Government from placing orders with manufacturing establishments who make use of so-called "efficiency methods," such as the Taylor system and other similar systems; in other words, it is proposed to extend the provision of the "Deitrick amendment" into the shops of privately owned concerns as well as those which are owned by the Government.

I believe that all employers of labor must pay fair wages and must in every way give their employees fair treatment if they expect to establish a permanently successful business, but workmen must likewise expect to render a reasonable return in services to their employers. If a manufacturer is to run his business successfully and profitably, he must obtain the most efficient workmen that he can for the rate which he pays. It is against efforts of this kind that the exponents of the "Deitrick amendment" have directed their guns. To allow any such provision to be enacted into law, as I understand is now contemplated, would be a terrible blow to the industries of our country. During the present generally prosperous period now prevailing it behooves us to put the manufacturing business of the country on as economical and efficient basis as may be possible, so that our position may be strong enough to stand the strain of duller times.

I sincerely trust that you will vigorously oppose any proposed legislation of this character.

Yours, very truly,

ROBERT F. MORSE, Treasurer.

JANUARY 4, 1916.

HON. RICHARD OLNEY, 2d,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. OLNEY: Rumor has it that further legislation will be asked for to restrain, more completely than the Dietrick Army appropriation bill rider did, the advancement of scientific management, or any similar kind of efficiency in Government work. Now that you are on the Army Committee, I thought you would be glad to have the manufacturer's viewpoint on this; and I feel very sure, with a knowledge of the facts, that you will use your influence to restrict such further legislation.

I have been particularly interested in watching the development of scientific management in the past at the Watertown Arsenal, under the direction of Col. Wheeler, and had felt that there was the first object lesson in real efficiency in Government manufacture. I am interested in the so-called Taylor form of scientific management in general, and am practicing, or developing, this in this company and in three other unrelated industries of which I am treasurer.

I have felt that attempts, such as have been made through the influence of labor officials, to prevent this form of development in Government work, and their attempts to prevent it by increasing their attack on the use of the stop watch, and of time studies, have been attended with very dangerous and far-reaching results. Those who arbitrarily state that a stop watch should not be used in industries might just as well say that a microscope, graduated balances, or instruments of precision should not be used in analyzing any of the processes of industry.

A stop watch is used as a means of ascertaining the best way of doing work, not, as has been reported, simply for the purpose of driving an employee faster. Factory efficiency is not real efficiency unless it makes the performance of a given task easier for the worker by the elimination of delays, unnecessary movement, and makes possible a better analysis of machine operation.

Some criticism has also been made that the quality of the work suffers; that is, that quality is sacrificed for speed and quantity. My experience in the machine shops that I have observed, as well as in the plants in which I have developed the Taylor system, has proved to me conclusively that at least 60 per cent of the increased output of a plant, due to this system, is due to methods that do not directly affect the workmanship at all. I have yet to see this system developed in any manufacturing company without the result being a distinct improvement in the quality of the work, better working conditions and industrial relations, and lower unit costs.

That scientific management is consistent with the presence of labor unions and collective bargaining is instanced by the fact that the presidents in the four local labor unions connected with the printing industry are all men in our employ and men of exceedingly high standard. Furthermore, our collective agreements with such unions provide for the development of factory efficiency.

I see no reason why Government work should not be done on as efficient lines as private work, provided, of course, liberal wages are paid and no unreasonable exertion required. The present war has illustrated—and particularly in the industrial conditions shown up in England—that England is paying a terrible price for the inefficiency of their mills and factories, and for the complete failure, until just recently, of their ministers to understand industrial operations and industrial relations. The great cry for preparedness seems futile in this country if our Senators and Representatives legislate to make impossible any in-

creased efficiency in Government manufacturing by the best recognized methods to-day, or, what is worse, actually, and without doubt unknowingly, undo the progress which has been made in a few places.

If my belief in the great advantages derived from scientific management can be justified by the facts, is not the attitude of Congress square against progress in efficiency, which our Government should attempt to further? I feel very strongly on this whole matter, as do many other manufacturers, and our concern is that Government action of this kind should be based on what seems to be a misconception of the facts.

Yours, very truly,

THE PLIMPTON PRESS,
HENRY P. KENDALL, Treasurer.

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON PREMIUM SYSTEM IN GOVERNMENT WORK AGAINST THE PROHIBITION OF ECONOMIC ADMINISTRATION IN GOVERNMENT WORKSHOPS.

DECEMBER 14, 1915.

To the executive committee and board of directors:

At the last session of Congress, when the bill making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, was under discussion in the House, the following amendment, popularly known as the "Deitrick rider," was proposed:

"Provided, That no part of the appropriations made in this bill shall be available for the salary or pay of any officer, manager, superintendent, foreman, or other person having charge of the work of any employee of the United States Government while making or causing to be made, with a stop watch or other time-measuring device, a time study of any job or any such employee between the starting and completion thereof or of the movements of any such employee while engaged upon such work; nor shall any part of the appropriations made in this bill be available to pay any premium or bonus or cash reward to any employee in addition to his regular wages, except for suggestions resulting in improvements or economy in the operations of any Government plant; and no claim for service performed by any person while violating this proviso shall be allowed."

There was very little, if any, debate on this amendment, and it was adopted by a large majority. It was later rejected by the Senate, but finally restored in conference and is now part of the law. It is not, however, as effective as those interested in its passage intended it to be, since it applies only to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and is not applicable to expenditures from any other appropriations than those contained in the Army bill.

EFFECT OF THE DEITRICK AMENDMENT.

All Army officers are paid from the appropriations in this bill, and time studies in the arsenals and other Government establishments in charge of such officers have ceased for this fiscal year; likewise, all premium and bonus payments to workmen have ceased for the same period for all work performed under the same bill.

It appears, however, that while the amendment was probably especially directed against the Watertown Arsenal, in our neighborhood, where considerable progress was being made in industrial and economical development and where the workmen were receiving good premiums in addition to their regular day's wages, the work at this arsenal is practically all done under appropriations contained in the fortifications bill, and therefore the premium payments which were in effect there have been continued.

SUPPRESSION OF ECONOMIC ADMINISTRATION.

We have reason to believe, however, that at this session of Congress a more determined and skillfully directed effort will be made to completely suppress any form of economic administration of Government workshops under whatever appropriations the work may be performed and to prohibit all forms of bonus, premium, or piece-rate payments in those shops, thus reducing them to the dead level of the old day-wage systems, with no lawful means of satisfactorily establishing or maintaining any standard of production.

PROTEST BY THE CHAMBER.

Upon the recommendation of your committee last February, the chamber made an earnest protest, through New England Senators and Representatives, against the passage of the aforementioned "Deitrick rider," and similar protests were made by many other organizations, including the United States Chamber of Commerce. None of these organizations were, however, advised regarding this movement until near the close of the session, which was a short one, and after the adoption of the amendment by the House, by which time it had gained such headway that the protests, as is known, were not effective.

FAR-REACHING EFFECTS OF THE MOVEMENT.

While it has been generally recognized that this rider was the herald of a general movement on the part of a large influence to prohibit, through congressional action, all forms of satisfactory administration and economic performance in Government workshops alone, the rider itself may be taken as the expression of the real attitude of those opponents toward all privately owned shops, in general, and is an indirect step toward the accomplishment of a well-laid plan which now menaces the industrial world. Your committee believes that when the immediate plans regarding Government shops have been consummated, further effort will be made to extend similar prohibitions, in a far-reaching way, to establishments furnishing material or supplies to the Government, to the extent of even prohibiting altogether Government purchases from private plants unless completely operated in accordance with the terms of similar prohibitive special legislation.

OPPOSITION IS URGED.

It is in the light of this matter as thus presented that your committee deems it necessary to suggest that the chamber again consider this subject in good season and while there is yet time for proper thought of it on the part of all interested, and that it oppose any form of legislation of the character of that indicated herein.

In this connection it seems appropriate to repeat the following statements, which were included in its report of last February as reasons for opposing the "Deitrick rider":

1. Any action limiting the accuracy and economy of manufacture can not but impair the efficiency of work of the Government and, by reflection, the efficiency of all manufacture. Such impairment of efficiency can not fail to be among the factors enhancing cost of production and living expense.

2. The most searching investigations of the methods attached by this amendment, when these methods have been competently introduced, indicate that the workers employed suffer no detriment to health and prospect but, on the contrary, find their living conditions improved. The amendment should, therefore, be opposed in the true interests of labor.

RECOMMENDATIONS.

Your committee therefore recommends that the following resolution be adopted by the chamber, and that copies of it and of the report be furnished the Senators and Representatives of New England, associations of manufacturers, associations of commerce, boards of trade, chambers of commerce, and other associations of similar character, requesting their cooperation for the purpose of defeating any prohibitive or restrictive measures of the kind referred to herein which may be aimed at Government establishments at this session of Congress, viz: "Whereas under an equitable Government every individual is entitled to own and to enjoy the results of his own labor. No legislation should have for its purpose the withholding of such rights by retarding economic or industrial efficiency and by prohibiting the right to compensation based upon superior individual ability and its consequent impairment of personal ambition and initiative.

"Resolved, That the Boston Chamber of Commerce urges the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States to refrain from favorable consideration of any measures aimed at Government establishments which tend—

"To interfere with economical administration;
"To cause the abolishment of proper means for the determination and maintenance of standards of production; or
"To prohibit the forms or methods of remuneration to workmen in practice in the various similar industries of the country."

Respectfully submitted.

EDWIN F. GAY, *Chairman.*
WALTER C. FISH,

Special Committee on Premium System in Government Work.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN,
February 26, 1916.

Mr. SANFORD E. THOMPSON,
Newton Highlands, Mass.

DEAR SIR: The delay in answering your letter of the 3d was due to my absence from the city. In reply I would say that, before hearing from you, I had already written letters to the Congressman from this district, to our Senator, and to each member of the House Committee on Military Affairs, urging all of them to vote and use their influence against any legislation designed to prevent the use of a stop watch and the payment of premiums or bonuses to Government employees.

In answer to your request for facts from my personal experience in regard to the effect of the introduction of time study and bonuses, I would say that, within the last two weeks, I have been in Pittsfield and at that time interviewed a number of the employees of Eaton, Crane & Pike regarding this point. In reply to my questions, both the girls and the men who are working on bonus and who have been under this scheme of payment for from six months to a year, stated that (1) they preferred the bonus payment to the old piecework system; (2) they were better satisfied because they were getting more money and working 9 hours a day instead of 10; (3) their health had not been impaired in the slightest, and, judging from their appearance, I should say that it had improved.

From the management of the company I learned that the output had been largely increased and that service as regards keeping of promised dates of delivery was so much better that there was no comparison.

I was particularly interested in the replies given me by the girls on the wrapping machines, because I had set the time for the tasks on this work and had had considerable difficulty in inducing the girls to try to make their bonuses. They had been accustomed to piecework and were afraid that someone was trying to "put something over on them." I found, however, as I have already told you, that they were more than satisfied and don't want to go back to the old scheme. If there is anything further I can do to assist in this matter, please let me know.

With kindest regards, I remain,
Yours, truly,

J. A. BURSLEY.

EFFICIENCY SOCIETY,
New York, June 19, 1916.

TO MEMBERS OF CONGRESS:

Under date of January 21, 1916, before his elevation to the Supreme Court, Mr. Louis D. Brandeis, an eminent advocate of the workers, wrote us as follows:

"Referring to the proposed congressional legislation to prohibit the introduction or use of time study and premium payments in Government establishments:

"In my opinion any such restriction upon the conduct of Government establishments would be highly inadvisable. The purpose for thus proposing the legislation is doubtless one which all of us would approve. Increased efficiency ought not to be purchased at the expense of health and other qualities essential to good citizenship and the general welfare, but no one can doubt that increased efficiency is essential to the public welfare; that we have not yet learned how best to secure that efficiency, and that the most important element in securing efficiency is the knowledge of facts—to the ascertainment of which time study is a means.

"To prohibit time study and premium payment is as crude a method of affording to the workman proper protection as the proverbial 'burning of the house to roast the pig.'"

We respectfully request you to consider this in connection with the Van Dyke and Tavenner bills and appropriation riders.

Yours, truly,

A. W. KIMBER, *Secretary.*

CHICAGO, February 20, 1916.

Mr. R. B. FRASER.

DEAR SIR: As per your request, I herewith submit my views on the system you have so carefully installed in our department; the same is for the betterment of the employee. Systematic labor by skilled workmen means carefulness, production, profit, and satisfaction, both to employer and employee.

Very truly,

JOHN GURALSKI.

Mr. FRASER: It's to my individual opinion in regards to the bonus system, which to say that bonus systems is better than the old way in

many ways; for instance, as preparing lifts, etc., and doing away with a lot of unnecessary work.

The bonus system has added an extra pay envelope, which helps a great deal.

Yours, truly,

FRANK L. MARKOAT.

HAMDEN, CONN., February 26, 1916.

DEAR SIR: I take great pleasure in writing to you about our bonus system. I find it a great help to me and also to many others of this factory. It also encourages us to put more interest in our work.

I have always found it satisfactory, and it has never been any injury to my health.

FLORENCE JOHNSON.

NEW HAVEN, CONN.

MY DEAR SIR: I have worked for the Acme Wire Co. 11 years. I was timed according to the Taylor system and I think they were very fair. As instructor here I am in a position to study the girls closely. They are just as contented and healthy as they were on daywork, as far as I can judge.

The work we get out is just as good as before because inspectors watch it from start to finish.

Under the Taylor system the girls do the work the quickest and easiest way, found by timing an efficient operator.

Sincerely, yours,

MARGARET PURCELL.

NEW HAVEN, CONN., February 28, 1916.

DEAR SIR: I have worked in the Acme Wire Co. nearly four years, and during that time I have worked under three systems—daywork, piecework, and now the Taylor system.

I do think and like the Taylor system the best.

Yours, truly,

A. KOCK.

NEW HAVEN, CONN., February 24, 1916.

Mr. SANFORD E. THOMPSON,
Boston, Mass.

DEAR SIR: It gives me great pleasure to write to you in regard to the bonus system.

The bonus system is a great help to every one in my estimation, especially to the self-supporting girls. Every week when we receive our wages it is encouraging to think we have other money besides our regular week's salary. It is discouraging to me when I get a day job, because we know we don't have to work too fast, and it is tiresome and tedious to me.

The bonus system, in regards to myself, has not injured my health in anyway, which I am very glad to say.

Yours, respectfully,

MISS ROSE DALLAS,
No. 344 Second Avenue, West Haven, Conn.

NEW HAVEN, CONN., February 24, 1916.

Mr. SANFORD E. THOMPSON,
141 Milk Street, Boston, Mass.

DEAR SIR: I have been employed with the Acme Wire Co. for the past nine years, and during that time I have been working about four years on the bonus system, which I can say with all sincerity that I do not work any harder than I did when I was on day work. I can also make more money.

Yours, truly,

MAE C. BARRETT.

Mr. SANFORD E. THOMPSON,
Boston, Mass.

DEAR SIR: I am writing this letter for the purpose of encouraging the use of the bonus system.

I have been working for the Acme Wire Co., New Haven, Conn., for the past three years, before and ever since the use of that system, and have been well satisfied.

It has not interfered in the least with my physical condition or happiness, and as yet have never met with the slightest accident.

The bonus system not only benefits the employees in wages, but also enables the company to get out a sufficient quantity of work each day which has been thoroughly inspected.

For myself, I am in favor of the bonus system.

Yours, truly,

MISS HELEN BAKER.

NEW HAVEN, CONN., February 24, 1916.

Mr. SANFORD E. THOMPSON,
141 Milk Street, Boston, Mass.

DEAR SIR: My opinion has been asked regarding the bonus system and I would like to say that I would rather have the bonus. After speaking to a number of others, we do not believe that we are overworked, but we are making far more than if we were doing daywork.

I am working in the Acme Wire Co. under the Tailleur system.

Yours, respectfully,

JENNY R. C. LIND,
19 Anderson Street.

BANGOR, ME., March 8, 1916.

MY DEAR MR. HALL: This is just a brief sketch of what I believe scientific management has done for the Eastern Manufacturing Co.

A few years ago this concern was practically being run by the employees. Now it is all done by system and is controlled by the scientific and service departments.

Perhaps one of the numerous facts that are to be mentioned, the first one should be in regard to the hours of labor. This mill, which always has been run on a schedule of 10 hours a day and a fixed amount of wages to be paid weekly to laborers, is now being run on a 9-hour schedule and the laborers are paid by piecework. This not only helps the mill, but also the employees. They take a great deal more interest in their work and get out more than ever before. Every employee makes more money. The girls on an average make from two to two-fifty a week over their usual amount of pay.

Before the system work was begun the head boss of each department employed his own help. Now this is all done through the service department. At this department is kept a record file of every employee. This makes it very easy to locate anybody about the mill. When office help is needed this file is referred to, and anybody that is an employee

of the mill that has education enough for the requirements of the position is promoted rather than to take in a new person. This was never done before.

We also have a fine new dispensary, which was very much needed. This enables the firm to give proper care and attention to all accidents, which were only half attended to before.

We also have a library, which is something entirely new for us. In this library are kept several very good books, which are loaned to the employees free of charge for two weeks. It is surprising to see how much interest both the men and girls have taken in it. The girls have had candy sales to raise money to buy books, and it has also had some good donations.

Some of the girls have formed a basket-ball team and play two evenings a week.

The boys had a hockey team during the ice season. These were all unheard of before. In time we expect to have nice rest rooms.

From a general consideration of everything, I think scientific management has done much for this concern and has made everything around and about the mill 100 per cent better.

Sincerely, yours,

ANNA CURREN.

MARCH 8, 1916.

Mr. HALL,
Eastern Manufacturing Co. Mill, Brewer, Me.

DEAR SIR: I am pleased to reply to your question as to how I regard the conditions under the Taylor system and conditions under the old way, and will say:

First. I get more money in wages.

Second. That there is no lost time, and in many other ways I find the Taylor system much better for the workpeople.

Yours, truly,

E. S. SMILEY.

WILLIMAS & WILKINS CO.:

In classes of work where possible, I believe that by making time studies both employer and employee will be benefited. Surely persons who are competent and efficient and who produce a larger amount of work should receive a higher wage than those who are less efficient and produce less work. The employee is paid for the exact amount of work produced. The employer pays for the exact amount of work received. Is it not a square deal?

In my own experience the bonus system pays far better than a standard wage.

ADA G. BEARD.

BREWER, ME., March 8, 1916.

Mr. HALL.

DEAR SIR: I have been a "counter" in the Eastern Manufacturing Co.'s mill for the last 10 years.

Within the last two or three years the owners have introduced scientific management, which has worked a marvelous change in the mill and its employees.

Before this introduction work came along haphazard, with little or no regularity, working on one order and then suddenly changing to another without notifying the foreman. We also kept our own time.

Now there is a planning department, which assigns to each individual his work for the day. For the counters we receive a ticket at the window of this department designating what particular order we shall count, and with the time we receive it stamped on it; and on the back of this ticket how it must be counted—that is, in reams of 500 sheets or half reams of 250 sheets, and if the colored ream marks are to be inserted to mark the "knifeful" for the trimmers.

By the "knifeful" I mean as much paper as can be trimmed by an undercut knife at one time. The amount varies according to the thickness of the paper from two to two and one-half and three reams, thus saving time and energy on from one-half to one ream at each trimming. Then when we have finished the order we return the ticket to the planning room and the time is again stamped on it.

This systematic management has effected an increase in the wages of most of the employees, and although it did not increase the counters directly it has influenced us in an indirect way.

There is a move man now, whose duty it is to haul in these loads of paper assigned to us, and posted on a bulletin board beforehand, so he will know what we are working on and to take away those we have finished counting, thus doing away with the necessity of the men who wait on us going in search of a load, as they formerly had to do, taking the time to select a load of lightweight paper (to make his own work easy) and haul it into place for us. You may readily see how we thereby had many idle minutes during the day.

By scientific management we now have our pay has been increased at least 25 cents per day (each of us), in that we have steady work all the time with no loafing in between, despite the fact that the working day has been voluntarily shortened by the company from 10 to 9 hours.

Last but not least there is the "service department" and library, headed by the capable Mrs. Hoskins who has so interested herself in us girls that we are like a great family, all interested in the good welfare of each other. She has caused the walls of the mill to be whitewashed, making it clean and wholesome. She even furnishes the men with gum twice a week to try and discourage the tobacco-chewing habit with its consequential spitting.

There used also to be a good deal of familiarity between the men and girls, making them appear more or less vulgar. Now it is all different for the new system has restricted us in such a way that this condition is seldom almost never seen.

The library books are loaned us free of charge, and we have two basket-ball teams each engaged in friendly rivalry against the other.

I can not better express my sentiment and appreciation of this great scientific change from the old way of doing things than by saying that we employees have been benefited a thousandfold.

I will sign what I am,

Respectfully, yours,

CATHERINE COULTER,
"Scientific Management."

My DEAR MRS. HOSKINS: I thought I would give you an idea of what I thought what has passed in the last two years. I have worked here four years. Anybody employed the girls. The men said and did what they pleased. We are working shorter hours and getting more pay. We have many other things that are helping the girls out very much. I am better in health and all, and it is better in all ways.

INA CAMPBELL.

GENTLEMEN: It gives me great pleasure as instructor of the plater girls at the Eastern Manufacturing Co.'s mill at South Brewer, to testify in regard to task and bonus.

I worked on the platers four years previous to the installing of the task and bonus system. Under this system the object of the operators is to reach the highest possible point of efficiency for which they are paid.

Being an ex-operator under the old working plan I readily notice the efficiency of the task and bonus as regards the employer and employees. Therefore I heartily indorse the efficiency of the Taylor system.

There is also an improvement in the general conditions within the last few months that is beneficial to the girls and greatly appreciated by them, namely, the shortened hours, the rest room, with a nurse in attendance, which is greatly appreciated, and a great deal of sanitary improvements.

IRENE SHEA.

SOUTH BREWER, ME., March 6, 1916.

Mr. HALL: I take this manner of showing my sincere appreciation of the benefits which the girls in the plater department derive from the new system which you introduced in the Eastern Manufacturing Co.

Sincerely, yours,

THESSA DODWELL.

FEBRUARY 21, 1916.

Mr. E. B. PASSANO,
President Williams & Wilkins Co., Baltimore, Md.

DEAR SIR: I have been asked to state my opinion of the bonus system under which we work.

I like it and would much regret returning to a straight-salary method, when extra effort counts for little or nothing to the operative.

I consider the present system the finest sort of encouragement to do more and better work. It is a fair deal on both sides. It creates a personal interest on the part of the employee in the firm's progress, and the operative is enabled to earn more money with no more physical strain than under any other system, and with a greater mental satisfaction, because extra production and quality are recorded and comes back in the pay envelope.

I am earning more money in less time, with less physical and mental strain than I believe would be possible on a straight-salary basis, and I am better satisfied than I have ever been in the years I have been employed.

The fact that I came here 18 months ago a stranger, without home or friends in the city, and I liked your bonus system enough to remain, and then return here four times from trips home, rather than accept \$18 per week straight salary in my home State, Massachusetts, is the best argument I could offer.

Very respectfully,

LILLIE M. HILL.

BALTIMORE, MD., February 20, 1916.

Mr. E. B. PASSANO.

DEAR SIR: In regard to the bonus question would say that having worked on bonus system now for over two years I think it is a good proposition for both operator and proprietor, as the operator strives to do a greater amount of work in a given time than if she were on straight time. It has not injured me physically, as I have gained in weight since I have had my present position.

Hoping you will continue the bonus system, I remain,

Respectfully,

Mrs. MAE LOWNBY,
No. 1028 N. Eden Street.

NAVAL CONSULTING BOARD OF THE UNITED STATES,
Brooklyn, N. Y., April 22, 1916.

Mr. W. HERMAN GREUL,
Secretary Committee of Ten,
Eleventh Avenue and Twenty-sixth Street, New York.

DEAR SIR: I have received yours of the 19th with inclosures, calling my attention to the Tavenner and Van Dyke bills. To my mind these measures, if carried into effect, would work great harm and injustice. I have not only been an employer of skilled labor for 35 years, but I have always been a great admirer of skilled mechanics and good workmen, and have spent much of my life in close contact with them. My aim has always been to recognize and reward meritorious service in every line. Nothing gives me greater pleasure than to see my men advance and receive more remuneration in recognition of extra effort and devotion to their tasks. In my judgment, all attempts, such as are represented in these bills, to smother and do away with proper reward for increased skill and efficiency are not only against all reason, but pernicious in the extreme. I know by personal experience that proper incentive for achievement is a wonderful stimulus to performance, and I believe this to be true in the case of every man, regardless of his calling.

As for myself, I am unalterably opposed to the robbing of any man of proper incentive that will inspire him to greater achievement and usefulness. In these troublous times, when the country may need our services, the best that can be brought out in each of us is none too good.

Hoping that this is responsive to your call, I beg to remain,

Sincerely, yours,

ELMER A. SPERRY.

UNITED SHIRT & COLLAR CO.,
Troy, N. Y., April 14, 1916.

Mr. H. D. MINICH,
Tenth Floor, 110 State Street, Boston, Mass.

DEAR SIR: The bonus and efficiency methods which you have established in our different departments have been, in my estimation, a great success in two ways: The operators are well pleased, since their spirit of cooperation and efficiency brings them a proportionate increase in wages, and the operating costs are automatically decreased on this cooperative basis.

If the proposed bills of Mr. Tavenner and Mr. Van Dyke become laws and all time-study methods and all bonus systems of wages are prohibited in connection with all Government work, efficiency will, in my opinion, be greatly impaired and the result will be detrimental to employee as well as to employer.

Considering the crisis which business in this country faces with the end of the war, this is a poor time to tamper with what we have acquired in the way of perfected and efficient methods.

Very truly, yours,

J. K. P. PINE, President.

SEWELL—CLAPP—ENVELOPES.

CHICAGO, March 1, 1916.

MR. SANFORD E. THOMPSON,
141 Milk Street, Boston, Mass.

MY DEAR MR. THOMPSON: I am glad to do what I can to respond to your request of February 3 to give you some of the results of our experience with the setting of tasks by the use of the stop watch.

It should, of course, be clearly understood by those who are investigating this matter that the use of the stop watch is altogether unjustified and mischievous unless it is preceded by a careful building up of standardization and efficient methods. This preliminary to stop-watch work is itself of the utmost benefit to the worker, because its prime object is to make it easy and comfortable for him to do his best work—to surround him with the best conditions, to give him the best tools, and to acquaint him with the best methods. No time study which is not preceded by these preparations is of any value, and if time study ever comes into disrepute, it will, in my judgment, be mainly due to the ill-considered effort to use it without proper preparation. My personal experience in the envelope mill of Sewell—Clapp—Envelopes, Chicago, enables me to reply to your questions as follows:

The happiness of the worker.—Every worker in our plant who has been permitted to work under task and bonus as a result of time study has expressed himself as pleased with the new method, and no contrary opinion has come to our ears. It not only increases the worker's pay, which, of course, affects his happiness, but it removes practically all the worry, the fret, and the discomfort which, I believe, are more wearing upon the worker than the labor itself. It is an interesting fact that when our company recently offered to its employees an opportunity to buy some of its preferred stock, the first purchaser was one of those in this mill who had been working longest on task and bonus. He is a native of eastern Europe, who has no sentimental regard for the concern other than that which involves his own welfare.

The evidence is not wanting in our case that improved working conditions register not only in the peace of mind of the worker himself, but that material improvement in the home atmosphere likewise follows. It makes an immense difference to the family at home whether or not the father returns tired and fretted and worried by his work.

The health of the worker.—Whatever improvement in factory conditions contributes to the happiness of the worker is, of course, very likely materially to affect his health also. It is further to be noted that it is to the interest of the employer to protect the worker from all undue strain or driving.

Time studies are normally made under conditions which may be depended upon for permanent results, and anything like speeding up or exceptional output would destroy their purpose. In our mill time study revealed the fact that in a certain department a large portion of the time required for a certain operation was absorbed by a movement involving considerable muscular strain in an awkward position. Directed solely by these time studies, we devised a contrivance which removed practically all this strain, and the work is now done with ease by lighter and less muscular men than those whom it formerly tested severely.

Accidents: As a general proposition accidents are due to irregular or haphazard conditions. The preparation for time study works against anything of this sort and requires a careful investigation of the safest and best method of performing an operation which, theoretically, at least, would very much lessen the danger of accidents. We can conceive of no respect in which time study can increase the liability to accident.

Wages: Time studies are made for the purpose of setting a task which under scientific management practices results in the offering of a bonus. This bonus is not accompanied by any reduction in wages and is just so much addition to the prevailing rate of pay. In our mill time studies have resulted in material increase in every case where task and bonus have been established. It is our purpose to pay bonus to every man in our employ whose work is of such a character that reliable time studies of it can be made.

Hours of labor: No direct connection between time study and hours of labor now occurs to me. As time studies lead to task and bonus, and as these increase the worker's earnings and the output of the plant, the tendency is, of course, toward shorter hours, and there is nothing in the system which would exercise an influence in the contrary direction.

Output: Task and bonus based on time studies manifestly increase output. In our mill there has been a marked result of this sort. There would otherwise be no object in it. The effectiveness of the method lies in the fact that the increased output is produced not by driving the worker but by surrounding him with the best possible tools, methods, and conditions.

Cost of product: The ultimate object of time study is, of course, a reduction in the cost of the product, and in proportion as the output is increased this result is obtained, less, of the course, the increased wages earned by the worker. Scientific management principles result in a number of other mechanisms which tend in the same direction.

Quality of product: Task and bonus make necessary a complete inspection system, and this, of course, raises the quality of the output. This improvement of quality is made the easier by the various steps of standardization of tools, materials, and processes which always accompany it.

In our mill there has not been a single discordant note in the unanimous approval of the working of task and bonus methods of payment. Those who are now so paid are thoroughly satisfied, and those who have not yet come under this method of payment are plainly manifesting their eagerness and impatience to be so favored.

A recent experience may be of interest to you in this connection. Our company has for 15 years gathered its heads of departments and other workmen together at an annual dinner at which every man has an opportunity to speak his mind and has habitually availed himself of it with unreserved frankness. Criticisms and complaints of the management and of one department against another have been frequent. The last of these dinners occurred only a few days ago, and the tone of the talk around the table was in marked contrast to that which has heretofore prevailed. With possibly one or two exceptions, every speaker made the burden of his talk a direct or indirect appreciation of the benefits he had derived from scientific management. Some of the speakers were unconsciously paying this tribute to task and bonus but others attributed the bettered conditions directly to this system. It is probably impossible for me to convey to you the impression which I received, but I can only say that the unanimous opinion of the workers that scientific management has been a distinct benefit to them and the institution by which they are employed was emphatic and unmistakable.

I inclose a few letters written by members of our working force, which carry their own evidence of genuineness and sincerity. They are the result of my request that the men write to me their real sentiments without the slightest suggestion on my part as to what sort of opinions I wished to have expressed.

I trust that I have covered satisfactorily the items for which you ask and if there is anything else that I can do, kindly let me know.

I might state that no employees in any plant where I have worked on scientific management have ever suffered due to bonus and time-study methods. On the other hand, there has always been a greater degree of satisfaction and a tendency to stick, and to develop extraordinary workers instead of the common type. All of which is conducive, of course, to more permanent organization, better habits of stability and industry, and less expense due to dissatisfied help and changing conditions.

It seems to me that it is the height of inconsistency at this time, when the whole country is crying for preparedness, and preparedness against the most efficient Nation on the globe, a Nation which has built up its efficiency by just such means as those of scientific management, that certain of our Congressmen want to build laws which are going to be permanent factors in preventing the United States from realizing just the kind of preparedness they need. I see no reason why an instrument of precision, such as the stop watch, for measuring skill, should be objected to any more than any other instrument for measuring material or anything of value. It seems to me that these Congressmen could better spend their time in attacking the quacks and fourflushers who are using the stop watch instead of making their attack upon the methods themselves.

You are at liberty to use this communication and accompanying papers as seems to you wise.

Very truly, yours,

SMITH & FURBUSH MACHINE CO.,
HANCOCK AND SOMERSET STREETS,
Philadelphia, Pa., U. S. A., February 8, 1916.

MR. SANFORD E. THOMPSON,
141 Milk Street, Boston, Mass.

DEAR SIR: Replying to your favor of the 3d instant, I make reply to the questions in your letter as follows:

Our workers are much happier under the system because they make more money and are not scolded. It is their own loss if they do not produce enough to get premiums and eliminate scolding on account of suspicion of soldiering.

We have held our men much better.

The few men we use from time to time on straight daywork are dissatisfied and ask to be put on premium work.

The health of our workers is better than before, due to their generally better mental feeling and greater happiness in their work. No one in our shop has ever shown any ill effects due to overwork.

Accidents are less than formerly, due to better study of how to do each job to the best advantage.

Rate of wages is regular market rate per hour per day rate, and men average from 20 to 25 per cent premiums when working on premium work.

Hours of labor average 9½ hours per day, and extra 50 per cent for overtime.

Output is greater.

Cost is about the same as formerly, but the men get more money, and we know much better what cost is and consequently can make selling price more intelligently.

Quality of product is better than formerly, because we now have thorough inspection of product that formerly we did not have.

Trusting this may be of some advantage to the cause, we are,

Yours, truly,

C. W. SCHWARTZ, Jr.

THE LODGE & SHIPLEY MACHINE TOOL CO.,
Cincinnati, Ohio, February 15, 1916.

EFFICIENCY SOCIETY,
52 Broadway, New York City.

GENTLEMEN: In answer to yours of the 9th in reference to the question of bonus or premium system of payment to the worker, wish to advise that we have had some experience along this line, having started in on the premium system some 14 years ago and maintaining it throughout this period. We have made it entirely satisfactory to the men. As proof of this statement, we recently gave to our men a service pin, and of the 475 on our pay roll there were over 200 who had been with our company over five years. This would show, at least, that the system of payment was not one to drive the men out of the shop. As a matter of fact it has a tendency to keep them here, as we find that the number of men leaving during a month will not exceed 2 per cent of the total number. This we consider a very small turnover. It must naturally have a tendency to make the men more cheerful and happier, as their remuneration is continually increasing as they become more proficient, which allows them more freedom to buy the necessities for their homes and some of the luxuries.

Regarding their health: We recently had the United States Government staff of doctors examine our men, and out of the total number there was only some 15 who did not care to be examined. Out of all who were examined we found but one man infected for the particular trouble they were seeking.

The bonus or premium system will, of course, have a tendency to reduce the cost of work. It also has a tendency to improve the quality of the product, due to the fact that if a man makes poor work he has to duplicate the poor work with good work and have his premium earning reduced, if he has any coming to him. This makes him more careful, although he knows he will always get the equivalent of his daily or weekly wage, still, if he has from 25 per cent to 30 per cent more than same coming to him due to premium earnings, he naturally does not care to lose this increase through negligent or careless work.

The system was hard to inaugurate, the men feeling that we would not treat them right; that if we reduced the hours on the work that we would cut the premium allowance. This we have never done, consequently to-day it would be a very serious thing to us if we were to make an attempt to do away with the premiums or bonus system. The men want it as much now as they disliked it 14 years ago.

Yours, very truly,

LOUIS B. WEBER, Assistant Manager.

BOSTON, March 1, 1916.

Re: Stop-watch legislation.
Mr. SANFORD E. THOMPSON,
141 Milk Street, Boston, Mass.

DEAR SIR: In reply to your favor of the 3d, would say that we have made numerous time studies on our work and have set tasks and paid bonuses for the completion of the task in the specified time.

We have found—
That the workmen have been better satisfied and strongly objected to being taken off the task and bonus work and put on daywork.
We have no records of any ill health of the worker being due to his work on task and bonus.
There has been no increase in the number of accidents.
Wages have been increased from 25 to 50 per cent.
The hours of labor have been reduced.
The output has increased from 25 to 75 per cent.
Cost of parts has been reduced from 10 to 50 per cent.
The quality of the product has not decreased and in the majority of cases has increased.

Yours, very truly,

ABERTHAW CONSTRUCTION CO.,
JOHN H. SCOVILLE.

PROVIDENCE, R. I., February 19, 1916.

Mr. SANFORD E. THOMPSON,
141 Milk Street, Boston, Mass.

DEAR SIR: I must apologize for having mislaid your letter of February 3 in regard to stop-watch legislation.

In regard to the questions which you ask, I would reply as follows:
Our experience has been that our employees have been anxious to have us take time studies on the jobs on which they are working, so that they may be able to make the bonus.

We have not kept statistics to show any change in the health of the worker or in the number of accidents, but are positive that the accidents are less on the men working on the time study than in the rest of the shop.

The men working on the bonus work average at least 35 per cent more wages than those working daywork. The hours of labor on the bonus work are the same.

The output is considerably more on the work which has been time studied and the cost of product considerably less.

The quality of the product is in general better under time-studied work, owing to the fact that the workmen understand that if any of the work does not pass inspection that they are not paid the bonus for the jobs.

We regret that we can not give you more definite information in regard to these questions, but would be glad to assist in any way that we can in getting to the legislators correct information on this matter.

We propose to protest as effectively as possible to our Representatives in regard to this proposed legislation.

Yours, truly,

NEW ENGLAND BUTT CO.
J. G. ALDRICH.

DETROIT, MICH., U. S. A., February 22, 1916.

Mr. SANFORD E. THOMPSON,
141 Milk Street, Boston, Mass.

DEAR SIR: Answering your letter of the 3d and referring to the questions in the second paragraph:

We believe that generally the happiness of the workers is increased through having premium work throughout the factory. We have been requested by the men to set standard times where we had not yet been able to get the work done, and often an employee is dissatisfied because it is not done as fast as he thinks it ought.

I do not see how the installation of premium work could affect an employee's health if he worked the regular factory hours.

There should be no more accidents with premium work than with any other work. Very often there are more accidents because the men are inexperienced.

The average premium earnings is about 27 per cent of the day wages. Therefore it is a substantial increase.

Hours of labor have been shortened by the premium system.

The output has increased, but so has the working force. I can not give you the ratio of increase in output that is due to the premium system.

I can not get the relative cost of product by reason of introducing the premium system. We introduced the system because we thought it was better than the piecework and any work system which we had previously used.

The quality of our product has been maintained in every degree. The stop watch and time study saves the employee many unnecessary movements and thus reduces his physical and mental fatigue by reducing the lost motions to a minimum.

Any further information desired will be cheerfully given.

Yours, very truly,

PACKARD MOTOR CAR CO.,
F. F. BEALL,
Vice President of Manufacturing.

BALTIMORE, MD., February 14, 1916.

Mr. W. HERMAN GRUEL,
Efficiency Society, 52 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: Our monotype keyboards are operated under the differential piece-rate system. Since changing from the regular-hour rate about five years ago there has been an increase in production of about 33 per cent. The operatives are earning from 33 to 50 per cent more. They apparently are satisfied and in good health. One young woman who has worked in some of the largest offices in the East states that the working conditions are pleasanter than in any office in which she has worked.

Yours, very truly,

WILLIAMS & WILKINS CO.,
E. B. PASSANO, President.

STOP-WATCH LEGISLATION.

EATON, CRANE & PIKE CO.,
Pittsfield, Mass., March 10, 1916.

Mr. SANFORD E. THOMPSON,
141 Milk Street, Boston, Mass.

DEAR Mr. THOMPSON: In reply to your letter of the 3d instant, would say that I do not see why the working conditions of Government

employees are different from those in any mill or factory, and for that reason the benefits obtained by employees in other than Government factories working under the Taylor system of scientific management would apply to this work in Government institutions. The benefits derived by our employees from scientific management so far—and we have been at it but two and one-half years—are as follows:

Average increase in wages, 15 per cent.
Reduction in working hours, 16 per cent.

A feeling of greater confidence, in that the task set by means of a scientific study of the work is known by the employee to be accurate. In our case a recent test on machines producing 85 per cent of our boxes shows that the difference between the time allowed for 2,000 hours of work and the time taken was less than three-fourths of an hour.

The health of the workers has in no way been impaired. In fact, we firmly believe it has been benefited—

Because of the shorter hours.

Because of the greater ease of doing the work, even though the production be increased. The greater ease is brought about by a careful and scientific study of the method of doing the work, and, in the case of machinery, of making changes that will make the operating of same more natural for the employee and eliminating any undue strain that may have previously existed. Both in our hand operations and our machine operations unnecessary and tiring motions have been removed. We also give rest periods of 10 minutes in the morning and 10 minutes in the afternoon to employees engaged in the most tiresome or monotonous work. These rest periods are at the expense of the company. It has also come to our attention that, due to the opportunity afforded by scientific management to obtain a sizeable increase in wages, a number of our operators have taken a new lease of life and seem more happy and contented with life in general, which has an indirect effect on the health of the worker.

Accidents have decreased materially.

It has been gratifying to us to see many of our foremen and other employees who had been working in the same positions for many years without material progressing feel that scientific management offered them such a great opportunity for making themselves worth more to the company and to have them take advantage of that feeling and develop in a manner which oftentimes we did not previously believe was possible.

It has been said by some opponents of the Taylor system that the individuality is lessened or taken away. Our experience has been exactly the reverse.

We have spoken above only about the benefits to our employees, but the benefits to our company may also be of interest.

During the 10 busiest weeks in 1915 our production increased 22 per cent over the average of the 10 busiest weeks in 1910, 1911, and 1912. We are able to obtain under the system an increase in production on an average of 50 per cent per hour. The quality of our product has improved, as the bonus is based on perfect work.

The control of our orders has been as important as our increased production. We are able to give our customers 75 per cent better service and to make delivery promises that we know can be lived up to.

TIME STUDY.

The feeling against time study with a stop watch can only be caused by misunderstanding as to the meaning of "time study" and it seems as though the opposition comes mainly from those who can not have availed themselves of the opportunity to find out what time study really means. Otherwise, some of the arguments they have brought forth would not have been presented. While time study is an important factor in determining scientifically the length of time that it should take an operator or a machine to produce a certain amount of work, there are other factors equally as important, such as a proper routing system, in obtaining the increase in production. Not one of our operators objected in the least to time studies taken with a stop watch. We saw to it that they all understood what it meant. The fact that they are able without more effort to earn their bonuses in almost every instance, has demonstrated clearly to them, we feel sure, that the stop-watch system is not an evil but a benefit.

Very truly, yours,

A. W. EATON.

KLINK, BEAN & CO.,
San Francisco, February 17, 1916.

Mr. HERMAN W. GRUEL.

Chairman of Board of Trustees, Efficiency Society, New York.

DEAR SIR: Replying to your circular addressed to all members of the efficiency society, regarding the Tamm bill, will say that I have had many years' personal experience in large factories throughout the United States in the introduction of time study and premium and bonus payments, and submit the following:

The happiness of the worker is greatly increased when he is working to his normal capacity and making more money than a flat compensation.

The health of the worker: I have seen workmen whose health had been impaired by piecework rates which were laid down without scientific study. One of the objects of time study is to determine the rate of work which will not be injurious to the health of the workmen.

Accidents: Proper time study precludes accidents, as every possible method is studied to prevent them.

Wages: Wages are almost always raised for those workers who take a proper interest.

Hours of labor: The hours of labor are practically determined by the unions, on the Pacific coast, at least.

Output, nothing.

Cost of product: If the premium and bonus system is introduced, the cost of the product is lowered, and by increasing the output the overhead is automatically decreased.

Quality of product: As a rule the premium or bonus system appeals to the more intelligent class of workmen, and the more intelligent the workmen the better the quality of the product, other things being equal.

On the Pacific coast we have found very little, if any, objection among the workmen to the introduction of these methods, and we believe that this opposition comes largely from certain leaders who wish to use it in a political way. It certainly seems that we would have found objections among the rank and file in the regular course of our work, if it really existed.

Yours, very truly,

B. T. BEAN.

STOP-WATCH LEGISLATION.

LEWISTON, ME., February 16, 1916.

Mr. SANFORD R. THOMPSON,
141 Milk Street, Boston, Mass.

MY DEAR SIR: Your letter to Mr. Bates of February 3 has been given to the writer for answer to-day. We are giving you answers to the various questions under the heading you have suggested, and we trust this answers all of these points.

We have, as you are probably aware, the usual records showing the old production, production after improving machinery and equipment before setting task, production asked for on task, average production actually obtained, increase in wages to bonus operators, reduction in wage cost, etc.; also a daily record for each bonus operator of their performance. If copies of any of these would be at all interesting to you, I would be very glad to send them at once.

As we are very desirous of defeating this bill, recognizing the influence it will have in industries, we would be only too glad to do anything you can suggest to assist your committee. Please ask for any further assistance you may require.

Sincerely, yours,

LEWISTON BLEACHERY & DYE WORKS.
J. E. MULLANEY.

LEWISTON BLEACHERY & DYE WORKS,
Lewiston, Me., February 16, 1916.

Mr. SANFORD E. THOMPSON,
141 Milk Street, Boston, Mass.

MY DEAR SIR: Happiness of the workers: Our bonus workers are apparently happier and more contented, as it is now easier to hold them, while the day workers are very anxious and ready for bonus work and make no complaint to the presence of an instructor, in fact on several occasions having asked for the assistance of instructor.

Health of the worker: We have no cases of ill health among bonus workers.

Accidents: We are positive that the number of accidents is decreasing. Wages: Records show an average of 25 per cent increase in wages to bonus operators.

Hours of labor: Task workers rest at stated periods. Female workers, besides the rest periods, leave plant one-half hour early.

Output: Our output has been increased, due to improved machines and methods about 60 per cent, and due to training operatives and bonus incentive 40 per cent.

Cost of output: Is now about 80 per cent of former average cost.

Quality of product: Has not suffered, to say the least.

SPRINGFIELD, MASS., February 16, 1916.

EFFICIENCY SOCIETY,
52 Broadway, New York City.

ATTENTION MR. GREUL.

GENTLEMEN: In reply to yours of February 9, regarding personal experience with premium or bonus systems, wish to state that during my experience have found it is a mutual arrangement between employee and employer whereby, under your question "A"—

The happiness of the operator is greatly increased, as he has an opportunity to increase his earnings as well as efficiency.

We find operators who work under bonus systems to be in better physical and mental condition.

Regarding accidents, the writer believes there are fewer accidents because they are attending more closely to their work.

Regarding wages, the average hourly rate under bonus was 40 per cent higher than under regular day-work rating.

Hours of labor: We are getting more work under bonus system in eight-hour day than we formerly got under straight hourly rating in nine hours, due to increased production from bonus system.

Output: Greatly increased.

Cost of production: Considerably cheaper.

Quality of product: Equally as good as under day-work system.

Trusting this information is what you desire and will be of some benefit, I remain,

Yours, truly,

KNOX MOTORS CO.,
F. E. DOOLITTLE,
Superintendent.

EASTERN MANUFACTURING CO.,
Bangor, Me., February 7, 1916.

An increase in wages has resulted from the installation of this system of task and bonus, and the workers appear more happy and satisfied with their work owing to the fact that they are making more money and turning out a good day's work.

Since the introduction of scientific management this company has organized a service department whose principal function is to look after all matters pertaining to the health, comfort, and contentment of all employees. This department employs all new help and makes as careful a selection as is possible, endeavoring to secure for each position those who are physically and mentally suited to the work. Where the health of the worker is not good an effort is made to assign him work where there will be as little as possible physical strain. There have been no ill effects on the health of any of the operators employed on task and bonus, as there is no undue strain placed upon them while working under these conditions.

The nature of the work done in this mill is such that accidents are not liable to happen. No reports of accidents to workers on task and bonus have been made since the introduction of this system.

Weekly earnings of employees who have been placed on task and bonus have increased from 20 to 50 per cent.

Since the 1st of January, 1916, this company has been able to reduce its hours of labor from 10 to 9 and make an increase of 10 per cent on all wages affected by this reduction in hours.

The increase in output since task and bonus has been established varies in different departments from 20 per cent to 75 per cent.

The cost of product as affected by the work on which the task and bonus system is applied has decreased on various operations in amounts ranging from 10 per cent to 25 per cent. This decrease in cost takes cognizance of the fact that the overhead or indirect expenses are increased under the system of scientific management over what they were under the old type of management, but this increase of indirect labor is figured in the cost of production which shows a reduction in spite of this additional cost factor.

There has been a marked improvement in the quality of the product, due to the rigid inspection which has been made on all work done under

task and bonus. This is evidenced by a decrease in the criticisms which have been made on our product by our customers.

FRED R. AYER.

HERMANN, AUKAM & CO.,
Lebanon, Pa., February 8, 1916.

Mr. SANFORD E. THOMPSON,
141 Milk Street, Boston, Mass.

DEAR Mr. THOMPSON: I am very glad to answer categorically the points in your letter of the 3d instant. In addition to this, I will write to some of the members of the House and Senate Military and Naval Affairs Committees in regard to the effect of bonus and premium work upon the happiness of the worker. I shall not indulge in any flights of fancy, merely remarking that the percentage of labor turnover on the operations which we put earliest and have had longest on bonus is markedly smaller than upon our piecework or daywork operations.

The health of the worker: Our employment statistics have not been available long enough or in sufficiently detailed form for me to give you any real information on this score. Incidentally, however, the necessity of the maintenance of standard conditions imposed by time study has resulted in more sanitary and cleanly conditions throughout our plant than existed previously.

Accidents: The number of accidents in our plant is very small, since the majority of the operations are hand operations and comparatively little machinery is employed. The bulk of the machine accidents we do have are in a department which as yet is not upon bonus, and for which the conditions of safety and cleanliness have not yet been standardized.

Wages: In the beginning of our time study and bonus work, we have progressively taken the operations upon which the wages were lowest, the output least, and the labor turnover greatest. Bonus work has resulted on these operations in an increase of wages of from 25 to 75 per cent; in a good many individual cases of over 100 per cent.

Hours of labor: Up to the present time bonus work has had no effect on the hours of labor, as only about half our plant is on bonus work, and we have not attained the ideal condition of balanced production that will enable us to change our hours, although the reduction of the working day is one of the chief goals at which we are aiming.

Output: With the introduction of bonus work the departments affected have shown a total increase of about 150 per cent in production in the past year and a half—that is, we are producing in the departments affected by bonus work about two and one-half times the amount produced 18 months ago. This is not due entirely to bonus work, but is largely contributed to by routing and generally more careful planning, but bonus work has made it possible to reach this altitude.

Cost of production: The direct cost of our product has been somewhat reduced. As to the effect on the indirect cost I am sorry I am unable to inform you, as I do not have the figures available at this plant.

Quality: The quality of the product has been immensely bettered; our inspection has steadily grown stricter, and we have not found the exaction of a high standard of quality is having any other than a beneficial effect all along the line. High quality of product and high speed of production have gone together under the maintenance of proper conditions. Our production in this plant, as you will notice, increased very appreciably in a short period. I am happy to say, further, that the end is not yet in sight; that there are vastly larger possibilities in the departments in which we have not done very intensive work. I should like to call to your attention an interesting incident that happened here within 10 days. A number of operators in a department which employs about 300 hands and which to the present has been working under piece rates, a good many of which are very inequitable, petitioned for an increase in the piece rates on certain lines of goods, and at the time of the petition raised the question why they could not be put on bonus work the same as operators in other departments, who, under new conditions, were earning much higher wages than formerly, and also higher wages than the petitioners. We have begun time study in that department.

If I can add anything further to this letter in future communications, I am at your service.

Very truly, yours,

D. G. WALSH, Jr.

TABOR MANUFACTURING CO., PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Records examined by Mr. Godfrey, now president of Drexel Institute, show 73 per cent increased wages and 25 per cent reduction in selling price.

EASTERN MANUFACTURING CO., BANGOR, ME.

[By Mr. F. R. Ayer, vice president and general manager.]

Workers more satisfied: weekly earnings for employees increased 25 per cent to 50 per cent; hours reduced from 10 to 9; increase in output, 20 per cent to 75 per cent; cost reduced 10 per cent to 25 per cent; quality of product improved.

LEWISTON BLEACHERY AND DYE WORKS, LEWISTON, ME.

[By Mr. D. N. Bates, agent.]

Wages increased 25 per cent; rest periods given to workers; women quit work one-half hour earlier than men; accidents decreased; output increased by improved machine and methods about 60 per cent; by training operators and bonus, 40 per cent; cost reduced about 40 per cent; workers anxious for a bonus.

H. H. FRANKLIN MFG. CO., SYRACUSE, N. Y.

[By Mr. G. D. Babcock, production manager.]

Increase in wages, 36 per cent—20 per cent above average wage in locality; hours reduced to 50 per week; reduction in sale price of our product for improved quality, 32 per cent.

HERMANN, AUKAM & CO., LEBANON, PA.

[By Mr. D. J. Walsh, Jr.]

Labor turnover reduced; sanitary conditions improved; increase of wages of 25 per cent to 75 per cent; increase in production, 150 per cent; largely through the combination of planning and bonus incentive; direct cost of production somewhat reduced; quality bettered. The operators in one department requested that bonus work be established in their department so as to give them a chance to earn as high wages as the operators now on bonus.

SMITH & FURBUSH MACHINE CO., PHILADELPHIA, PA.

[By C. W. Schwartz, jr., general manager.]

Twenty per cent to 25 per cent premiums earned; output increased; gross cost, including expenses, about the same, with much greater uniformity of cost and more accurate cost in detail; quality better; scolding eliminated.

PACKARD MOTOR CAR CO., DETROIT, MICH.

[By S. S. Beall, vice president of manufacturing.]

Happiness increased; have been requested by men to set standard times; average premium 27 per cent of day wages; hours of labor shortened by premium system; output increased; quality of products maintained.

KNOX MOTORS CO., SPRINGFIELD, MASS.

[By F. E. Doolittle, superintendent.]

Happiness of operators greatly increased; better physical and mental condition; more work accomplished in eight hours under bonus system than in nine hours on straight time; output greatly increased; cost considerably cheaper; quality equally good.

ACME WIRE CO., NEW HAVEN, CONN.

[By Ralph W. Langley, works manager.]

Wages of employees increased 25 per cent; records prove no increase in accidents; no injury to health; output increased 25 per cent to 50 per cent; cost diminished; quality of product improved; bonus earnings frequently deposited in savings bank.

PLIMPTON PRESS, NORWOOD, MASS.

[By A. E. Barter, superintendent.]

Workers happier through the setting of definite tasks; health improved and accidents decreased; wages increased 20 per cent to 30 per cent, with average wage increased much more than this through the more continuous employment, which is a direct result of time study; capacity of plant increased; standard of quality improved rather than lowered.

NEW ENGLAND BUTT CO., PROVIDENCE, R. I.

[By J. G. Aldrich, president.]

Employees anxious to have time studies made; accidents less; wages at least 35 per cent higher; output considerably more on work which has been time studied; cost of product considerably less; quality of product is in general better under time-studied work.

SEWELL-CLAPP ENVELOPE CO., CHICAGO, ILL.

[By R. B. Frazer.]

Wages based on time study increased 15 per cent to 25 per cent; hours of labor planned to be reduced; increase in output up to 100 per cent. In a recent offer of special preferred stock the first purchasers were men who were working on bonuses.

WAVERLEY PRESS, BALTIMORE, MD.

[By Edward B. Passano, president.]

Increase in production 33½ per cent; operatives earning 33 to 50 per cent more, apparently satisfied and in good health.

CLOTHCRAFT SHOPS, CLEVELAND, OHIO.

[By Richard A. Felss, general manager.]

Happiness improved, health of workers improved, as shown specifically by average of absences only 1.4 per cent; accidents formerly quite numerous reduced to practically nothing; wages largely increased; hours of labor reduced from 54 to 48 and overtime practically eliminated; output increased; cost substantially lessened, although wages enormously increased; accurate standards of quality have been set through stop-watch observations.

EATON, CRANE & PIKE CO.

[By Wm. M. Eaton, secretary and treasurer.]

Increase in wages, 15 per cent; hours reduced, 10 per cent; greater confidence because employee knows task set by scientific study of methods and time is accurate; health benefited through the shorter hours; greater ease in doing work; rest periods and greater happiness because of wage increase; accidents decreased materially; output increased 22 per cent; quality of product improved.

Dr. H. S. Person, director of the Amos Tuck School of Administration and Finance of Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H., writes as follows:

"I have never been in charge of an industrial plant, nor have I practiced management engineering, therefore what I have to say is not based upon that sort of experience. I have, however, in order to acquaint myself with scientific management for the purpose of instruction, visited many plants, talked with workmen, and made observations, particularly with respect to the affect of scientific management upon the workman. My conclusions are as follows with respect to the Taylor system of management in which is used the stop watch for time study and in which is applied some form of premium of bonus-wage payment:

"The happiness of the worker is greater than under conventional management.

"The health of the worker seems to average better than under conventional management.

"The statistical record of accidents shows that they are less under the Taylor system of management.

"Wage are greater for a given expenditure of time and energy.

"Hours of labor vary in different plants according to the industry, but for any given industry seem to be less than for the average of that industry.

"The output is greater per hour of application of labor.

"The unit cost of the product is less than under conventional management.

"The quality of product is better than under conventional forms of management, for the reason that its method of inspection eliminates defective work."

Under this scientific management the service department was installed, which included numerous benefits for us. The working hours have been shortened, the sanitary conditions are much improved.

NELLIE MILLER,
Eastern Manufacturing Co., Bangor, Me.

First, I get more money in wages, and, second, there is not any time lost, and in many other ways I find the Taylor system much better for the work people.

N. S. SMILEY,
Eastern Manufacturing Co., Bangor, Me.

I can not better express my appreciation and sentiment of this great scientific change from the old way of doing things than by saying that we employees have been benefited a thousandfold.

CATHERINE COULTER,
Eastern Manufacturing Co., Bangor, Me.

From a general consideration of everything I think scientific management has done much for this concern and has made everything around and in the mill 100 per cent better.

ANNA CURREN,
Eastern Manufacturing Co., Bangor, Me.

I am better in health and all, and it is better in all ways.

IDA CAMPBELL,
Eastern Manufacturing Co., Bangor, Me.

Mr. WILLIAM HEMMERLY,
New Haven, Conn.

DEAR SIR: After I am over my surprise that intelligent people in our days can try to stop a method that soon will show up as the only method under which the workingman will work in the future, I shall gladly and frankly state my experience of working under a bonus system.

I started to work for a concern that was putting in a bonus system (Taylor system) in 1912. When I started to work the shop was still on day-work basis and all the jobs were day work. I was at that time earning \$8 a week, but a few weeks later I was transferred to some part of the shop where they all worked on piecework. After a little experience I could here earn from \$11 to \$13, but when the whistle blew at night I would be all tired out because I started in full speed in the morning and kept it going as long as possible, but I would always be too tired to go anywhere at night.

After a while the company was ready to put the whole factory on bonus basis, and I started to work after the new system, together with the whole room. At first we did not like it at all, but after a few days had passed we all found that we were not only making the same money and doing the same quantity of work, but never got tired out as we used to, because there was a certain time set to do the operation in which made us start in with speed that would enable us to finish the job in time, and by keeping it going with that speed all day we would most the time produce more than we did after the piecework system without being tired, and after the bonus system we could always be sure to get at least our day-rate pay, even if we had bad luck with the work or didn't feel good, as we were always paid our day rate, even if we did not make the job in bonus time (the time the operator is allowed for a certain operation). The bonus time was set by a time-study clerk, who timed two or three medium operators with a stop watch. He did not only time the whole operation, but he also timed every necessary movement the operator did to do the operation, and by doing so he would get the exact time it would take any medium operator to do the jobs. On top of that was allowed a certain per cent for lost time, etc. So by any means this was the only fair way to get the time. It was fair to the operator, because she or he could be sure that it was the right time for the operation; and it was fair to the company, because they were sure to get the work done in the time it ought to be.

After that I have never heard one unsatisfactory word said in the shop about the bonus system, and we had many operators coming from the other shops with piecework system who stated that they never would work after the piecework system again after having tried bonus system.

The bonus system makes the workingman and his home happy, because he don't come home from work all tired out. He also gets fair wages and work under human conditions, with the same rights as the fellow workmen.

If you wish, you can publish this letter if it can be of any help for the standing of the bonus system.

Very truly, yours,

TORVAL D. HOYER,
Acme Wire Co.

I have worked in the Acme Wire Co. nearly four years, and during that time I worked under three systems—daywork, piecework, and now the Taylor system.

I do think and like the Taylor system the best.

Yours, truly,

A. KOCH,
Acme Wire Co.

With my part of work at time study on task and bonus have found it very interesting and educating.

The old method of payment means just one pay envelope on pay day, while the bonus plan makes a willing worker and puts on an extra red envelope into his hands, with lots to gain and nothing to lose.

S. F. GILLA,
Sewell-Clapp Envelopes.

Mr. E. B. PASSANO,
President Waverly Press, Baltimore, Md.

DEAR SIR: I have been asked to state my opinion of the bonus system under which we work.

I like it and would much regret returning to a straight salary, where extra effort counts for little or nothing to the operative.

I consider the present system the finest sort of encouragement to do more work and better work. It is a fair deal on both sides. It creates a personal interest on the part of the employee in the firm's progress,

and the operative is enabled to earn more money with no more physical strain than under any other system and with a greater mental satisfaction, because extra production and quality are recorded and come back in the pay envelopes.

I am earning more money in less time, with less physical and mental strain than I believe would be possible on a straight salary basis, and I am better satisfied than I have been in the years I have been employed.

The fact that I came here 18 months ago a stranger, without home or friends in the city, and liked your bonus system well enough to remain and then return here four times from trips home, rather than accept \$18 per week straight salary in my State, Massachusetts, is the best argument I can offer.

Very respectfully,

FEBRUARY 21, 1916.

LILLIAN H. HILL.

Under the Taylor system the girls do the work the quickest and easiest way, found by timing an efficient operator.

MARGARET PURCELL,
Acme Wire Co., New Haven, Conn.

It has not interfered in the least with my physical condition or happiness. For myself I am in favor of the bonus system.

HELEN BAKER,
Acme Wire Co.

It also encourages us to put more interest in our work.

FLORENCE JOHNSON,
Acme Wire Co.

It opens the way to better positions for men of every phase of employment who can handle themselves in positions of trust and authority. I can speak without a possible chance of contradiction of my own position after showing the engineers that I could work under and with their plans my position as a foreman under long hours was improved and was placed in one of the most responsible positions in our plant, and my hours changed from nine and one-half to eight hours a day and giving me the opportunity to increase my earning capacity and my future fixed if I continue to be honest and on the job.

H. C. HOWES,
Sewell-Clapp Envelope, Chicago.

After working under its control against the old rule-of-thumb methods you find out how fair it is.

H. G. HOWES,
Sewell-Clapp Envelopes, Chicago.

In classes of work where possible I believe that by making time studies both employer and employees will be benefited. Surely persons who are competent and efficient and who produce a large amount of work should receive a higher wage than those who are less efficient and produce less work. The employee is paid for the exact amount of work produced. The employer pays for the exact amount of work received. Is it not a square deal?

In my own experience the bonus system pays far better than a standard wage.

ADA G. BEARD,
Waverly Press, Baltimore, Md.

In regard to the bonus question, would say that having worked on bonus system now for over two years I am in favor of it.

Mrs. MAE LOWNEY,
Waverly Press, Baltimore, Md.

Resolution by Chamber of Commerce of the United States in regard to the question of industrial efficiency and reaffirming the chamber's former action on this question adopted at the fourth annual meeting of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States February 10, 1916.

Whereas the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, assembled in its third annual meeting, urged that Congress should reject the so-called Deitrick amendment to a pending appropriation bill, in so far as this amendment sought to prevent the study of methods to increase industrial efficiency in manufacturing establishments of the Government and to forbid additional compensation to employees as a reward for improvement in skill and effort; and

Whereas no legislative enactment of any kind should have as its purpose interference with the development of industrial efficiency in ways which comport with the public interest: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Chamber of Commerce of the United States in fourth annual meeting assembled emphatically reaffirms the attitude it has previously taken upon this question.

The amendment of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs is, on page 90, after line 19, to strike out:

Provided, That no part of the appropriations made in this act shall be available for the salary or pay of any officer, manager, superintendent, foreman, or other person having charge of the work of any employee of the United States while making or causing to be made with a stop watch, or other time-measuring device, a time study of any job of any such employee between the starting and completion thereof, or of the movements of any such employee while engaged upon such work; nor shall any part of the appropriations made in this act be available to pay any premium or bonus or cash reward to any employee in addition to his regular wages, except for suggestions resulting in improvements or economy in the operation of any Government plant.

Mr. REED obtained the floor.

Mr. BRADY. Mr. President—

Mr. REED. Does the Senator wish to speak on this amendment?

Mr. BRADY. Just for a moment.

Mr. REED. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BRADY. I just wanted to say that I voted against striking out this amendment in the committee, and reserved the right to oppose the amendment on the floor of the Senate. I did so for the reason that I do not believe it is for the best

interests of the Government or the workingmen, either, to strike out the section as it is written in the House bill.

I have listened with much interest to what the Senator from Massachusetts had to say, and he presents a splendid argument from his viewpoint. But I believe we will have more efficiency and good service by giving the workingmen bonuses in a different manner than to attempt to hold a stop watch on them. For that reason I shall vote to strike out the provision.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Idaho to make his very few and very modest remarks. I think he might have gone much further but for his modesty, for he has been in his time a very large employer of labor, and he has also had experience as a laborer. Speaking as he does in his unostentatious manner and giving it as his opinion, I think that what he has said is entitled to more weight than the words of an inexperienced man.

Mr. President, as a prelude to what I am about to say I want to put Massachusetts against Massachusetts. The junior Senator from that great State [Mr. WEEKS] has occupied the floor of the Senate in support of the stop-watch, Taylor, and other systems, which he groups generally under the head of efficiency systems, and has very earnestly advocated the continuance of these systems, and, by logic, the extension of these systems in Government plants; and I presume I would not do that Senator an injustice if I were further to assume that he is in favor of introducing this system into all departments of governmental work and activity.

I do not profess to be an expert as to the details of these systems, but as I understand the system it is this:

An expert, or an alleged efficiency expert, comes into a private or a Government plant. He makes up his mind how long it ought to take a workman to do a particular thing. Thereupon that is fixed as the standard, and any man who does the work in shorter time is given a credit, an additional payment. Any workman who exceeds the time receives nothing for the excess time. This, it is urged, makes for efficiency and offers a premium to the more skillful and active employees.

In order to determine what a workman is doing, as I understand the system—and I speak of it in the rough—if the expert has determined that a certain job ought to be done in 50 minutes, when a workman starts at that job the stop watch is started, and when it has run the 50 minutes the stop watch stops. If it takes the workman an hour longer to complete the job, he gets no pay for that additional hour; but if he gets through with his job in 40 minutes he not only gets the price he would receive if he did it in 50 minutes, but he gets an additional price. So that the premium is put upon speed—not upon the care or skill with which the work is done. If it be up to a standard sufficient to pass at all, a premium is put upon speed.

A very fine analysis of that thought is found in the remarks of the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], made with reference to a provision such as we now have before us. It is reported in the House hearings. Senator LODGE said:

The one object of the time measure is to produce speed. Now, speed is not the only thing that the Government or any other employer or manufacturer is seeking for. There is something more important than speed, and that is quality. Speed has nothing to do with quality. Owing to great inventions of our time, owing to steam and electricity, we have carried speed to such an extent in all of our manufactures that certainly in many cases the product has deteriorated in quality as it has advanced in quantity and rapidity of production.

The stop watch and the time measure can tell you nothing whatever about quality. It may be a basis of fixing wages or anything else, but the only thing we can possibly tell by time is speed. We all associate a stop watch with its use for racing horses. I dare say it is used now for racing automobiles, but not by a man buying horses for his ordinary use.

Now, to put the stop watch on human beings may tell how fast they can work, but it can tell nothing of the quality of their work. Nor how long they may work. A horse may be very good for a short spurt and absolutely worthless for a 4-mile race. It is a poor test. It is a promoter of the idea that the one thing to do is to turn out just as much as we can just as fast as we can. That has gone through everything in this period of ours. It has deteriorated style, it has deteriorated literature, it has deteriorated art. It is deteriorating manufacture.

Mr. President, this is an important matter. There are about eight Senators in the Chamber; and I have gotten a little tired of hearing discussions here to vacant seats and seeing Senators come in and not know the question on which they are voting. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MYERS in the chair). The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Bankhead	Chilton	Dillingham	Hardwick
Borah	Clapp	Fall	Husting
Brady	Clark, Wyo.	Fletcher	James
Broussard	Cullerson	Gallinger	Johnson, S. Da's.
Bryan	Cummins	Grona	Jones
Chamberlain	Curtis	Harding	Kenyon

Kern
La Follette
Lane
Lee, Md.
Lippitt
Lodge
McCumber
Martin, Va.
Martine, N. J.

Myers
Norris
O'Gorman
Overman
Page
Penrose
Poindexter
Ransdell
Reed

Shafroth
Sheppard
Smith, Md.
Smith, S. C.
Smoot
Swanson
Thomas
Thompson
Townsend

Underwood
Vardaman
Wadsworth
Warren
Weeks
Williams

Mr. KERN. I wish to announce the unavoidable absence of the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] on important business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-seven Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, my sole object in calling a quorum was in order that this matter may be stated so that at least some 10 or 15 Members of the Senate will know what the question is when we come to vote on it. I do not say that for the purpose of criticizing Senators. We are held here necessarily from 10 o'clock in the morning until 6.30 in the evening. Every Senator has business to attend to that requires his attention elsewhere, and I have seen, particularly in the last few days, important amendments passed or defeated by men a large number of whom had heard no part of the discussion and were not familiar with the question.

Now, if you will bear with me a very few minutes, I want to state this matter. The House of Representatives by its bill prohibited or attempted to prohibit the use of the stopwatch system in the Government arsenals. The Senate committee strikes out that provision, and the question is whether we will introduce and extend that system in the Government plants and arsenals or whether we will stop it.

Congress undertook to stop it by legislation some time ago, and Gen. Crozier, as is conclusively shown by the House report, practically nullified the act of Congress.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. REED. I do.

Mr. WEEKS. The Senator, I think, is doing Gen. Crozier a little injustice in making that statement. Most of the work done at the Watertown Arsenal is provided for under the fortifications bill. The fortifications bill did not contain the provision which the Senator is criticizing, and therefore he could do it without evading the act of Congress.

Mr. REED. Yes; he found a way by which technically he could defeat the purpose of the act. He very assiduously, and I will not say cunningly but persistently, pursued that course.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President—

Mr. REED. I wish the Senator would not interrupt me, because I am going to try and be very brief.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Very well.

Mr. REED. The real question is the Taylor system. It may be called by any name you please, but it is the introduction of the Taylor system with some modifications. I want the Senate before it votes this system into our Government arsenals to know what the Taylor system is.

I call attention to the House report at page 14, and you can get an idea of Mr. Taylor's object when he created this system from his own statement, which is quoted. If it be not the statement of a man who is willing to drive labor to the edge of despair, then I can not understand the English language. I would characterize it more harshly, but its author has gone into the great beyond.

When the writer left the steel works, the Bethlehem pieceworkers were the finest body of picked laborers that he had ever seen together. They were practically all first-class men, because in each case the task which they were called upon to perform was such that only a first-class man could do it. The tasks were all purposely made so severe that not more than one out of five laborers (perhaps even a smaller percentage than this) could keep up.

Where the labor market is large enough to secure in a reasonable time enough strictly first-class men, the piecework rates should be fixed on such a basis that only a first-class man working at his best can earn the average amount called for. This figure should be, in the case of first-class men, as stated above, from 30 to 100 per cent beyond the wages usually paid. The task idea is emphasized with this style of piecework by two things—the high wages and the laying off, after a reasonable trial, of incompetent men; and for the success of the system the number of men employed on practically the same class of work should be large enough for the workmen quite often to have the object lesson of seeing men laid off for failing to earn high wages and others substituted in their places.

Now, that was the idea of the father of this system, to create a system where only one man out of ten could survive its hardships, and to hold before all employees constantly the example of their fellow workmen being discharged.

How is the system organized and effectuated? I read from page 15 of the House report. They quote the testimony of Mr. Frey, who was one of the board appointed to investigate this very question, the Federal Industrial Relations Commission.

If you will follow them you will see how it works out a plan that absolutely compels every man to work in constant fear of discharge and every man to become the slave driver of his fellow workmen or of every man who may work under him. Here is the scheme worked out:

One instance showing the extent to which "efficiency experts" can develop methods of speeding the workers up to their physical and nervous limit made a permanent impression upon the investigators.

The plant employed the usual forms of time and motion study for the determination of what the task should be, and the workers were paid a bonus if they accomplished the task. For example, if the time set upon a task was one hour, the worker, if he finished the job in an hour, was credited with an hour and a quarter's pay, based upon his hourly wage rate; so that if this was 20 cents he would receive 25 cents for the hour's work.

This bonus was not considered sufficient to properly assist and stimulate the workers, so the foreman was also paid a bonus, this being based upon the number of workers under his charge who earned their full bonus. For the foreman's efficiency to reach 100 per cent it would be necessary for every worker in his gang to earn their bonus every hour of the working day. It was therefore to the foreman's interest to do all that lay in his power to see that every worker accomplished the task which had been set.

However, this was but a part of the scheme or system which aimed to get all of the work possible out of the workers, for another factor entered largely into the plan. The time-study man and task setter was also paid a bonus which was based upon the number of workers who failed to make their tasks, the task setter's efficiency reaching 100 per cent only when every worker in a group failed to finish their jobs in the time set for the accomplishment of their tasks. The time-study man was therefore paid a bonus to set the tasks so high that the workers could rarely, if ever, accomplish them, while the foreman was paid a bonus based upon the number of workers who could be prevailed upon to finish their jobs within the time set.

Under this system there were no rest periods—

And so forth.

There is more of this, which I shall not take the time to read.

Mr. THOMAS. I was called out, and only entered the Chamber while the Senator was reading. May I ask the Senator what he is reading from?

Mr. REED. I have just read from the testimony of Mr. Frey, of the Industrial Relations Commission, quoted in the report of the committee of the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, an analysis of the scheme exposes its diabolism and shows to what oppressive uses the Taylor system can be put. Let me illustrate the scheme just referred to:

A factory owner employs an efficiency expert whose business it is to determine the number of minutes within which each piece of work in the factory must be completed. It is then provided that if any workman does not perform his task within the given time he shall be docked, but that he shall have a premium if he completes the task in less than the specified time.

The factory owner then employs a boss who likewise comes within the control of the same system, the rule as to the boss being that his rating is to be determined by the efficiency of the men. Accordingly, if the boss can compel every man under him to complete his work within the time fixed by the efficiency engineer, the boss's efficiency is 100 per cent. If he can force the men under him to do the work in less time than that specified the boss's efficiency is thereby increased above 100 per cent. But if a single man fails to perform his task within the allotted time, the boss's efficiency is to that extent decreased. The result is that the boss as a matter of self-protection or self-advancement is compelled to drive his men to the very limit of their strength.

But the scheme does not end here. The efficiency expert or time-study man and task setter is paid a bonus if the workmen fail to perform the task set by him. If he sets the task so hard that no single man can perform the work assigned, then the task setter's efficiency goes to 100 per cent. The greater the degree of failure the higher will be the task setter's efficiency.

Conceive, if you can, the condition of an employee compelled to work at a task which is set by a man whose rating and value depend upon the task being made so hard that the employee can not perform it, and to work under a boss whose rating and value is to be determined by his ability to compel the laborer to perform the task in less than the time fixed by the efficiency expert. Is it not plain that the employee is being ground between the upper millstone (the efficiency expert), and the nether millstone (the boss)?

Such a scheme is more inhuman than that conceived in the mind of old Pharaoh when he compelled the Israelites to make bricks without straw. Pharaoh's scheme was crude and ineffective. The Taylor system is scientifically fiendish.

That is the Taylor system in its entirety and in its beauty, and that is the system that is being proposed for the Government factories.

As was said by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] time speeds are not the only element. You put a lot of men to work and tell them if they accomplish a certain task within a certain time, so that it can pass inspection, they will receive a premium, and if they do not they will lose their time.

One of these men is engaged in assembling one of the great pieces of ordnance, the working or the nonworking of which may mean the saving of a battle or the losing of a battle. Put him under such a system as I have described, that man may turn out a piece of ordnance and some day it will fail to do its work and a great catastrophe fall upon our arms. The whole system is inhuman. It is brutal. It is fiendish, and it ought not to be imposed upon white men or upon men of any other color.

Now, Mr. President, where was it devised? Was it a thing that was advocated by those who studied the welfare of labor or was it advocated by those who studied the other side of the question?

I find in this report that there is quoted as an advocate of this system that distinguished gentleman of whom we heard so much when we were investigating the lobby, and who was the head of the manufacturers' lobby association here in Washington.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] has read some letters. Of course you can get individual letters from individual men, particularly as is indicated by this report when influence has been brought upon men by their bosses and their superiors. But what about the great voice, the common voice of labor, upon this question? The Senator says this system has met with universal approval. But this is what the House committee said after a full investigation, the results of which are to be found in this volume of approximately 375 pages. This is what that committee said:

Labor, organized and unorganized, has systematically opposed the introduction of the system into Government plants. Gen. Crozier asserts that outside influences are responsible for the workers' hostile attitude, but the evidence submitted to your committee seems completely to disprove the general theory.

I call attention in this connection of those who have some regard for human beings to the report at page 14, in which it is stated:

The United States Public Health Service has just issued bulletin No. 73, "Tuberculosis Among Industrial Workers," by Surg. D. E. Robinson and Asst. Surg. J. G. Wilson.

Those gentlemen are surely impartial and competent witnesses, and here is what they have to say:

"SPEEDING UP.

"This is a natural resultant of the piecework system, and from the standpoint of the employees' health does more harm than any other one thing associated with factory work. Although it works, or appears to work, to the interest of the employer by increasing the output of the individual workers, these good results are probably only temporary, as the pernicious effect upon the health of the wage earner will, in the end, have the opposite effect."

And again on page 16 of the bulletin, speaking particularly of the boot and shoe industry:

"One of the most noticeable things about the work in these factories is the high tension at which everyone seems to be working, as the work in nearly all instances is piecework and earnings naturally depend on the output. This high-pressure work or speeding, in our opinion, is one of the most important causes of the lowered physical vitality noticed among these workers, as the constant strain of work at top speed, week after week, must tell in the end. The human body is only a machine, too often a delicate one, capable of standing only so much abuse. With this high-pressure work for eight or nine hours a day, with but a half hour's breathing spell for lunch, coupled with the effects of dissipation and loss of sleep, we have a combination that only the strong can resist, the weak succumbing to any infection with which they come into contact. Moreover, the nervous organization suffers in this speeding process and neurasthenic individuals were frequently observed among both male and female shop workers."

If the Senator will pardon me, I call attention to another vice of this system. Who is it that lays out the work for these men? Who are these efficiency experts? If they were old and skilled mechanics who had themselves stood at the forge and at the lathe and had worked, they might devise a plan that would be reasonably fair for their fellow workmen; but this is what we are told by the House committee as the result of their investigation, at page 13:

The bulk of the time-study men encountered were immature men drawn from the shop or from college. They were expected to get their knowledge and training in all the matters enumerated above through the actual work of the time study and task setting. In the majority of cases encountered it was not considered essential that they should have had any special training in the particular industry. A man who had worked exclusively in the machine shop was considered competent, after a few weeks or months of contact and trial experience, to set tasks in a cotton mill.

A little further on, on that same line, at page 25, you will find this:

We found very early in our investigations that not only were the leading exponents of scientific management at odds between themselves as to how time studies should be made and what form of payment should be used, but that they were unanimously of the opinion that there were more fakers installing scientific management than there were fakers in any other profession.

So you take a class of so-called efficiency experts, the majority of whom are fakers, and you place one of those inexperienced fakers in a great factory where hundreds of American citizens are employed, and Mr. Fakir, who never put hand to

a lathe, who could not assemble a monkey wrench, proceeds to say how long and how short a time a piece of work shall be done in. If he makes an unjust decision, every man in the plant suffers; but if he is really an expert according to the Taylor idea, he works out a scheme in which every man is worked at the highest tension of muscle and nerve and brain.

How has it worked? The House hearings and the testimony developed that to some extent. They took the case of some of the best workmen in some of the best shops who were working according to the schedules prepared by these alleged experts. They put that workman to work, and then found that his efficiency varied—that is, taking the rule of the expert now as the basis—all the way from 21 per cent to 150 per cent. In some cases working at the same rate, the same tension, he could do the job in two-thirds of the time laid down; in other cases, it took nearly five times the amount that was allowed to do the work.

That is the kind of system that we are asked to install in our Government workshops. It is repugnant to every principle of humanity; it is destructive to really scientific work; it destroys the independence of the laboring men; it puts them on a nervous and mental test, which absorbs all of their vitality. It is intolerable; it is unbearable; it is being condemned by the most humane of labor employers; and the Congress of the United States of America, which is engaged in passing legislation for the amelioration of the condition of children, for the shortening of the hours of labor, and for other measures looking toward a betterment of the condition of the toiler, is about to be asked by the Senate committee to commit itself to a policy as racking, as abominable, as harrowing, as revolting, as grinding as was ever devised by a slave driver in the Tropics.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I have no desire to detain the Senate at any length, but I feel very deeply in relation to this matter. Primarily I am opposed, as I have before said, to this system. I feel that it is humiliating to the average man to have a boss stand over him as he would over a horse with a time watch. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] said that with very few exceptions all laboring men were for it. I find here in the House hearings, on page 35, the statement of Mr. O'Connell. I will not read the whole of his statement, but he says this:

The men at the Rock Island Arsenal of the United States Government—1,500 of them—when it became generally known that the Taylor system would be put into effect, these men, regardless of their trade or calling, whether mechanics or laborers, this army of men arose as one man and said: "No; no Taylor system for us. We are working for one of the best employers in the world, the United States Government; we have an eight-hour working day; the wages are as good as those paid by private employers; but we will not accept the Taylor system."

I find here, again, a letter to the former Secretary of War dated at the Watertown Arsenal, which the Senator from Massachusetts has quoted, to Lindley M. Garrison. I shall not read the whole of it, but I shall read a portion of it, as follows:

The effect of this system here has been to create a feeling of distrust between the employees and the management; it has destroyed every vestige of cooperation between the workmen and the foremen collectively, and has produced a condition of unhappiness throughout the whole works.

Yet I heard the Senator from Massachusetts quote from some letter which was sent to him from some private concern, stating how happy their employees were. The fact is the average man is not very happy under toll; there is no doubt about that. We work because it will bring us results.

As I said in my opening remarks on this subject, I realize that the Government of the United States can do nothing as to private concerns. The great plants of Carnegie, of Phipps, and those like the Homestead and Bethlehem plants will do as they please; but I pray, in God's name, let the Government of the United States be a model to the employers of labor throughout the land. That the Carnegie and Homestead people have made money for their principals under this system I do not deny, but let our Government plant not be built up upon the bone and blood of our American workmen.

The Senator from Massachusetts stated that under this system wages have been increased. I desire, however, to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that wages have been increased without the application of this system. The wages of bricklayers, carpenters, mechanics, and blacksmiths throughout our entire land have been increased. They have increased in wage, in general thrift, and in general happiness.

The Senator cites the fact that the time system was applied only in the case of the making of some intricate or delicate tools. I have here a report showing that men were timed while carrying 13 tons of ore during 8 hours. Think of a human frame lifting up and carrying 13 tons of ore! That this laborer might carry 15 or 16, or even more, tons of ore to suit these unreasonable and unholy exactions a time watch was held on him.

The Senator from Massachusetts tells us about some woman who in her stitching would use a thread a yard long, when if it was 10 inches long she might take two stitches instead of one. Great God! Has it come to this, that as to the poor seamstress who sits and stitches and stitches her very life away by the glimmer of a midnight lamp, they calculate the stitches to this degree? Oh, heavens! Is it possible that the liberal, generous, educated "hub of the universe"—Massachusetts—stands for a system that would so measure a woman's earnings and her livelihood?

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I yield to my best friend.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator from New Jersey in part represents a manufacturing State—

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I do.

Mr. GALLINGER. A wonderful State. Do not a great many of the manufacturers in New Jersey employ this system?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I think too many of them do.

Mr. GALLINGER. Has the Senator received many protests from laboring men in those industries?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Oh, they are under the thumb of the men who employ them. No; I have not, but I should like to know by what process the Senator from New Hampshire has received so many commendatory letters of this unholy system? I have not received many.

Mr. GALLINGER. My observation is that laboring men are not much under the thumb of their employers nowadays. That is my observation.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. No, thank God, the laboring men are on top.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think they are.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Yes; I think they are.

Mr. GALLINGER. I know in my own little State, which is a manufacturing State, a good many of the industrial establishments are employing this system, and I have never received a single protest against it by letter or otherwise.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I can find you protest after protest, although I have not sought them out. I could hardly believe that in the Senate, in this enlightened age, there could be found so splendid a Senator as the Senator from the great Commonwealth of Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] standing up and defending such an unholy and indefensible system.

Mr. GALLINGER. My own impression is, if the Senator will permit me, though unfortunately I have not the facts to substantiate the suggestion I am going to make, that there has been a great exaggeration as to what this system really means. But we will let that pass for the present. I wonder very much, indeed, that in our great industrial establishments where this system is in vogue the laboring men are not complaining more than they are; in fact, so far as I know, they are not complaining at all.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I have no desire to detain the Senate longer, and I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, before the Senator from New Jersey sits down, I want to ask him a question, which nobody can answer so well as he. What does he think the effect would be if the stop-watch system were applied to the Senate of the United States? [Laughter.]

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I think it might be a blessing to the country; but, if we were engaged in physical toil, I would say that it would be utterly un-American, ungenerous, and inhuman.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Military Affairs I cast my vote for the elimination of this proviso. Having done so, it is perhaps not improper that I should occupy briefly the attention of the Senate with a statement of the reasons which controlled my action.

The interests of the public are of some importance in all matters of general legislation, and generally quite as important as those which are identified with some particular features of it; and, in my judgment, the interests of the public as to this and kindred subjects of legislation, especially in our so-called measures of preparation, require the establishment of that efficiency commensurate with first-class production consistent with the rights of the employees of the Government and with the general elements of humanity.

Mr. President, it is very easy to attribute improper motives to those whose opinions are not entirely satisfactory to us, and it is equally easy to meet argument with vituperation. Vituperation, however, is a species of self-indulgence, and is in no sense argumentation. I shall, therefore, in the short time that

I shall occupy endeavor to confine myself to the merits of the subject as I understand them.

I may say, Mr. President, by way of preliminary, that I have no fear of being reproached with any desire or intention of impairing the rights or denying the just requirements of labor in anything which I do here in the discharge of my duties. If a man's record is of any value, it should serve him amply by mere reference to it whenever occasion requires.

I advocated the eight-hour day nearly 40 years ago, and 29 years ago I appeared before a committee of the general assembly of my State in advocacy of an employers' liability act, basing my argument on the dissenting opinion of a judge of the Supreme Court of Ohio in the case of Railroad Co. against Kealy, as I now recall, in Eighth Ohio Reports, which embodies every argument for that legislation which has recently been enacted and which we designate by the general term of "employers' liability acts." I have been and I always shall be an advocate of every movement tending to ameliorate labor conditions, with due regard to the mutual welfare of all, so long as I am in public life. On the other hand, if there be propositions which do not commend themselves to my judgment and which seem to be inimical to labor or to society, I shall from the same sense of duty act in accordance with what my judgment requires. Hence, in so far as this subject is concerned, being one which affects the public interest quite as much as if not more than any private interest, the disposition to be made of it should be determined by such facts and inferences as may be pertinent to the subject.

Mr. President, with this preliminary statement, let us see what the proviso is. It reads as follows:

That no part of the appropriations made in this act shall be available for the salary or pay of any officer, manager, superintendent, foreman, or other person having charge of the work of any employee of the United States while making or causing to be made with a stop watch, or other time-measuring device, a time study of any job of any such employee between the starting and completion thereof, or of the movements of any such employee while engaged upon such work; nor shall any part of the appropriations made in this act be available to pay any premium or bonus or cash reward to any employee in addition to his regular wages, except for suggestions resulting in improvements or economy in the operation of any Government plant.

In argument this proviso has been confounded—at least that seems to me a proper deduction—with what is known as the Taylor system—a system which has been lauded and condemned to as great a degree, perhaps, as any industrial experiment of modern times, the merits of which, either in theory or in practice, I shall not spend any time in discussing. It may or it may not be, for any purpose of mine, a most pernicious and damnable system, one invented for the undoing of labor and for the destruction of the energies and the health of those employed in our manufactories. But I want to say with reference to it that if the system is what the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] has asserted it to be, if the system is capable of being and has been used for the production of those conditions to which the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINE] refers, it should not only be banished from all the avenues of Government employment but it should be prohibited by law in every State in the Union, for if it be true that in its general use it serves to debilitate, overwork, and destroy the health of the laborer, then a great public interest, above and beyond that of any manufacturer or of any laborer, demands governmental action for its prohibition.

But, Mr. President, has this system or any system which heretofore has been in operation in any of the arsenals or armories of the United States produced these dire results, or any of them; and, if so, where is the evidence of the fact?

This matter was presented to the Military Affairs Committee some two years ago for the first time in my experience. There it was the subject of general discussion, and arguments in favor of and against it were made by the respective members of that committee to each other. A Senator came before us asking to be heard against the proposed amendment. He was armed with a number of communications, principally, I think, from the Frankford Arsenal, from the workmen employed there; and, without any exception, these letters were in protest to the committee against the adoption of the proviso. I recall distinctly that in a number of instances it was recited by the writers that, through the extra pay they had been able to realize in the performance of their tasks, they had purchased homes upon the installment plan, and were depending upon the continuance of the existing system to earn sufficient to meet the installments and pay the amounts still due upon them. That, Mr. President, made and makes a greater appeal to me than anything which has been urged in behalf of or against the proviso, for if it be true that under the operation of whatever system was employed, the wage earner was able to obtain a home for himself and his family, to anchor himself to the soil

of the Commonwealth, and become a freeholder in very truth, until those homes are paid for there should be no interference with the prevailing system.

Now, it may be that these letters were extorted from their signers by slave drivers in the employ of the Government, or by the exercise of some coercive power the existence of which I can not imagine in a governmental establishment, and that they were not, therefore, the free expressions of those who wrote the letters, or, if so, that they were exaggerated or false. But, Mr. President, as suggested by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], the overpay was certainly no exaggeration. I do not think anything contained in these letters is an exaggeration; for if so, how easily it could have been refuted if the fact were so.

The letters which have been presented here by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS], coming from the Watertown Arsenal and from outside employees, may have been the result of coercion, but to my mind it is a poor way to meet a proposition by questioning the source of the proof, and to insinuate that a fact properly authenticated should not be received because, forsooth, the contingencies may permit of the conclusion that the communication was not the act of free will of the person making it.

I also endeavored to ascertain, on my own account, if there were any specific instances of overwork under the prevailing system, such as the indefinite one instanced by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINE]. Of course my means of investigation were limited, but they disclosed nothing of the kind; and the instance given by the Senator from New Jersey—which he unquestionably believes to have occurred—is, to my mind, nothing in the world but a myth. I do not believe that any individual can be produced who has been compelled to work under any system in any department of the Government until completely exhausted and taken to a hospital or some other place for physical relief.

It is easy, Mr. President, to cite an instance if it exists, and very easy to establish it by name, date, and place of occurrence. The Senator, in response to my request, could do no more than to state that he had received his information from some source, the only definite thing about it being its alleged occurrence in the mail department. I do not believe it occurred. I do not believe that the Senator, if he makes a proper investigation, will be able to discover that it occurred.

Mr. President, it will be noted that this amendment as it passed the House prohibits the use of any method whatever, by means of which the labor cost of any given piece of work or of the manufacture of any given item or article, can be ascertained. If not only the stop watch but every other device for determining these things are prohibited, then the determination itself is impossible; and if it is to be understood that all attempt at the measurement of things with a view of determining cost as well as efficiency is to be prohibited in all governmental workshops, then how is it possible to determine the relation, in labor and other expense, which those things which the Government produces bear to those which the Government does not produce but must purchase?

Some time ago it was stated upon this floor that in the manufacture of powder the Government output cost far less than the prices which before that time it had been compelled to pay to private manufacturers. How was that cost ascertained? There must have been some method of determining it by a consideration of every item going into the production of the finished article, some measurement involving, of course, the process of time, without which all measurements are absolutely impossible, with the consequence that the Government has been able to say: "The powder which we manufacture costs us only so much; therefore we will only pay a similar amount, or that sum plus a small profit, to those who desire to sell us powder hereafter." What private manufacturer would accept a mere ipse dixit of the Government any more than that of a competitor? And what one would refuse to accept the fact upon which the statement is based if ascertained by unimpeachable processes? And how are those facts to be ascertained in any manner if those in charge of governmental work are by law prohibited from using any method of determining the facts?

That, Mr. President, is one of my most serious objections to this proviso. It is catholic in its extent; it is absolute; there is no possible way, in my judgment, for an honest man to avoid the prohibition which it places upon his action, and I do not think anyone will attempt it.

Mr. President, much has been said here about the pernicious consequences to the laboring man, the wage earner, of the application to him of the principle of time service known in general parlance as the stop-watch system.

Now, I concede that it can be abused, and I join in the statement of the Senator from Missouri that where this or any similar system is used for the purpose of oppressing or speeding up and overburdening the physical system of the wage earner it is infamous. The term is not too harsh. But, Mr. President, the fact that any system is subject to abuse—and nearly all of them are—is no argument against the system itself when properly used and properly applied. We can be extreme and intemperate in everything; and in the past employers—there may be some now, but happily very few—who may be so actuated by the principle of gain as to exact the utmost degree of effort and the last ounce of strength, all that can be given by the employee in exchange for his day's wages. Such an employer is an enemy of his kind; his name should be anathema; and he is entitled neither to the consideration of his Government nor of society. On the other hand, Mr. President, in all of our modern establishments, and especially in view of world-wide competition, efficiency is and must be the watchword of the day.

I recall that some time ago Mr. Justice Brandeis startled the country by the statement, during a trial of some controversies before the Interstate Commerce Commission, that the railroad companies of the country could save a million dollars a day by the exercise of efficiency and economy in management. The statement, I say, was startling. Not only so, but it was regarded with incredulity by the great majority of the people and was ridiculed by the railroad managers themselves. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] reminds me that the late Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. Aldrich, upon the floor of the Senate made the remark—and I believe it was true—that a proper system of efficiency in governmental administration would mean a saving every year of \$300,000,000—a saving which the present demands upon the governmental purse would make extremely desirable and relieve the majority members of the Senate Finance Committee of an infinite amount of worry and trouble over revenue problems.

Mr. President, the railroads, notwithstanding the indignant denunciation with which they received the statement of Mr. Justice Brandeis, began to act upon it; and I venture to state that their investigations and subsequent changes vindicated his judgment and that a great saving has been effected. Has any laborer in the railroad world been at all injured by reason of the introduction of these new ideas and systems of efficiency and of economy? Was the saving thus effected by the introduction of reforms and changes which bore upon the physical condition and wasted the physical energies of the wage earner? If so, Mr. President, we would have heard of it long, long ago.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I am interested in the statement just made by the Senator from Colorado with regard to Mr. Brandeis. Does the Senator from Colorado mean to be understood as saying that the railroads have effected economies through which a million dollars a day has been saved along the lines suggested by Mr. Brandeis?

Mr. THOMAS. No; I do not say that. What I meant to say was that they began a system of economies which unquestionably disclosed the fact that they were operating their roads at needless expense, and I have no doubt they saved hundreds of thousands of dollars every day.

Mr. CUMMINS. I understand that the suggestions of Mr. Brandeis were not adopted at all, that the railroads found it impossible to adopt them, and that subsequently the rates were increased in order to accomplish what it was thought might be accomplished by a reduction in operating expenses.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, of course I shall not enter into a discussion of the action of the railroads after the announcement; but my recollection of conditions, and the history of the times since that statement, is that in many instances economies were effected, efficiencies were established, consequent upon the published statement to which I have referred, which realized an enormous amount of revenue which up to that time was wasted.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, speaking of Mr. Justice Brandeis reminds me, the Senator may recall it, that a short time before going on the bench he made a public statement in which he said in effect that it would be a great mistake to give up the efficiency methods which were being used by the Government.

Mr. THOMAS. I thank the Senator for the reminder, which had temporarily escaped me. Surely, Mr. Justice Brandeis would not be accused of being actuated by love and affection for the employers of the country, and certainly not by any desire to thwart the wishes of the wage earners of the Nation.

Mr. President, I do not know whether the so-called Taylor system is used in the Ford factory or not, but I do know, and I think we are all aware of the fact, that the operations of that great establishment are carried on with an efficiency and econ-

omy that is little short of a marvel. The management know to the fraction of a cent the cost of every car that is produced. They can figure the number of cars that can be produced every 24 hours, and in the event of an increase in their business exactly the added number of men and material needed for the purpose. The world has obtained a benefit from this wonderful organization that is incalculable in dollars and cents.

In the first place, Ford has built a car so cheap that it is accessible to all classes and conditions of men. The Ford machine is as common in the country as the cattle upon the hillside, and in evolving such a car, Mr. President, he has forced a reduction in the price of cars made by every other manufacturer in the land, in some instances to the extent of 50 per cent below the prices prevailing before this marvelous system of efficiency became effective in establishing an automobile standard to which all competitors must pay tribute.

Mr. REED. I wish to ask the Senator the same question I asked the Senator from Massachusetts, if the stop-watch system or time system is used in his factory.

Mr. THOMAS. If the Senator had done me the honor to listen to me he would have known that just a few moments ago I said that I did not know whether he used it or not, but that he used some system, and this proviso excludes the Government from using any system whatever. He has applied some system by means of which he has been able to determine the time necessary to produce every part of a car, and to assemble it, thereby determining the price to the public, combining both cost and profit.

Mr. REED. I hope the Senator will pardon me. That is a very different thing from working under the Taylor system. Any man might easily figure out what it costs, the time it takes in a factory, to produce a given result. That has nothing to do with the Taylor system.

Mr. THOMAS. I am not talking about the Taylor system.

Mr. REED. That is what this bill is aimed at.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator assumes that this proviso is aimed at the Taylor system. His construction of it may be correct. My construction of the proviso is that it prohibits the Government from using any system whatever, because no system is possible that does not involve some measurement of time. The Senator says that the efficiency of the Ford factory is something that can be obtained without resort to the Taylor system. I grant that; but it is impossible, Mr. President, to acquire it without a resort to some system that must take into consideration the most inconsiderable as well as the largest item going into the manufacture of the enormous output of that concern, and, as the entire country gets the benefit of it, it is the greatest of all the testimonials to the necessity of system and efficiency in work.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, if the interpretation put upon this proviso by the Senator from Colorado were correct, his argument would be unanswerable, but I beg to suggest to him this thought or to ask him this question: Is it not true that the system prohibited in the proviso has reference only to the ascertainment of the wages of the particular man; that is, the capacity of the particular man to produce? It does not prohibit any system for the ascertainment of the cost of work, but it does prohibit a system which establishes a standard for a particular man and fixes the wages of the man by the standard so established.

If it were true that it prevented the Government from ascertaining what it cost to turn out gun carriages or rifles, or anything of that sort, I would be almost as much opposed to it as is the Senator from Colorado, but it has no reference to the cost at all any more than though wages were paid upon a uniform standard of \$3 a day or \$5 a day. It is only for the purpose of ascertaining what the Government should pay that particular man.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, the Senator's construction of this proviso is not mine. The subject of wages is not mentioned in the proviso even indirectly. It prohibits the use of any system for the purpose of studying jobs or products. While the Senator's contention might be one of the results of labor studies, as I read the proviso, it is not the thing, if the language used in the proviso means anything to me, that is embodied in the phraseology employed by the drafter of the measure.

I was about to submit one further thought, Mr. President, upon the subject under discussion when interrupted. It is that this great system known as the Ford Motor Co. pays the best wages of any institution in the country, together with bonuses in the shape of a division of profits in addition to wages, the bonus being measured upon the basis of efficiency.

Where is the workman in the United States who criticizes or can fairly criticize the policy of that great private institution? Where is the man who does not feel fortunate if he can

secure employment by it? Where is the employee who has left it voluntarily? It is to my mind the highest and greatest testimonial of industrial efficiency in the world, higher than the Standard Oil Co., because it distributes its benefits to every man who contributes, however humble a share, to the upbuilding and the continuance of its operations. Without the establishment of an efficiency system of measurement of some sort by means of which every item of cost could be ascertained, the great Ford factory would not be what it is, and the multitudes laboring there at a minimum of \$5 a day for eight hours, with these additional bonuses, would be out of employment or holding precarious jobs all over the country.

Mr. President, however damnable a system may be when improperly employed or ill adjusted, if it can produce consequences such as this, if properly employed and developed, it is certainly a system which the Government of the United States should be privileged to resort to if it proposes to become a manufacturer of the wares which it consumes in competition with private production. I would like to see every arsenal in the United States run on the Ford plan. I would like to see every new industrial activity of the Government based upon the Ford plan paying wages at the same rate and paying bonuses of some sort, I do not care whether you call them bonuses or not, based upon a system of efficiency which wrongs no man and helps nearly everybody.

Mr. President, in this system which prevails in the arsenals, or which did prevail prior to the enactment of recent legislation, there is doubtless a standard called a day's work which is paid to every man regardless of his capacity and regardless of his output. In other words, no matter how far short a man may fall as compared to the man of highest efficiency the day wage is absolute and he only works so long. Unless I am greatly mistaken the limit of employment in our arsenals is eight hours. If that be true, then I can not conceive how it is possible that the application of some method for the purpose of determining the cost of production can be in any way physically or mentally injurious to the workmen.

I think the cases of speeding up to which our attention has been called have occurred, must have occurred where an eight-hour day did not prevail. I make that statement with some hesitation because my information is very limited, but upon general principles an eight-hour day based upon a fair standard of wage and of production can not very well produce any of the consequences which have been so eloquently pictured to the imagination here.

Mr. President, I have been always led to believe that class legislation should be avoided wherever possible. We do not always hew to the line with regard to that maxim any more than to others, but there is in this sort of legislation the objection that it is designed for the benefit of a class only, to the detriment largely of the Government itself, and class legislation is class legislation whether its privileged object be of high or low degree. In other words, class legislation is objectionable regardless of the persons who may be its beneficiaries. Of course, while it may be replied that class legislation begets class legislation, the fact that it is such can not be denied; and I think it should be excluded, and particularly in legislation which has for its object the initiation of enterprises of governmental concern and designed to enable the Government to experiment freely in its efforts to obtain such supplies on its own account as may be needed in its manifold operations.

I have heard it said, Mr. President, and by high authority, and my reading tells me that many so insist, that the real objection to the establishment of efficiency systems is that it serves to destroy that equality of wage earners for which a great many of the organizations contend. I make that statement also with some hesitation, because I am unaware of the extent to which it may be advocated or opposed; but this I know, that if an employer is to be inhibited from taking any steps or doing anything whereby he can ascertain the difference between the productive energies and powers of employees it obviously follows that he who is the least capable must ultimately become the standard for him who is the most capable, and that the dead level of mediocrity or a level below that must be reached if the purpose sought to be subserved can be obtained.

Mr. President, that is impossible. Legislation can not do it. Nature can not do it. All men are created equal. That is true as to equality of opportunity, but there are differences, physical and mental, between all the myriad inhabitants of this earth, and every man in a democratic country is entitled as a citizen to the exercise and development of every faculty which God has given him, subject only to the laws, and without let or hindrance by man or by government. We can obtain an equality in nature only by leveling the mountains to the plains. We can not elevate the plains to the level of the summits.

We must, therefore, Mr. President, legislation or no legislation, recognize the right of a man who possesses faculties superior to those of his fellows to enjoy the benefit of them in any system, regardless of what his calling may be. We recognize the right in every other department of life. We send our children to school and spur the ambition of each to exceed his fellows. Every system that will hold the ambitious down to the level of his less fortunate fellows will be repudiated by the common sense of every thinking man and woman in the country. The same is true in the professions; the same is true everywhere; and it will always be true, regardless of human legislation, as long as time shall run. There is no equality in nature; there is no equality of physical and mental endowment among men.

What is efficiency, Mr. President? One homely definition would be, the best way of doing things. I understand it is the purpose of the Government to follow that method of procedure which will enable it to ascertain the best way of doing things, so that it can compete with those great private institutions engaged in the manufacture of the articles which the Government proposes to make for itself, and just in proportion as we place handicaps on the Government just in that proportion will its attempt to compete with private institutions fail, and the Government manufacture will be a failure because of the contrast that its cost of production will present to that high state of efficiency prevailing in private circles and to which no just complaint can be made.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I desire to offer an amendment to the bill.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. The question before the Senate is on the committee amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the committee amendment.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I thought it was on my motion, Mr. President. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, which is to strike out the House text. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER], and, in his absence, I temporarily withhold my vote.

Mr. CURTIS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK], and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. HARDING (when his name was called). In the absence of the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], with whom I have a general pair, I withhold my vote.

Mr. MYERS (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES] and vote "nay."

Mr. REED (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. TAGGART] and vote "nay."

Mr. SMITH of Georgia (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] and vote "yea."

Mr. TILLMAN (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA] and vote "nay."

Mr. WADSWORTH (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HOLLISS]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I am relieved from my pair on the Army appropriation bill, and I vote "yea."

Mr. CHILTON. I inquire if the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. CHILTON. I have a pair with that Senator, which I transfer to the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] and vote "nay."

Mr. GRONNA (when his name was called). I inquire if the Senator from Maine [Mr. JOHNSON] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. GRONNA. I have a general pair with that Senator and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. LIPPITT. I have a general pair with the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH]. I see he has not voted, and so I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. HARDING. I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] to the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER] and vote "yea."

Mr. THOMPSON (after having voted in the negative). I transfer my pair with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. CURTIS. I am requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CATRON] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN];

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY]; and

The Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND] with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE].

The result was announced—yeas 15, nays 36, as follows:

YEAS—15.

Brandegee	du Pont	Smoot	Weeks
Chamberlain	Gallinger	Thomas	Williams
Clark, Wyo.	Harding	Townsend	Works
Dillingham	Page	Warren	

NAYS—36.

Ashurst	James	Myers	Shields
Beckham	Johnson, S. Dak.	Norris	Simmons
Borah	Jones	O'Gorman	Smith, S. C.
Brady	Kenyon	Overman	Sterling
Chilton	Kern	Penrose	Stone
Clapp	La Follette	Poinexter	Swanson
Cummins	Lane	Reed	Thompson
Fletcher	Lee, Md.	Shafroth	Tillman
Husting	Martine, N. J.	Sheppard	Vardaman

NOT VOTING—44.

Bankhead	Gronna	McLean	Saulsbury
Broussard	Hardwick	Martin, Va.	Sherman
Bryan	Hitchcock	Nelson	Smith, Ariz.
Catron	Hollis	Newlands	Smith, Ga.
Clarke, Ark.	Hughes	Oliver	Smith, Md.
Colt	Johnson, Me.	Owen	Smith, Mich.
Culberson	Lea, Tenn.	Phelan	Sutherland
Curtis	Lewis	Pittman	Taggart
Fall	Lippitt	Pomerene	Underwood
Goff	Lodge	Ransdell	Wadsworth
Gore	McCumber	Robinson	Walsh

So the amendment of the committee was rejected.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I should like very much to dispose of the committee amendments before individual amendments are offered from the floor.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the next amendment passed over.

The SECRETARY. The next amendment passed over is on page 91, after line 17, to strike out:

SEC. 2. That a council of executive information is hereby established, for the coordination of industries and resources for the national security and welfare, to consist of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of Labor.

SEC. 3. That the council of executive information shall nominate to the President, and the President shall appoint, an advisory commission, consisting of not more than seven persons, each of whom shall have special knowledge of some industry, public utility, or the development of some natural resource, or be otherwise specially qualified, in the opinion of the council, for the performance of the duties hereinafter provided. The members of the advisory commission shall serve without compensation, but shall be allowed actual expenses of travel and subsistence when attending meetings of the commission or engaged in investigations pertaining to its activities. The advisory commission shall hold such meetings as shall be called by the council or be provided by the rules and regulations adopted by the council for the conduct of its work.

SEC. 4. That it shall be the duty of the council of executive information to supervise and direct investigations and make recommendations to the President and the heads of executive departments as to the location of railroads with reference to the frontier of the United States so as to render possible expeditious concentration of troops and supplies to points of defense; the coordination of military, industrial, and commercial purposes in the location of extensive highways and branch lines of railroad; the utilization of waterways; the mobilization of military and naval resources for defense; the increase of domestic production of articles and materials essential to the support of armies and of the people during the interruption of foreign commerce; the development of seagoing transportation; data as to amounts, location, method and means of production, and availability of military supplies; the giving of information to producers and manufacturers as to the class of supplies needed by the military and other services of the Government, the requirements relating thereto, and the creation of relations which will render possible in time of need the immediate concentration and utilization of the resources of the Nation.

SEC. 5. That the council of executive information shall adopt rules and regulations for the conduct of its work, which rules and regulations shall be subject to the approval of the President, and shall provide for the work of the advisory commission to the end that the special knowledge of such commission may be developed by suitable investigation, research, and inquiry and made available in conference and report for the use of the council; and the council may organize subordinate bodies for its assistance in special investigations, either by the employment of experts or by the creation of committees of specially qualified persons to serve without compensation, but to direct the investigations of experts so employed.

SEC. 6. That the sum of \$200,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be immediately available for experimental work and investigations undertaken by the council, by the advisory commission, or subordinate bodies, for the employment of a director, expert and clerical expenses and supplies, and for the neces-

sary expenses of members of the advisory commission or subordinate bodies going to and attending meetings of the commission or subordinate bodies. Reports shall be submitted by all subordinate bodies and by the advisory commission to the council, and from time to time the council shall report to the President or to the heads of executive departments upon special inquiries or subjects appropriate thereto, and an annual report to the Congress shall be submitted through the President, including as full a statement of the activities of the council and the agencies subordinate to it as is consistent with the public interest, including an itemized account of the expenditures made by the council or authorized by it, in as full detail as the public interest will permit: *Provided, however,* That when deemed proper the President may authorize, in amounts stipulated by him, unvouchered expenditures and report the gross sums so authorized not itemized.

And insert:

SEC. 2. That a council of national defense is hereby established for the coordination of industries and resources for the national security and welfare, to consist of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Chief of Staff of the Army, an officer of the Navy not below the rank of captain to be designated by the Secretary of the Navy, and not more than six persons to be appointed by the President of the United States, each of whom shall have special knowledge of some industry, public utility, or the development of some natural resource, or be otherwise specially qualified, in the opinion of the President, for the performance of the duties hereinafter provided. The additional members of the council shall serve without compensation, but shall be allowed actual expenses of travel and subsistence when attending meetings of the council or engaged in investigations pertaining to its activities. The council shall hold such meetings as shall be called by it or be provided by the rules and regulations adopted by the council for the conduct of its work.

That it shall be the duty of the council of national defense to supervise and direct investigations and make recommendations to the President and the heads of executive departments as to the location of railroads with reference to the frontier of the United States so as to render possible expeditious concentration of troops and supplies to points of defense; the coordination of military, industrial, and commercial purposes in the location of extensive highways and branch lines of railroad; the utilization of waterways; the mobilization of military and naval resources for defense; the increase of domestic production of articles and materials essential to the support of armies and of the people during the interruption of foreign commerce; the development of seagoing transportation; data as to amounts, location, method and means of production, and availability of military supplies; the giving of information to producers and manufacturers as to the class of supplies needed by the military and other services of the Government, the requirements relating thereto, and the creation of relations which will render possible in time of need the immediate concentration and utilization of the resources of the Nation.

That the council of national defense shall adopt rules and regulations for the conduct of its work, which rules and regulations shall be subject to the approval of the President, and shall provide for the work of the council to the end that the special knowledge of such council may be developed by suitable investigation, research, and inquiry and made available in conference and report for the use of the council; and the council may organize subordinate bodies for its assistance in special investigations, either by the employment of experts or by the creation of committees of specially qualified persons to serve without compensation, but to direct the investigations of experts so employed.

That the sum of \$10,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated for the necessary expenses of members of the council in going to and attending meetings of the council or its subordinate bodies or while engaged in its work. Reports shall be submitted by all subordinate bodies and by the council to the President and to the heads of executive departments upon special inquiries or subjects appropriate thereto, and an annual report to the Congress shall be submitted through the President, including as full a statement of the activities of the council and the agencies subordinate to it as is consistent with the public interest, including an itemized account of the expenditures made by the council or authorized by it, in as full detail as the public interest will permit: *Provided, however,* That when deemed proper the President may authorize, in amounts stipulated by him, unvouchered expenditures and report the gross sums so authorized not itemized.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment. After the words "President of the United States," in line 1, page 95, I move to insert "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In the committee amendment, on page 95, line 1, after the words "President of the United States," it is proposed to insert "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

Mr. CUMMINS. The effect of the amendment is to require that the civilian members of the council shall be confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. So far as I am able to do so, I am willing to accept the amendment.

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

Mr. GALLINGER. Let the provision be read as it will read if amended.

The SECRETARY. If amended, the provision will read:

SEC. 2. That a council of national defense is hereby established for the coordination of industries and resources for the national security and welfare, to consist of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Chief of Staff of the Army, an officer of the Navy not below the rank of captain to be designated by the Secretary of the Navy, and not more than six persons to be appointed by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate—

And so forth.

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

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I shall not consume the time of the Senate in further stating my objections to the creation of a so-called council of national defense. It is entirely right that the President and the members of his Cabinet shall receive all the information that they can looking to the proper movements of the Army and the Navy; but I am opposed to the march toward the supremacy of the military branch of the Government. I am opposed to giving the council the authority to supervise all the industries of the country and attempt to influence their development in the direction of military strength and power. The establishment of this council will, in my opinion, do more to turn the public over to the control of the military arm of the Government than the creation of large armies or the construction of large navies.

In adopting this amendment we practically announce that all the industrial and civil energies of our people will be exerted with reference to the movements of the Army and the Navy and their use in time of war. I am not willing, for one, to take that step, and I shall therefore vote against the amendment proposed by the committee. If the amendment is rejected I shall move to strike out the provisions upon the same subject which are found in the House bill, and when the time comes for a vote on the amendment I shall ask for the yeas and nays.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended, on which the yeas and nays have been requested.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CURTIS (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] and withhold my vote.

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). Announcing the same pair and transfer as before, I vote "yea."

Mr. TILLMAN (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as to transfer of pairs, I vote "yea."

Mr. WADSWORTH (when his name was called). I transfer my general pair with the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HOLLI] to the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER] and will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HARDING. I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] to the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. LIPPITT. I renew the announcement of my pair with the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH], which I allow to stand for the day, and withhold my vote.

Mr. GRONNA. I transfer my pair with the Senator from Maine [Mr. JOHNSON] to the senior Senator from California [Mr. WORKS] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. REED. I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] to the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. TAGGART] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. MYERS. I announce the same transfer of my pair that I announced on the last vote and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. CHILTON. I make the same announcement that I made on the last roll call and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CATRON] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN];

The Senator from Utah Mr. [SUTHERLAND] with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE]; and

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. THOMPSON].

The result was announced—yeas 39, nays 13, as follows:

YEAS—39.

Beckham	Husting	Poindexter	Sterling
Brady	James	Reed	Stone
Brandegge	Lodge	Saulsbury	Swanson
Chamberlain	Martin, Va.	Shafroth	Thomas
Chilton	Martine, N. J.	Sheppard	Tillman
Clark, Wyo.	Myers	Simmons	Townsend
Dillingham	O'Gorman	Smith, Ga.	Warren
du Pont	Overman	Smith, Md.	Weeks
Fletcher	Page	Smith, S. C.	Williams
Gallinger	Penrose	Smoot	

NAYS—13.

Clapp	Jones	Lane	Wadsworth
Cummins	Kenyon	Lee, Md.	
Gronna	Kern	Norris	
Harding	La Follette	Vardaman	

NOT VOTING—43.

Ashurst	Bryan	Culberson	Gore
Bankhead	Catron	Curtis	Hardwick
Borah	Clarke, Ark.	Fall	Hitchcock
Broussard	Colt	Goff	Hollis

Hughes	McLean	Pomerene	Sutherland
Johnson, Me.	Nelson	Ransdell	Taggart
Johnson, S. Dak.	Newlands	Robinson	Thompson
Lea, Tenn.	Oliver	Sherman	Underwood
Lewis	Owen	Shields	Walsh
Lippitt	Phelan	Smith, Ariz.	Works
McCumber	Pittman	Smith, Mich.	

So the amendment of the committee as amended was agreed to. The SECRETARY. The only other amendments of the committee passed over will be found on page 8, where, in the total for the Signal Service of the Army, found in line 5, the committee proposes to strike out "\$3,775,000" and to insert "\$14,827,156."

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. That went over at the request of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN]. I believe he wanted to get some information which he has obtained, and he makes no further objection to it.

Mr. OVERMAN. That is correct.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The SECRETARY. Also, in line 6, it is proposed to strike out "\$3,222,100" and to insert "\$13,281,666."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 48, line 6, after the word "War," it is proposed to insert:

Provided further, That the Secretary of War is authorized to expend from the above amount not to exceed \$110,000 for the purpose of providing temporary shelter on the Canal Zone for one regiment of Infantry and one company of Engineers.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. On page 43, the item in line 20 was reduced from \$20,280,000 to \$16,000,000. I have since received advices from the War Department that that ought to be retained at \$20,280,000, the amount originally estimated for by the department. I, therefore, ask that that be changed to \$20,280,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on reconsidering the vote whereby the amendment was agreed to. Without objection, it will be reconsidered.

The SECRETARY. It is now proposed to restore the original amendment, striking out "\$12,000,000," and inserting in lieu thereof "\$20,280,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there further amendments?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I send to the desk an amendment, which I ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 61, line 12, after the word "repealed," it is proposed to insert:

Provided, That hereafter the maximum age limit for eligibility to appointment of first lieutenants in the Medical Department of the Army shall be 32 years.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, may I ask that that be stated again?

The Secretary again stated the amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. That is an increase of two years of the present law?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Two years for the Medical Corps. I will state to the Senator that the Surgeon General advises me that under the strictness of the requirements for admission to the practice of medicine in many of the States of the Union, a young man is hardly fitted to practice his profession, or rather it is difficult for him to pass the examinations and be commissioned, until he is past 30 years of age, particularly where he serves an internship in a hospital. Many young men of 30 or 31 are just completing their education by service in the hospitals; and he therefore requested that this increase be made.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, that is a very startling suggestion coming from the Surgeon General of the Army—that a young man has to be 32 years old before he knows enough to go into the Army.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I do not mean to put it as strongly as that, but I meant to say that the requirements are very much higher than they used to be.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes; they are.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. A young man graduates at 24 or 26 from the medical school, and then he goes and serves an internship in a hospital.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes; a year or so.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I may have put it a little stronger than the Surgeon General put it to me; but the effect of his language to me was that the requirements are very much

higher than they used to be, and that a man is better suited for appointment at 32 than he is at 28.

Mr. GALLINGER. I do not object to the amendment, but I thought it was a little strong.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, there is another amendment that the committee requested me to submit to the Senate. I send it to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 23, after line 23, it is proposed to insert:

The President is hereby authorized to nominate and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, appoint Edward W. Whitaker, late lieutenant colonel First Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Cavalry, and brevet brigadier general, United States Volunteers, a lieutenant colonel of Cavalry in the Army of the United States; and when so appointed he shall be placed upon the retired list of the Army, unlimited, with the pay and emoluments of a retired officer of that grade, the retired list being thereby increased in number to that extent: *Provided*, That on receiving the said retired pay under this act he shall relinquish all his right and claim to pension from the United States after the date of the passage of this act, and any payment made to him covering a period subsequent to the passage of this act shall be deducted from the amount due him on the first payment under this act.

Mr. GALLINGER. I suggest to the Senator that he substitute the word "approval" for "passage." It occurs twice in the amendment and it ought to be "approval."

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes; it ought.

Mr. GALLINGER. I suggest that that change be made.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have no objection to that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be modified as suggested. The question is on the amendment as modified.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does that complete the committee amendments?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. That completes the committee amendments, but there is one other amendment which is not a committee amendment. I offer this as an individual amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 32, after line 22, it is proposed to insert:

Provided further, That the President is hereby authorized to appoint a commission, consisting of not less than three civilian citizens, residents of the United States, to hold office at the pleasure of the President, whose duty it shall be to inspect all foods supplied for the military forces of the United States for the purpose of determining whether the quality of such foods conforms with the specifications of the purchase, and whether such foods are wholesome, suitable, and adequate, and to report thereon at reasonable intervals to the President, with such recommendations as, in their opinion, may tend to improve the rations and promote the physical welfare of the military forces of the United States.

That each of said commissioners shall receive a salary at the rate of \$5,000 per annum and their actual and necessary traveling and incidental expenses, and the sum of \$20,000 is hereby appropriated for that purpose.

Provided, however, That the President may, in his discretion, accept as an assistant to such commission the services of anyone who may volunteer for such purpose, and allow and direct the payment of his actual and necessary traveling and other necessary expenses.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, the purpose in offering that amendment—and I know it is subject to a point of order if anybody wants to make it—is this: Already the question has been raised by some of the newspapers of the country, and by many who are very much interested in the National Guard, as to the quality of food that is being served, not only to the guardsmen but to the Regular Army; the question not only as to whether or not these goods come up to the standard but whether they are of the nourishing class of food that they should be. There is no way to reach these men who sell embalmed beef to the troops on the border unless they can be punished for violation of the interstate law. Many of these packing houses have their plants in the particular State where the food product is to be used. If the main establishment is in Chicago, for instance, they have a branch plant in Texas, and the goods are furnished and delivered to perform the terms of the contract in Texas, so that if the goods are not what they ought to be there is no way to punish them.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, does this amendment provide any way of punishing them?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Not at all; but it gives the Government an opportunity to see whether or not the goods are what they ought to be.

Mr. CLAPP. Are our two institutions for the education of military officers so deficient that when men get command of a troop they are unable to determine whether or not these contracts are complied with? Is the War Department unable to determine whether or not the contracts are complied with? It seems to me it is an open affront to the War Department itself.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I did not stop to figure out whether it was an affront to anybody; but we do know that in 1898, during the Spanish-American War, embalmed beef, in spite of the officers of the Army, was served to the men in Cuba.

Mr. CLAPP. If that is being done to-day, Congress ought to investigate it, and somebody who is responsible for it ought to be brought to account.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I am not suggesting that it is done. I am only calling attention to the reports printed in the newspapers. I have had clippings sent to me from various sources. The object is to avoid the necessity of investigations and to see to it that those things can not happen again.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to ask the Senator if the Inspector General has not the whole question under his charge, and will the Senator say that the Inspector General is not doing his duty in that regard? We have appropriated for I do not know how many inspectors; I have not looked it up. Are they not capable of doing that work?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. They may be perfectly capable, Mr. President, but I am hedging against what may happen—not what has happened. I have here in my possession right now, I will say to the Senator, a letter from a distinguished Member of the House of Representatives—Mr. HULBERT—who went with Mr. McCann, who was the food expert, over to inspect one of these camps the other day, and he gives an account of just the conditions that existed in Cuba. Most of the food, I think, that is being served is all right, but there are occasionally cases where embalmed beef—corned beef, so called—is being served, and he says it simply represents the gristle and by-products of the meat where all the juices have been taken out.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I wish to ask the Senator if he thinks, in order to accomplish what he wishes to accomplish, he has provided a sufficient force. He provides, as I heard the amendment, for only three inspectors. How large is the force?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Only three.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. That is what I thought, and the amendment provides an appropriation for those three only.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. That is all.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Does the Senator think that three are sufficient to accomplish the purpose he wishes to accomplish and to inspect the food?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I do not think it will be necessary to go to all the places, but a man is supposed to go to one of the concentration camps where there are large bodies of troops and where a large quantity of food must be collected.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Another thing I will ask the Senator. Is it not likely that there might be a controversy between the civilian board and the officers of the Army who are charged by law with these particular duties. Would it not lead to a conflict of authority and perhaps to an unfortunate disagreement?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. There is a bare possibility of that, but I assume that they would act together.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I think this is a very unfortunate amendment. I can see that it will result in a conflict of authority and in harm rather than good. As it is manifestly general legislation on an appropriation I make a point of order against it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. On page 23, after line 23, I move to insert the amendment I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. On page 23, after line 23, insert:

That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, Col. Rogers Birnie (retired) a brigadier general and place him on the list of the Army.

Mr. SMOOT. Is this reported from the committee?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. No; it is not reported.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I wish to say in regard to the amendment I have offered that Col. Birnie is a man who has a splendid record, and his promotion has been recommended by the War Department.

Mr. SMOOT. Recommended to whom, I will ask?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. There is a bill in the House, and it has been recommended.

Mr. SMOOT. Has not the President had the recommendation sent to him?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I do not think they are usually sent to the President.

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. On page 22 there is exactly a similar provision in the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, we are going to fight those cases when we get the bill in the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. Let the amendment be read again. I thought it was a promotion rather than a retirement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be again read. The SECRETARY. On page 23, after line 23, insert the following:

That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, Col. Rogers Birnie (retired) a brigadier general and place him on the retired list of the Army.

Mr. SMOOT. It is to promote him on the retired list.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. With the advice and consent of the Senate.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, is not this general legislation subject to a point of order? I think it is.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is brigadier-general legislation. [Laughter.]

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I object. I make a point of order on it. I am opposed to retiring any of these men and advancing their rank after they have dropped out of the Army. I think the whole thing is bad, and I expect to vote against every one I get a chance at and kill every one I can in any way I get a chance to do it.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will say to the Senator from Georgia there is in this bill a similar provision.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I see, and it passed when I was out of the Senate. I am watching to reserve it for a separate vote when the bill comes out of Committee of the Whole and is reported to the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the real point of order the Chair does not feel that it is general legislation. It looks as though it applied to this one particular demand.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It amounts to an increase of appropriation then.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That point was not made.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I make it now, and any other point that occurs to the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If it increases the appropriation and there is no estimate for it, the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. CURTIS. I offer the following amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 28, line 16, after the amount insert the following proviso:

Provided, That the provisions of the act of May 11, 1908, as amended by the act of March 3, 1909, relating to pay to beneficiaries of officers and enlisted men on the active list of the Army is hereby extended to officers and enlisted men of the National Guard when called or drafted into the service of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Kansas.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. OVERMAN. I offer the following amendment, to come in on page 72.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. On page 72, after line 25, insert:

That the sum of \$25,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated for cleaning out the old jetties and other obstructions erected by the Government and placed in the French Broad River in North Carolina for the purpose of navigation and long since abandoned, and the Chief of Engineers of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to have removed as soon as practical all obstructions placed thereon by the Government for the purpose of navigation.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I would not introduce that amendment here but for the fact that there is an emergency requiring it. It has risen by reason of the great flood. Thirty years ago, strange to say, the Government of the United States attempted to make the French Broad River navigable, and for 25 miles jetties were built 40 feet on each side of the river, leaving a channel 30 feet down the French Broad.

The recent storm has caused those jetties to be a great dam, and over 45,000 acres of the finest land there is in the country are buried in some 10 to 20 feet of water standing there over the corn. The water can not get away. These jetties are there, and they ought to be moved. There is fear that a great epidemic will break out by the standing water. The engineer has sent an expert down there, and he thinks that he can remove the obstruction shortly. I ask that this amendment be placed on the bill.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from North Carolina what bearing this proposition has on the military preparedness of the United States?

Mr. OVERMAN. It is only an emergency matter, and I hope the Senator will not object.

Mr. PENROSE. I did not know but that part of the coast of North Carolina was liable to invasion or bombardment.

Mr. OVERMAN. It has been bombarded by the rains and the storms, and the people are in distress.

Mr. PENROSE. Sharks are getting up there, too, probably.

Mr. OVERMAN. It is a river where no sharks are found; but black bass abound there, and if the Senator will come down

there I will take him fishing and he will get some mighty fine fishing.

Mr. PENROSE. Then I will vote for the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment submitted by the Senator from North Carolina.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KERN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 38, line 25, it is proposed to insert a semicolon and the words:

And members of the National Guard who have been mustered into the service of the United States and are discharged for physical disability.

Mr. KERN. Mr. President, the amendment is offered because of the fact that a number of members of the National Guard of my State who have been sent to the Mexican border have been subjected to additional physical examinations, have been found physically unfit, and therefore have been discharged from the service; but no means have been provided for returning them to their homes, and they are there stranded and helpless. The amendment follows the provision on page 38, which makes an appropriation "for travel allowance to enlisted men on discharge." I merely include in that provision the members of the National Guard who have been mustered into the service of the United States, but who may be discharged on account of physical disability.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask whether the National Guard members referred to by the Senator were examined before they went to the border?

Mr. KERN. I do not know about that; but I know they have been discharged on account of physical disability—that is my information—since they arrived there.

Mr. SMOOT. Since their arrival at the border?

Mr. KERN. Since their arrival at the border. The amendment will do no harm, and if any cases of that kind occur the men will not be left absolutely helpless after they have volunteered to serve their country.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I know that several members of the guard of my State were examined when mustered into the service, but the examination, owing to the hasty mobilization, had to be very superficial. They were accepted under that examination, but after going to the front they were reexamined and found physically disqualified for the service and were discharged. They have no means of getting home; and it seems to me that their travel expenses ought to be paid.

Mr. KERN. The amendment is designed to meet just such cases as that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Indiana.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 83, after line 10, it is proposed to insert a new paragraph, as follows:

To provide for the pay, transportation, and subsistence of those units of the National Guard which, not being included in the mobilization order issued by the President on June 18, 1916, were ordered by State authorities to maneuver camps for equipment and training in conjunction with troops included in said mobilization order, \$450,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary: *Provided*, That such expenses shall be paid only after they shall have been approved by the Secretary of War: *And provided further*, That the Government of the United States shall not be liable for any such expenses incurred during a period in excess of 28 days in addition to the 15 days of annual maneuvers provided for in section 92 of the act of June 3, 1916.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I should like to know the purpose of that amendment.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, this amendment is to take care of a very peculiar situation which has arisen in the State of New York, and which I think does not exist in any other State, although I am not absolutely certain as to that. The mobilization order of the President of June 18, 1916, called on the National Guard to furnish complete tactical divisions of troops. It so happened that there were at that time 13 Infantry regiments in the New York National Guard. Of those, 9 regiments would have been included in a tactical division. The governor of New York, instead of calling out the 9 regiments, thought it best to call out the 13 regiments, in order, I assume, to make a more careful selection of the 9 regiments which should be sent to the Texas border. The result was that the 4 additional Infantry regiments of the New York guard were mobilized, just as all the other guard troops in the United States were mobilized, and sent to mobilization

camps, and were immediately offered to the Federal Government by the governor in addition to the troops which were already accepted, the 9 Infantry regiments to which I have already referred.

The Government did not see fit, or did not need, to accept the four Infantry regiments, and those four regiments have been recruited to full war strength, have been completely equipped, and have been held in camp at the disposal of the Federal Government ever since.

A provision in this appropriation bill is to the effect that, in accordance with the act of June 3, 1916, the whole or any part of the National Guard shall be subject to annual maneuvers, not exceeding 15 days in length. The Secretary of War has assured, according to my information, the adjutant general of New York that he will allow pay, transportation, and subsistence for these four regiments of the New York guard for the 15 days in which, presumably and as a matter of fact, they have been engaged in maneuvers and in training. They constitute a force which the country could call upon at any time. The State, however, has kept those men in camp beyond the 15-day period. They have become, by reason of the training which they have received, exceptionally valuable national assets. They are the only regiments in the United States which have not been included in the mobilization order, either Regular or National Guard, which are recruited to war strength, and they are completely equipped.

It is on the ground and theory, to be perfectly frank, that the State of New York has done more than was asked of it, even if we do not include the additional four regiments, that I introduce this amendment asking the Federal Government, under proper regulations, to defray the expenses of transporting those troops to their homes, the cost of feeding them while they are in camp.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, so far as I am able to do so, I accept the amendment. It can go to conference, and we can secure further information concerning it, if necessary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. STONE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

RECESS.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I move that the Senate take a recess until 10 o'clock to-morrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m., Tuesday, July 25, 1916) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow Wednesday, July 26, 1916, at 10 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 25, 1916.

POSTMASTERS.

CALIFORNIA.

O. C. Goodin to be postmaster at Orosi, Cal., in place of J. T. Neely, resigned.

James Hoey to be postmaster at Martinez, Cal., in place of F. L. Glass. Incumbent's commission expired May 17, 1916.

W. Stairley to be postmaster at Richmond, Cal., in place of S. F. Jenkins. Incumbent's commission expired July 16, 1916.

CONNECTICUT.

W. H. Wall to be postmaster at East Hampton, Conn., in place of G. K. White. Incumbent's commission expires July 29, 1916.

ILLINOIS.

Joseph M. Connery to be postmaster at Enfield, Ill., in place of L. F. Gowdy. Incumbent's commission expired April 15, 1916.

IOWA.

W. E. Cox to be postmaster at Deep River, Iowa, in place of C. S. Marshall, resigned.

J. F. Kerberg to be postmaster at Sioux City, Iowa, in place of E. C. Tompkins. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1914.

KANSAS.

G. W. Wasson to be postmaster at Peru, Kans., in place of O. C. Wasson, resigned.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Edward T. Scully to be postmaster at Pittsfield, Mass., in place of J. G. Orr. Incumbent's commission expired February 7, 1916.

MINNESOTA.

C. J. Aldean to be postmaster at Verndale, Minn., in place of H. A. Allen. Incumbent's commission expired April 15, 1916.

Edward J. Cleary to be postmaster at South St. Paul, Minn., in place of G. F. Kramer. Incumbent's commission expires August 1, 1916.

MONTANA.

James A. Goodrich to be postmaster at Conrad, Mont., in place of T. A. Busey, resigned.

Anna S. Gossink to be postmaster at Lavina, Mont. Office became presidential July 1, 1916.

William Moser to be postmaster at Thompson Falls, Mont., in place of Charles Weber. Incumbent's commission expires August 24, 1916.

NEVADA.

Walter J. McKeough to be postmaster at Aurora, Nev. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

OHIO.

Lawrence Schunck to be postmaster at Celina, Ohio, in place of J. W. McKee. Incumbent's commission expires July 30, 1916.

OKLAHOMA.

A. E. Williams to be postmaster at Hammon, Okla., in place of L. D. Trent. Incumbent's commission expires August 9, 1916.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Ira C. Gleim to be postmaster at Mount Holly Springs, Pa., in place of A. M. Mullin. Incumbent's commission expired February 23, 1915.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

C. H. Bonnie to be postmaster at Wagner, S. Dak., in place of W. P. Joseph. Incumbent's commission expired July 24, 1916.

J. K. Mayer to be postmaster at Tripp, S. Dak., in place of C. F. McClung, jr., resigned.

TEXAS.

James V. Townsend to be postmaster at Vernon, Tex., in place of C. J. Farrell. Incumbent's commission expires August 23, 1916.

WISCONSIN.

Frank H. Rogers to be postmaster at Fort Atkinson, Wis., in place of G. W. Burchard. Incumbent's commission expired July 23, 1916.

G. W. Schiereck to be postmaster at Plymouth, Wis., in place of Charles Pfeifer. Incumbent's commission expired July 23, 1916.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 25, 1916.

REAPPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY.

BUREAU OF INSULAR AFFAIRS.

Brig. Gen. Frank McIntyre, Chief of the Bureau of Insular Affairs of the War Department, to be chief of said bureau for the period of four years beginning August 24, 1916, with rank of brigadier general.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

INFANTRY ARM.

Maj. Harold L. Jackson to be lieutenant colonel.

First Lieut. Charles S. Caffery to be captain.

First Lieut. Fred A. Cook to be captain.

Second Lieut. George D. Murphey to be first lieutenant.

PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Claudius R. Hyatt to be a lieutenant.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) John S. Barleau to be a lieutenant.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade):

Elmer L. Woodside.

Roy J. Wilson.

Carl E. Hoard.

Thomas M. Shock.

Kenneth R. R. Wallace.

William I. Causey, jr.

Norman C. Gillette.

Lloyd R. Gray.

Walter O. Henry.

William L. Wright.

John Le V. Hill.

John L. Hall.

Laurance T. Du Bose.

Harry R. Gellerstedt.

Charles J. Parrish.

Samuel N. Moore.

Leman L. Babbitt.

Edmund S. McCawley.

Langdon D. Pickering.

Leonard R. Agrell.

Asst. Surg. Cline H. Dragoo to be passed assistant surgeon.

Robert F. Barber, a citizen of New York, to be an assistant surgeon in the Medical Reserve Corps.

The following-named citizens to be assistant surgeons in the Medical Reserve Corps:

James A. Halpin,

William D. Heaton,

Aubrey M. Larsen,

Lincoln Humphreys,

Theo E. Cox,

Arthur W. Hoaglund,

Carroll H. Francis, and

Harold L. Jensen.

Asst. Paymaster Frederick C. Bowerfind to be a passed assistant paymaster.

Asst. Paymaster Ernest H. Barber to be a passed assistant paymaster.

Pay Clerk Frederick Scherberger, jr., to be a chief pay clerk.

REGISTER OF LAND OFFICE.

Hubbard H. Abbott to be register of the land office at Del Norte, Colo.

POSTMASTERS.

CALIFORNIA.

Elizabeth Clar, Guerneville.

CONNECTICUT.

Willis Hodge, South Glastonbury.

GEORGIA.

George F. Flanders, Swainsboro.

D. W. Folsom, Mount Vernon.

HAWAII.

Beatrice E. Ely, Fort Shafter.

IDAHO.

Hugh H. Hamilton, New Plymouth.

ILLINOIS.

Merr L. Abbott, Sheridan.

Leslie C. Hamilton, Manito.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Ellen K. Callaghan, Northfield.

E. J. Dion, Northbridge.

John J. Kelly, Dalton.

Thomas F. Maguire, East Walpole.

James R. Mansfield, Haydenville.

James M. Perley, Rowley.

Edward T. Scully, Pittsfield.

MICHIGAN.

John S. Mills, Holly.

MISSOURI.

James F. Ball, Montgomery City.

George T. Bell, Bucklin.

NEBRASKA.

H. T. Wilson, Stella.

NEW JERSEY.

George F. Stabel, Palisade.

NEW YORK.

Edwin G. Brown, Minetto.

Edward Grunert, Croghan.

John J. Mattison, Canandaigua.

OKLAHOMA.

H. A. Garrett, Wakita.

Bessie Hall, Tyrone.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Edward Cavanaugh, Coaldale.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

Nora O'Donnell, Ramona.

VIRGINIA.

John T. Cochran, The Plains.

J. E. Everette, North Emporia.

Samuel J. Horne, Coeburn.
J. Harry Leebrick, Elkton.

WEST VIRGINIA.

Walter S. Bambrick, Weirton.

WISCONSIN.

H. E. Austin, Boscobel.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, July 25, 1916.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

O God our heavenly Father, we pray that Thy Spirit may prevail in the hearts of Thy children and unite them into a harmonious brotherhood, each for all and all for each, exemplified in the life, precepts, and glorious example of the world's great religious Teacher; that we may free ourselves from the thralldom of materialism, which turns good into evil, peace into war, joy into sorrow, blights and corrodes the soul and robs it of the life eternal, which is joy and peace in the Holy Ghost.

Hear us, we beseech Thee, and answer our prayer that Thy kingdom may come and Thy will be done in earth as it is in Heaven. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, July 21, 1916, was read and approved.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Thursday next, and that on Thursday next we call business in order on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Thursday next, and that on that day business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent shall be in order. Is there objection?

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I presume that means Suspension Day also?

Mr. MANN. No.

The SPEAKER. That was not included in the request.

Mr. KITCHIN. I think that we will get rid of all these bills on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent, which would give more time, of course, on the first Monday for the suspension of the rules.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does the gentleman's request in any way mean suspension of the rules?

The SPEAKER. Not on Thursday.

Mr. MANN. Just the Calendar for Unanimous Consent.

Mr. COX. Then, I do not know that I shall have any objection to it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from North Carolina yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. LEVER. If this request be granted, it will not interfere with the consideration of conference reports if they should be ready?

Mr. KITCHIN. No.

Mr. MANN. Of course the gentleman's conference report could only be taken up on Thursday by unanimous consent, anyway.

Mr. KITCHIN. It would not interfere with conference reports if we grant unanimous consent for their consideration.

Mr. LEVER. I do not know that we will be ready with our conference report on the Agricultural bill at that time, but I wanted to know.

The SPEAKER. Does the Chair understand that this interferes with conference reports?

Mr. KITCHIN. As I understand it, Mr. Speaker, under our former understanding we will only take up these conference reports by unanimous consent, unless we give notice of three days if a contest is to be made upon them.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will put the request again. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Thursday next, and that on that day business in order on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent shall be considered, exclusive of anything else. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, of course that will not interfere with the request to take up the conference report on the Agricultural bill or any other report, because a conference report could only be considered in that way on that day.

Mr. KITCHIN. That is our understanding.

Mr. GARRETT. Or any other conference report.

The SPEAKER. Not to interfere with any conference report that can be considered by unanimous consent.

Mr. KITCHIN. That is correct.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears no objection.

ZEBULON BAIRD VANCE.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 322.

Resolved, That exercises appropriate to the reception and acceptance from the State of North Carolina of the statue of Zebulon Baird Vance, erected in Statuary Hall, in the Capitol, be made a special order for Saturday, July 29, 1916, at 3 o'clock p. m.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the gentleman that he omit the hour.

Mr. KITCHIN. My idea in putting in the hour is this: Two or three gentlemen are going to make unanimous-consent requests to be permitted to address the House on that day.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman would make it simply in order, then any request for unanimous consent could be granted, but if the hour is fixed at 3 o'clock it might be embarrassing. I would suggest that the gentleman say not later than 3 o'clock.

Mr. KITCHIN. Very well; I will ask unanimous consent that the resolution be amended in that particular, to make it not later than 3 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it will be so amended, and the Clerk will report the resolution as amended.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That exercises appropriate to the reception and acceptance from the State of North Carolina of the statue of Zebulon Baird Vance, erected in Statuary Hall, in the Capitol, be made a special order for Saturday, July 29, 1916, not later than 3 o'clock p. m.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, if the gentleman from North Carolina will permit, I would like to make this statement: Unless the conference report on the Agricultural appropriation bill is agreed upon and passed by the House before Monday next it will be necessary to pass a joint resolution continuing the appropriations of last year for another 30 days or for some specified time. I hope that we may be able to bring the conference report up on either Thursday or Saturday.

Mr. KITCHIN. This would not interfere with the conference report, because if we did not get through with its consideration on Saturday, if it be considered on that day, we would ask unanimous consent to continue this order until 4 o'clock.

Mr. LEVER. If it is understood that if the conference report on the Agricultural appropriation bill is ready for consideration on Saturday that this will not interfere with its consideration, I would not have any objection to it.

Mr. KITCHIN. I could not say that it would not interfere with it, because this is the only time we will have for this; but I would say that I shall ask unanimous consent that this go over until 4 o'clock, if it should be necessary.

Mr. LEVER. Well, I take it that in four hours' time we ought either to pass the conference report or vote it down.

Mr. KITCHIN. I ask that that stand good until 4 o'clock.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House on Saturday next for one hour on the question of vocational education.

Mr. MANN. Would the gentleman prefer Saturday or Thursday?

Mr. HUGHES. Thursday would be all right.

The SPEAKER. Which way does the gentleman desire to have it put?

Mr. HUGHES. Thursday.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent, on next Thursday, immediately after the reading of the Journal and clearing up of business on the Speaker's table,

that he be permitted to address the House not to exceed one hour—

Mr. GARNER. Not to interfere with conference reports.

The SPEAKER. The Chair was going to put that—not to exceed one hour on the vocational education bill, not to interfere with conference reports. Is there objection?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is that to take an hour out of the unanimous-consent consideration of bills?

Mr. HUGHES. I do not think that would affect the Unanimous Consent Calendar.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. It seems to me, if we are going to have Thursday set apart for the Unanimous Consent Calendar, we ought not to—

Mr. HUGHES. If the gentleman prefers, I will accept Saturday; I would like Thursday, however.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that on next Saturday, immediately after the reading of the Journal and the clearing up of business on the Speaker's table, not to interfere with conference reports, that he be permitted to address the House not to exceed one hour on the subject of vocational education. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate by Mr. Waldorf, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 11240) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, had agreed to the conference asked for by the House, and had appointed Mr. BRYAN, Mr. HUGHES, and Mr. POINDEXTER as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 12194) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, had agreed to the conference asked for by the House, and had appointed Mr. BRYAN, Mr. HUGHES, and Mr. POINDEXTER as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 14576) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, had agreed to the conference asked for by the House, and had appointed Mr. BRYAN, Mr. HUGHES, and Mr. POINDEXTER as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 13620) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, had agreed to the conference asked for by the House, and had appointed Mr. BRYAN, Mr. HUGHES, and Mr. POINDEXTER as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bill of the following title:

H. R. 17053. An act making additional appropriations for the Public Health Service for the fiscal year 1917.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments to bill (H. R. 15947) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes, had requested a conference with the House of Representatives on the bill and amendments, and had appointed Mr. TILMAN, Mr. SWANSON, and Mr. LODGE as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bill of the following title:

H. R. 3032. An act authorizing the county of St. Louis to construct a bridge across the St. Louis River between Minnesota and Wisconsin.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 6497. An act for the relief of Oleanne Marie Zahl Branum.

The message also announced that the President had, on July 20, 1916, approved and signed joint resolution of the following title:

S. J. Res. 60. Joint resolution creating a joint subcommittee from the membership of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce and the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate the conditions relating to interstate

and foreign commerce, and the necessity of further legislation relating thereto, and defining the powers and duties of such subcommittee.

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee as indicated below:

S. 6497. An act for the relief of Oleanne Marie Zahl Branum; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION AND BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled joint resolution and bills of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same.

H. J. Res. 218. Joint resolution authorizing the acceptance of the gift of the Berkshire Trout Hatchery, Berkshire County, Mass.;

H. R. 14725. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to subdivide a part of the town site of Plummer, Idaho, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4866. An act for the relief of Julia R. Goodloe;

H. R. 8787. An act for the relief of the heirs of Hundley V. Fowler, deceased; and

H. R. 10484. An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILL WITH SENATE AMENDMENTS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, House bill with Senate amendments of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee as indicated below:

H. R. 8002. An act confirming patents heretofore issued to certain Indians in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on July 19, 1916, they had presented to the President of the United States for his approval the following bills and joint resolution:

H. R. 11262. An act for the relief of Mrs. C. D. Corbin;

H. R. 11261. An act for the relief of Mary S. Corbin;

H. R. 6057. An act to amend section 14 of the reclamation extension act approved August 13, 1914;

H. J. Res. 218. Joint resolution authorizing the acceptance of the gift of the Berkshire Trout Hatchery, Berkshire County, Mass.;

H. R. 4866. An act for the relief of Julia R. Goodloe;

H. R. 8787. An act for the relief of the heirs of Hundley V. Fowler, deceased;

H. R. 14725. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to subdivide a part of the town site of Plummer, Idaho, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 10484. An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes.

SPEAKER PROTEMPORE THURSDAY.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] to act as Speaker on next Thursday. [Applause.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for not exceeding 40 minutes on next Saturday, after the reading of the Journal, and with these other conditions, not to interfere with conference reports, and so forth.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN] asks unanimous consent that on Saturday next, at the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from Georgia, he shall be permitted to address the House for not to exceed 40 minutes, not to interfere with conference reports. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. KENT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend my remarks in the Record by printing a comparative analysis of the Senate and House water-power bills as concerns navigable waters.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the water-power bills. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 20 minutes on next Saturday at the conclusion of the two speeches already made in order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that on next Saturday, at the conclusion

of the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN], he shall be permitted to address the House for not to exceed 20 minutes, not to interfere with conference reports, or—

Mr. ROGERS. Or with orders already made.

The SPEAKER. Of course it can not interfere with orders already made. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

COTTON SEED AND COTTONSEED PRODUCTS.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Speaker, last week a conference report was presented on the bill (H. R. 4767) authorizing the Director of the Census to collect and publish statistics of cotton seed and cottonseed products. There was an error in the phraseology of the conference report. I ask unanimous consent to withdraw that, and to substitute a corrected conference report, for printing in the Record.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana asks unanimous consent to withdraw a conference report and to submit a new one for printing in the Record. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I did not understand the subject of the gentleman's request.

The SPEAKER. He asks to withdraw a conference report on H. R. 4767, the cottonseed statistics bill, and he submits a corrected report for printing in the Record. Is there objection? There was no objection.

FLOOD CONDITIONS IN GEORGIA.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print in the Record a telegram from my colleague [Mr. HOWARD] touching flood conditions on the rivers in Georgia.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to print in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a telegram from his colleague [Mr. HOWARD] on the flood situation in Georgia. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The telegram is as follows:

DOUGLASVILLE, GA., July 25, 1916.

Hon. WM. C. ADAMSON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Am on the ground in Douglas, where flood conditions have wrought great damage, and about 1,200 people in Douglas and Campbell Counties are in dire distress and great need of immediate assistance. Committee of citizens met at courthouse yesterday and passed resolutions beseeching Congress to give aid to these poor people. Understand same conditions exist in your district in Coweta and Heard. Engineer Simonton has made report to War Department. So far as my people are concerned, it is conservatively estimated that it will take about \$3,600 to buy provisions for the 1,200 sufferers. Will you please introduce resolution this morning in your and my name and urge upon our colleagues the necessity of immediate action? See report of conditions in Gen. Black's office. Wire me Atlanta.

WM. SCHLEY HOWARD.

LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS.

Mr. CAPSTICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record in reference to providing service honor flags to the volunteer soldiers now in service along the Mexican border.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the subject of rural credits and also on the Democratic platform of 1912.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record on rural credits and on the Democratic platform of 1912. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SIEGEL] have permission to extend his remarks in the Record on the subject of child labor.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SIEGEL] have permission to extend his remarks in the Record on the child-labor bill. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN PROPERTY FROM TAXATION.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take up and consider the bill (S. 5172) entitled "An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the Daughters of the American Revolution in Washington, D. C."

The SPEAKER. The Chair will take it up in a minute.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on public buildings and full territorial form of government in Alaska.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the public-buildings bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record on the public-buildings bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by incorporating an address made by former Gov. Colquitt, of Texas, in which he declares the Wilson administration to be the greatest failure in history. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record by printing a speech made by ex-Gov. Colquitt, of Texas, declaring the Wilson administration to be the greatest failure in history. [Laughter.] Is there objection?

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not recall the particular address to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have it right here. I will be very glad to quote it.

Mr. GARNER. It is not necessary to do that, if the gentleman will call my attention to the time and place and subject.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. On page 54 of the Record of December 29, 1914, Gov. Colquitt, who has just been nominated for Senator from Texas, made this interesting declaration, and as the campaign was fought out on this line in Texas, it seems to me informative to the House. The House ought to know on what lines Gov. Colquitt made his fight.

The SPEAKER. Has it been printed?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It has.

Mr. GARNER. If the gentleman will indulge me a moment, I wish to correct his history. Gov. Colquitt has not been nominated for Senator of the State of Texas, and will not be nominated.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Amen! [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. He led by 20,000 votes.

Mr. GARNER. If the gentleman intends to intimate by his statement in reference to Gov. Colquitt's recent vote in Texas that it was based upon his opposition to the administration, I want to correct him there. There were seven candidates in Texas for Senator. Gov. Colquitt was considered an antiadministration man. All the other candidates, however, were supporting the administration, and the man whom the administration, I think, feels the kindest toward is to run off the race with Gov. Colquitt, is one of the present Senators from Texas, and will undoubtedly win the election. I mention this in order that the gentleman's history may be kept correct.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman will permit my remarks to be extended, I think his statement will be answered by Gov. Colquitt.

Mr. GARNER. The statement has already been printed in the Record. I do not think we ought to take up the space to print it again.

Mr. ADAMSON. Reserving the right to object, I say this, if Gov. Colquitt should happen to be elected and come here and serve during the second administration of our illustrious President, he will learn better sense. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. He will live a long life if he does.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. DAVIS of Texas and several other Members objected.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, I understand there was objection urged?

The SPEAKER. There were half a dozen objections.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the subject of public buildings.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record on the subject of public buildings. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PARK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the Mexican situation.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the Mexican situation. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the subject of the military highway in California.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record on the subject of the military highway in California. Is there objection? There was no objection.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE—AID TO FLOOD SUFFERERS IN ALABAMA.

The SPEAKER. There are two little resolutions here, House joint resolution 271, authorizing the Secretary of War to loan quartermaster's and medical supplies for the relief of destitute persons in the districts overflowed by the Alabama and other rivers of Alabama and their tributaries, and House joint resolution 272, the very same sort of resolution, except that it refers to the Coosa River and its tributaries. These were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ought to be referred to the Committee on Appropriations. Unless there is objection, they will be so referred.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, what is the proposition?

The SPEAKER. A change of reference. One is the resolution offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BURNETT. That goes to the Committee on Military Affairs, Mr. Speaker, I should think. It is for an authorization—

The SPEAKER. These things are generally referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and they are not privileged to go to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. HAY. I will say, Mr. Speaker, that heretofore resolutions of that character which did not carry appropriations have all gone to the Committee on Military Affairs. Now, the fact that this resolution does carry an appropriation does not necessarily take from the Committee on Military Affairs its jurisdiction of that resolution. I recall that in this Congress a resolution was introduced for the relief of the Arkansas flood sufferers, and that resolution went to the Committee on Military Affairs and was reported out by that committee. I do not see any reason why this resolution should not take the same course.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. HAY. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia objects.

EXEMPTION FROM TAXATION, PROPERTY OF DAUGHTERS OF AMERICAN REVOLUTION.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the Senate bill 5172, entitled "An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the Daughters of the American Revolution in Washington, D. C."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the property situated in square 173 in the city of Washington, D. C., described as lots 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, and 28, inclusive, occupied by the Daughters of the American Revolution, be, and the same is hereby, exempt from and after May 24, 1914, from all taxation so long as the same is so occupied and used, subject to the provisions of section 8 of the act approved March 3, 1877, providing for exemptions of church and school property, and acts amendatory thereof.

With a committee amendment as follows:

Amend, page 2, line 4, after the word "thereof," by adding the following:

"So, also, shall every rectory, parsonage, glebe house, and pastoral residence which is occupied as a residence by the pastor, rector, minister, or rabbi be so exempt from taxation in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That such rectory, parsonage, glebe house, or pastoral residence be owned by the church or congregation for which the said pastor, rector, minister, or rabbi officiates: *And provided further*, That not more than one such rectory, parsonage, glebe house, or pastoral residence shall be so exempt for any one congregation."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the Senate bill which the Clerk has just reported. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, there are two provisions in this bill. One is in reference to the building of the Daughters of the American Revolution, proposing to exempt that from taxation, and the other is in reference to parsonages.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Yes; the gentleman is correct.

Mr. MANN. Would the latter provision exempt from taxation a building that a minister happened to rent from somebody in town?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. No. The bill provides in plain terms that it must be owned by the congregation or the church for which he preaches. It must be strictly church property.

Mr. MANN. I make no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Kentucky if this exemption goes further than the exemptions under State laws in the various States?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I will say to the gentleman that this report is made by the gentleman's colleague, Mr. HILLIARD, who does not happen to be present at this moment. That question was gone into by the committee, and it was ascertained that this was in keeping practically with the laws of the States on that subject.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I will say to the gentleman, it seems to me you are setting a dangerous precedent by the enactment of this bill, and would be likely to open widely the gates to very dangerous exemptions.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. It would not open the gate widely at all. It would only apply to a parsonage actually owned by the church and actually occupied by the preacher for that church.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Does it apply to all denominations equally?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. To every one, with no exception. It applies to every one alike.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. How much taxes will be saved or exempted in the District of Columbia under this law?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I do not know.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Has not the gentleman's committee made any estimation as to how much the Federal Treasury will lose by the passage of this bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. The Federal Treasury will not lose a cent.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Why?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Because the Federal Treasury does not get the taxes.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. If the taxes are paid, they will ultimately go into the Treasury, will they not?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. They would go into the Treasury for the District of Columbia.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. That is what I mean. They would relieve the Federal Treasury to that extent, would they not?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I will say to the gentleman that it is quite a clear case that the church and school act of March 3, 1877, intended to do what this bill now does, but the taxing authorities have concluded that wherever the words "church property" were used in that act they meant only the ground on which the church stood; and if the parsonage stood right by it and was owned by the congregation and used by the minister of that congregation, it did not apply to that; but that it applied to all school property, wherever it might be located. In other words, it was liberally construed for the school property and too illiberally construed as to church property.

Mr. TALBOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. TALBOTT. This does no more than the laws in every State in the Union have done for church property?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. That is our information.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill as amended.

The Senate bill as amended was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

NOYES, MINN., AS A PORT OF ENTRY.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the present consideration of the bill (S. 5645) for the establishment of Noyes, in the State of Minnesota, as a port of entry and delivery for immediate transportation without appraisement of dutiable merchandise, reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DICKINSON] asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the privileges of the first and seventh sections of the act approved June 10, 1880, governing the immediate transportation of dutiable merchandise without appraisement, be, and are hereby, extended to the port of Noyes, in the State of Minnesota.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask that a communication from the Treasury Department which was submitted with the report, but by error of the printer was omitted, be read in connection with the report.

The SPEAKER. First, is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman inform the House where this important port of Noyes is located in the State of Minnesota?

Mr. DICKINSON. It is on the Northwestern Railroad at the Canadian border. The communication from the Treasury Department states exactly where it is located.

Mr. STAFFORD. Has this bill been introduced at the instance of the Treasury Department?

Mr. DICKINSON. It has the approval of the Treasury Department. It has passed the Senate, has been unanimously reported by the Ways and Means Committee, and there is no objection to it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman inform the committee how many such ports in the country have this privilege at present?

Mr. DICKINSON. I am not able to give that information.

Mr. STAFFORD. I know that we have passed such bills as this on previous occasions, but I did not think we afforded that distinction to insignificant places.

Mr. MANN. I think we invariably give the permission at every place on the Canadian border where a railroad crosses the line. Otherwise the railroad can not operate to bring in goods. This is a new railroad which has just reached this point.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is this place on the Canadian border?

Mr. DICKINSON. I so stated.

Mr. MANN. It is on the Canadian border, and this is necessary to facilitate the bringing of goods into the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the communication which the gentleman has sent up.

The Clerk read as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, May 29, 1916.

The CHAIRMAN COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE,
United States Senate.

Sir: I have the honor to refer to your letter of the 20th of April last, transmitting a copy of bill S. 5645, which provides for the extension to Noyes, Minn., of the privileges of the first and seventh sections of the act of June 10, 1880, governing the immediate transportation of dutiable merchandise without appraisement.

An investigation conducted by the department as to the commercial necessity of such action discloses the fact that the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste. Marie Railway have completed their respective lines running via Noyes and that considerable merchandise is imported and exported at that place.

I am therefore of the opinion that the privileges of the first and seventh sections of the act of June 10, 1880, should be extended to Noyes, Minn.

Respectfully,

WM. P. MALBURN,
Acting Secretary.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, and was accordingly read the third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. DICKINSON, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS BAYOU BARTHOLOMEW, ARK.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a concurrent resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House concurrent resolution 50.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate be, and they are hereby, requested to cancel their respective signatures to the enrolled bill (H. R. 12197) entitled "An act authorizing Ashley County, Ark., to construct a bridge across Bayou Bartholomew."

That, upon the cancellation of said signatures, the Clerk be directed to reenroll said bill with amendments as follows: On page 1, line 8, strike out the word "five" and insert in lieu thereof the word "four"; in line 9, strike out the word "four" and insert in lieu thereof the word "five."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, what are these amendments?

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. The amendments are merely to transpose the words "four" and "five" in the description, the range lines having been incorrectly described.

Mr. MANN. It is simply to correct an error in the description?

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. To correct an error in the description.

Mr. MANN. I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

BRIDGE ACROSS MISSISSIPPI RIVER, NEW ORLEANS, LA.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 16185) to give the consent of the Congress to the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River near and above the city of New Orleans, La., and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill which the Clerk will report.

The bill was read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the city of New Orleans, a municipal corporation existing under the laws of the State of Louisiana, or to the subordinate agencies of said city, their successors and assigns, when authorized by the State of Louisiana, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Mississippi River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, near and above the said city, in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906: *Provided,* That subject to the provisions of this act the said city of New Orleans, or its subordinate agencies, may construct a tunnel or tunnels under said river in lieu of the bridge herein authorized.

Sec. 2. That this act shall be null and void unless the construction of said bridge or tunnels is commenced within two years and completed within five years from the date of approval hereof.

Sec. 3. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Reserving the right to object, as I understand the bill it reads that this bridge is to be constructed "near and above" the city of New Orleans?

Mr. DUPRÉ. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. By the city?

Mr. DUPRÉ. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Is the city to build a bridge outside of its corporate limits?

Mr. DUPRÉ. A constitutional amendment has recently been submitted by the General Assembly of Louisiana, authorizing the city of New Orleans to build this bridge, and giving it authority to go beyond the confines of the city.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The bill authorizes the city of New Orleans to build a bridge or dig a tunnel outside of the corporate limits of the municipality?

Mr. DUPRÉ. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. And it also gives that right to the successors or assigns of the city to build the bridge. I do not know just what the method of doing that would be.

Mr. DUPRÉ. That is the usual form in such cases. It is not supposed that the city of New Orleans will go out of business as a corporation. I imagine it will continue to exist long after the gentleman from Wisconsin and I have disappeared from the earth.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Is it in contemplation that the city of New Orleans shall assign this right to any corporation?

Mr. DUPRÉ. No. I will state to the gentleman that I have in my hand a copy of the constitutional amendment covering this subject matter, and that it provides that the city of New Orleans shall be the owner of this improvement, and that it shall construct and operate it through its Belt Commission.

Mr. MANN. It is possible that the city might have to do it through a suborganization created by the city.

Mr. ADAMSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. One more question. The proposed tunnel or the proposed bridge—it is in the alternative, is it not, one or the other?

Mr. DUPRÉ. It provides that the Secretary of War may require the construction of a tunnel in lieu of the bridge.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. And it is to be used by the city, presumably for a belt-line road?

Mr. DUPRÉ. Yes; and other transportation lines that want to cross the Mississippi River.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DUPRÉ. Yes.

Mr. ADAMSON. There is no difficulty about the city building a bridge outside of its limits. It is necessary to go above the city, because ocean vessels come up to New Orleans, and the gentleman from Wisconsin need not be uneasy about it being a light matter to find somebody with money enough to take over this transaction. The great struggle there is to find means and methods of securing a bridge at all.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The gentleman from Wisconsin was not uneasy at all. He was making an inquiry which I presume arose in the mind of everyone who listened to the reading of the bill. My query did not indicate uneasiness, but simply a desire to find the facts that every legislator on this floor ought to know about a bill of this kind.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Wisconsin should remember that obtaining information at any time makes some people uneasy.

Mr. STAFFORD. I notice from reading the report that the War Department is averse to granting the privilege to the city authorities to build a bridge, but is willing to grant permission to construct a tunnel.

Mr. DUPRÉ. I do not think that the report goes that far.

Mr. STAFFORD. Have the city authorities considered building a tunnel in lieu of a bridge if the permit to build the bridge is not granted?

Mr. DUPRÉ. That is under serious contemplation. It is believed that it would be cheaper to construct a tunnel, and that it might be the best method of getting across the river.

Mr. STAFFORD. How far distant from the city is the proposed location of the bridge?

Mr. DUPRÉ. It is at a place called Nine Mile Point, which is 9 miles above Canal Street. It is just beyond the parish line of the parish of Orleans. I suppose it is 2 or 3 miles from the nearest point in Orleans Parish.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is it to be used for surface travel as well as railroad travel?

Mr. DUPRÉ. The idea is for railroad travel more particularly. There is not enough surface travel there to warrant it alone.

Mr. STAFFORD. Never having traveled much in that vicinity, I would like to ask the gentleman what is the first bridge above New Orleans?

Mr. DUPRÉ. There is no bridge nearer than Memphis.

Mr. McKELLAR. Memphis is the first, and that bridge has just been opened. I would like to ask the gentleman from Louisiana, Is the purpose to supply the needs of traffic as well as the railroad traffic?

Mr. DUPRÉ. I think that will be covered.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out the words "or to the subordinate agencies of said city their" and insert in lieu thereof the word "it."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read the following committee amendment:

Amend line 4, page 2, by inserting, after the word "act," the words "the Secretary of War may require."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I move to amend the committee amendment by striking out the word "require" and inserting the word "permit."

Mr. DUPRÉ. That is agreeable to me.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The Clerk read the following committee amendment:

Amend, after the words "New Orleans," in line 5, by striking out the comma and insert the words "or its subordinate agencies may" and insert in lieu thereof the word "to."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I offer the further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 7, after the word "authorized," change the period to a comma and add the following: "in accordance with the foregoing act approved March 23, 1906, so far as the same may be applicable."

Mr. MANN. That is to give the War Department control over construction.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

On motion of Mr. DUPRÉ, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 15947, the naval appropriation bill, with Senate amendments, disagree to all the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked for by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the naval appropriation bill, disagree to all the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked for by the Senate. Is there objection?

Mr. BROWNING. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee whether it is his intention to allow the House to vote on any of these amendments? I desire to have a separate vote on amendment No. 80, page 57 of the bill, authorizing increase in the enlisted strength of the Navy, and also on the amendments, commencing on page 176, line 13, for the further increase of the Naval Establishment of the United States, down to line 19, on page 180. I would like to have a vote on those amendments. I favor them and I believe the majority of the House also favors them.

Mr. PADGETT. I want to ask that the whole bill go to conference and that there be no limitation placed on the conferees. The conferees may report back an agreement and then it would be for the House to vote upon it.

Mr. BROWNING. Then we would have to vote for the rejection or the adoption of the conference report.

The SPEAKER. The vote would be on the conference report as a whole.

Mr. PADGETT. That is correct. I think the whole bill ought to go to conference without restrictions or limitations.

Mr. BROWNING. When I made the motion to recommit this House bill and voted against its passage, I did so for the reason that I did not consider it an adequate naval measure. The Senate has added important amendments which should be adopted, and in view of the fact that my motion to recommit was beaten by only six votes, I think the House should now be given opportunity to vote on the amendments of the Senate to which I have called attention.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to call the attention of the chairman of the committee to amendment 89. I do not believe that I can consistently let this bill go to conference on unanimous consent unless there is some assurance given the House in some way that the House conferees will not yield upon that amendment until the House has had an opportunity to vote upon it. The amendment I refer to is on page 60. A Member of this House said to me a few days ago that apparently every man who was in the Navy who wanted to be made a rear admiral went over to the Senate and had himself included in the list, and I think that remark must be very nearly true. I asked the Navy Department yesterday to furnish me with data showing how many new rear admirals would be taken care of if this amendment No. 89 were passed, and I was informed that it amounted to only 82. Of course they say they will not all be taken care of in the next two or three years, but I am not willing to let this bill go to conference unless we have some kind of assurance that the House conferees are not going to yield and agree to the Senate amendment and come back here and place us in the position of having to vote the conference report up or down.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I will state to the gentleman that my individual opinion is that that personnel legislation should be written with a good deal more care than it has been, and there should be a reduction in the percentages, reducing very materially the number provided for. There should be some personnel legislation, and the conferees would consider that very carefully. Speaking for myself I should not agree to it in the exact terms in which it is incorporated in the bill. I think it should be very materially reduced.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. COX. I have been told that the position of rear admiral corresponds to the position of brigadier general in the Army. A brigadier general in the Army has control of 5,000 men. A rear admiral ought to have substantially the same number. It is proposed here that the Navy be increased to 74,000 men. If this provision be finally agreed to, inasmuch as we have 20 rear admirals now—

Mr. PADGETT. Eighteen.

Mr. COX. That will make exactly 100 rear admirals to 74,000 enlisted men—out of all proportion, absolutely topheavy.

Mr. PADGETT. I will state to the gentleman there are 18 in the regular number, and then there are additional numbers, making, as I now remember, 26 that are now rear admirals. As I understand the figures, it would make about 82 all told, not 82 or 83 in addition to what we have now.

Mr. COX. I think this amendment actually means 82 in addition to what we have now. And we have now 145 rear admirals on the retired list. By this amendment they propose to make rear admirals out of men in the Medical Corps, the Pay Corps, the Construction Corps, the Corps of Civil Engineers, Chaplains' Corps, thereby permitting almost everyone to get himself made a rear admiral.

Mr. PADGETT. As I stated to the gentleman, there is a great deal of correction that ought to be made in that, and it is my purpose to go over it very carefully and to reduce it.

Mr. COX. I do not want to bind the gentleman too strongly, but I can not yield my rights on that proposition, and yet I do not want to interfere with this matter going to conference.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. Not now. If the Senate refuses to yield on this proposition, will the gentleman return this bill to the House and give the House a chance to vote upon it?

Mr. PADGETT. I will.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman state to the House whether there is any reason why we should embody in the naval appropriation bill a reorganization scheme of the entire personnel of the Navy?

Mr. PADGETT. There is some personnel legislation that is very badly needed.

Mr. STAFFORD. Why has not the gentleman brought it in in a separate bill so that the House could consider it upon its merits?

Mr. PADGETT. I will simply state that it was because we were engaged for nearly five months in the preparation of the naval appropriation bill, and while we have had extensive hearings heretofore, which have been printed, and a number of Members have them, we have not yet had an opportunity to bring in that legislation.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call attention to two more amendments with respect to the building program and the increase of the Navy. It seems to me that Congress is running stark, crazy mad on this preparedness program. This bill as it passed the House carried \$270,000,000—

Mr. PADGETT. Two hundred and sixty-nine million dollars.

Mr. COX. Practically \$270,000,000, and they have added \$50,000,000 in the Senate.

Mr. PADGETT. Forty-eight million dollars and odd.

Mr. COX. Well, we will not quibble over so small a matter as \$2,000,000; but it makes a total of about \$315,000,000 all told.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. COX. What does the gentleman think about that proposition?

Mr. PADGETT. I think that some of it will stick and some of it will go off.

Mr. COX. I shall have to get a more definite answer than that before I can consent to have this bill go to conference at this time.

Mr. PADGETT. That is all I can tell the gentleman on that proposition.

Mr. COX. I wanted to be given an opportunity to vote on this increase of the Navy which has been put on in the Senate.

Mr. PADGETT. As I said a moment ago, I think the bill ought to go to conference, and the conferees will try to adjust matters; and as to what we can do in reference to the building program I am not prepared to say, but I think there will be some adjustment.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield to me for a moment?

Mr. PADGETT. I will.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Can not the chairman give the gentleman from Indiana the same assurance on the building program that he did in reference to the personnel legislation?

Mr. PADGETT. That unless the Senate yields somewhat it will come back to the House. Yes, sir; I will make that statement.

Mr. COX. As it passed the House, we provided so many battle cruisers, I believe. I think the Senate cut out a number and adds four battleships. Is not that correct?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. COX. If I understand the gentleman correctly, that word "some" is a very narrow margin if this bill goes to conference. He states that unless the Senate yields "some" on that provision it would be returned to the House. That is very thin ice for a Member of the House to skate on who is opposed to such a tremendous building program as is carried in this measure.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman from Indiana yield?

Mr. COX. With pleasure.

Mr. MANN. I take it the gentleman believes that eventually this bill will go to conference?

Mr. COX. Oh, sure. It has to go to conference.

Mr. MANN. We all know this is a bill that will be passed in some shape.

Mr. COX. There is no question about that.

Mr. MANN. Well, what good will it do not to send it to conference?

Mr. COX. It might do a whole lot of good and it might not do any good. That will depend upon what the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union sees fit to do when we get there.

Mr. MANN. Oh, no; because if the Committee of the Whole should do something it will still go to conference. A vote might be a direction, but I take it that on a bill like this the House would not instruct the conferees on any proposition.

Mr. COX. Well—

Mr. MANN. It seems to me—I believe I am as finicky about these things as anybody in the House—it might be better to let the bill go to conference and give the conferees time enough to learn something about these Senate amendments. It is perfectly safe to say there will be no long, protracted hearings before the Committee on Naval Affairs if we should send it to the committee. If this bill should go to the committee, the committee will report the bill right out that all the Senate amendments be disagreed to and a conference asked for. We might spend a week or two weeks or three weeks on the bill in the House,

and we would not get any further along than we are now. It is the inevitable result of our methods of legislation.

Now, some gentlemen do not want this bill to go to conference, because they want to agree to some of the Senate amendments. Some gentlemen do not want it to go to conference, because they want to disagree to the Senate amendments. I would be willing to eat my hat if on a vote in the House the House does not disagree to every amendment the Senate has put in the bill and in the end send it to conference. Now, the conferees will have a little longer time, when they will study the subject. The rest of us do not know much about it.

Mr. COX. With all due deference to the House Committee on Naval Affairs heretofore—and I have followed this bill as closely as other Members—I think I am clearly within the record in saying that the House conferees have invariably yielded to the Senate upon important material matters and the Senate has yielded upon the immaterial matters.

Mr. PADGETT. The gentleman is mistaken about that.

Mr. COX. I think I am within the record in stating that.

Mr. PADGETT. I think the gentleman is not within the record. I think he is out of the record.

Mr. COX. If I am out of the record, I will stand corrected.

Mr. BUTLER. Just put it the other way.

Mr. COX. Just one more amendment to which I wish to call attention. The Senate sometimes does some wise things, but not often; but last spring, when the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill was going through, it put an amendment on over there which prohibited employees from drawing double salaries where the salary aggregated more than \$2,000. I think that was a good provision at that time. Now, then, the Senate here, by an amendment, proposes to avoid that.

Mr. PADGETT. No; they do not avoid that. I know about it. The Comptroller of the Treasury has made a ruling that secretaries or clerks of committees and various other clerks and officers are not public officers. He has said that they were not appointed to public offices, and that it should not apply to them. He has made the strange ruling that they are not public officers; that there is a difference between an officer and a public officer. That is the holding of the Comptroller of the Treasury. The result is that it had deprived a number—and among them the clerk of my committee, who is a retired naval officer, and is receiving his retired pay, and he is checked up, because they hold that he is not a public officer, and this is simply to correct that.

Mr. COX. The gentleman does not want to go on record here as criticizing the decision of the Comptroller of the Treasury, does he?

Mr. PADGETT. I do.

Mr. COX. Does the gentleman contend that the decision rendered by him was not within the law?

Mr. PADGETT. I do.

Mr. COX. Contrary to the law?

Mr. PADGETT. I do.

Mr. STAFFORD. That provision was incorporated in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act, over which another committee of the House has jurisdiction. Here we have another committee seeking to preempt the work of the legislative committee, and I would like to know from the gentleman whether he thinks it is fair to the other committee for his committee to preempt matters that pertain to another committee of the House?

Mr. PADGETT. We are not to preempt it. I understand that in the Senate the chairman of the Appropriation Committee, Senator MARTIN, who had control of the measure and put in the other provision for the very purpose of taking care of these cases, is in favor of this amendment and agreed that it might go into the naval bill because the other legislation has been passed.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I remember, this provision was put on the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill as it was introduced in the House.

Mr. PADGETT. I said it was, and the Comptroller of the Treasury, as I stated, has made this ruling, that these clerks of the committee and other officers, in the Coast Guard, the Naval Militia, and various other ones that I could bring up, and which I have not at my tongue's end right now, are not public officers. He said no one is a public officer unless he is exercising a part of the sovereignty. He makes a distinction between an officer and a public officer, and because the word "public" was used in the act he is holding up their case.

Mr. COX. Let me call the gentleman's attention to this amendment briefly here:

But this shall not apply to retired officers or enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, or to officers and enlisted men of the Organized Militia and Naval Militia in the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That no such re-

tired officer, officer, or enlisted man shall be denied or deprived of any of his pay, salary, or compensation as such, or of any other salary or compensation for services heretofore rendered, by reason of any decision or construction of said section 6.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes. That is put in there—

Mr. COX. The gentleman held a moment ago, if I caught his position correctly, that the Comptroller of the Treasury in rendering this decision rendered a decision in violation of the law.

Mr. PADGETT. I think the gentleman's interpretation of it is wholly at variance with and unwarranted by law. To say that the clerks of the committees and these men who are in the Naval Militia and the Coast Guard, and these others whose names you read there, are not public officers, is not sustained by correct reasoning.

Mr. COX. This, from my viewpoint, is nothing short of absolute class legislation.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. MANN. When that provision went into the bill recently, inserted as an amendment of the Senate, I made an inquiry of the conferees on the part of the House in reference to this situation. The clerk of the Naval Committee is a retired officer of the Navy. Clerks of equal rank in the House get \$2,500 a year. He gets \$2,400 a year, because of an old provision to the effect that no one drawing \$2,500 a year could draw another salary from the Government. So far as I know, no one wanted to interfere with him. The conferees on the part of the House assured me that the provision that we had agreed to would not affect him or anybody in his class. Now, I take it, although I have not made inquiry, that the comptroller or somebody has ruled that it does affect him. Is not that right?

Mr. PADGETT. That is correct, and he puts it on the ground that he is not a public officer.

Mr. MANN. And is different from the understanding of the conferees and the House when the legislative bill became a law?

Mr. PADGETT. When the legislative bill was before the House I went over to the Senate and had a conference with some of the members of the Senate Committee on Appropriations—Senators MARTIN and SWANSON—and they put the language in there, after a conference with Mr. Courts, clerk of the Appropriations Committee of the House, in order to take care of this situation, and when that language was put in there the comptroller ruled that these persons are not public officers. He says there is a distinction—I have never been able to comprehend what it is—between an officer and a public officer, and because the language in the legislative bill used the words "public officer" these persons are not entitled to pay and he is holding up the pay of 50 or 75 persons, say, including the clerk of my committee.

Mr. MANN. I do not remember exactly the language.

Mr. GARDNER. The situation is this: If anybody objects to this going to conference, it goes to the Committee on Naval Affairs, does it not?

Mr. PADGETT. Either that or remain on the Speaker's table and a rule to send it to conference.

Mr. GARDNER. And the Committee on Rules may take it away from the Committee on Naval Affairs, but it can not take it away from the Speaker's table without unanimous consent?

Mr. PADGETT. I think the Speaker has it in his discretion to hold it.

The SPEAKER. Ordinarily the Speaker holds the bill on his table if anybody asks him to do it, but if anybody insists that it be immediately referred to the committee it is referred.

Mr. GARDNER. That is my understanding, but what I want to say is this: Frequently the chairman of the committee gets out of that situation by saying, "Before we report an agreement with the Senate we will give the House an opportunity to vote on all these questions that the House seriously wants to take up." For instance, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] has something he wants to take up. I want a separate vote on the building program, and I want a separate vote on the personnel, and I want a separate vote on the personnel of the Marine Corps. I have no doubt if the gentleman would say, "We will give the House a chance to vote on these major points," he would not have the slightest difficulty, and I and the gentleman from Indiana and everybody else would be glad to see the bill go to conference, so long as there is a chance given to the House to deal with these questions, and not go to the conference committee without action.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MANN. What now becomes of the bill?

The SPEAKER. Ordinarily if the Speaker is asked to hold the bill on the table he holds it on the table temporarily, but if anybody insists on its being referred, he will refer it.

Mr. PADGETT. I ask, Mr. Speaker, that it be laid on the Speaker's table.

Mr. MANN. No; I think it would be more expeditious to send it to the committee and the committee will report it back. Somebody will object when it comes back.

Mr. BUTLER. I will give notice that we will need a quorum here to-morrow.

Mr. MANN. I ask that it be referred to the committee.

The SPEAKER. The bill is referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered printed.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. You will have to have a quorum on Thursday.

The SPEAKER. Under the order of the House the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, may I give notice now that I will call a meeting of the Naval Committee at 2 o'clock this afternoon in the room of Committee on Naval Affairs?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee gives notice that he will call a meeting of the Committee on Naval Affairs this afternoon at 2 o'clock.

Mr. MANN. Oh, Mr. Speaker, I do not think a man can give notice on the floor of the House of calling a committee in that way. That is no meeting of the committee in the true sense.

The SPEAKER. It is done, and nothing can be undone about it. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I have been asked several times recently about the industrial conditions upon the Pacific coast. I propose to answer those inquiries by making a few observations this afternoon in regard to the lumber and shingle industries of my State. Unfortunately for us upon the Pacific coast, we are not reaping any of the great prosperity that comes from the contest across the sea.

The State of Washington produces over 80 per cent of all the cedar shingles manufactured in the United States and over 60 per cent of all shingles of all kinds produced in the United States. The greatest competitor of the State of Washington in the shingle industry is British Columbia.

The men working in the mills of Washington are all white and all American citizens. The labor employed in the mills of British Columbia is 80 per cent oriental, mostly Chinese. The American shingle weaver receives approximately double the wages that are paid to his Chinese competitors in British Columbia.

Cedar logs, the material from which shingles are manufactured, are considerably lower in British Columbia than in Washington.

With these facts known to all who care to inform themselves, the result of what free shingles would mean is so plain that it is astonishing that even Democratic statesmen should not have realized it.

No better illustration of the workings of the protective tariff can be found than in the history of the shingle industry of Washington.

In the Payne law there were material changes in the tariff upon three important products of the State of Washington. The tariff was reduced on coal and the price of coal immediately increased. It was reduced on lumber and the price of lumber immediately increased. It was increased from 25 cents to 50 cents per thousand on shingles, and the price of shingles was immediately reduced; new mills opened up; new markets were found; production increased; work and wages increased; the British Columbia producer was driven from many American markets that they had long controlled; the mills for the first time in the history of the industry ran 12 months of the year instead of 6 months. This is the history of the increase of the tariff on shingles under the Payne law, but these facts meant nothing to the Democratic Party.

In the Underwood law shingles were placed upon the free list.

Sixty days before the Underwood law went into effect all American mills were running full time.

Sixty days before the Underwood law went into effect half of the Canadian mills were closed.

Sixty days after the Underwood law went into effect 80 per cent of the American mills were closed.

Sixty days after the Underwood law went into effect all Canadian mills were running at full capacity, both night and day.

Sixty days after the Underwood law went into effect there were more idle men looking for work in the State of Washington than ever before.

The Payne law opened the American mill and closed the foreign mill.

The Underwood law opened the foreign mill and closed the American mill.

The Payne law gave the work and the wages to the American and kept the money at home.

The Underwood law gave the work and the wages to the foreigner—the Chinaman, the Japanese, and the Hindu—and sent the money out of the country.

The effect of the Underwood law was to immediately depress the markets of this country. During the first year under that law, the total amount of shingles consumed in the United States decreased 30 per cent, but notwithstanding this decrease in total sales, the sales from British Columbia for each month of that year in the United States was approximately equal to the total sales that had been made in any one year under the Payne law.

While most of our mills were closed those of British Columbia were running night and day, and 95 per cent of all the shingles produced in British Columbia are sold in the United States to the exclusion of the American product.

Such is the destructive story of Democratic free trade and the shingle industry. The great war in Europe changed conditions to some extent. The industry to-day in British Columbia is not so prosperous as it was immediately before the war, although the shingle industry is still probably the most prosperous in British Columbia.

Many of our mills are still closed. Many of them are running only a part of the time and at part capacity. Some of them are running on the cooperative plan, dividing with their employees such profits as they are able to secure, in an effort to keep from closing entirely.

Wages now and at all times have been very much lower under the Underwood law than under the Payne law.

During the last 10 months over 7,500 carloads of shingles have come into this country from British Columbia—more than came into the country during the entire time that the Payne law was upon the statute books. The Government has lost the revenue and is placing a direct tax upon the people to get money to meet current expenses.

During the operation of the Underwood law more than \$8,000,000 in wages have been taken from American labor in the shingle mills of the State of Washington and given to the Chinese, the Japanese, and the Hindu in British Columbia. That much money has gone out of circulation and out of the country. Many of our mills are closed and decaying. Many prosperous communities and towns have become desolate places.

But the price of shingles to the consumer has not been reduced a single penny by the Underwood law. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Unless the tariff is restored on shingles before the war in Europe ends, that industry is doomed to certain and rapid destruction.

Shingles is but one illustration as to the effect of free trade on the industries of Washington. The result as to lumber, lime, fish, the dairy and fruit industry is the same, differing only in degree. All these industries will be greatly injured if the tariff is not restored before peace is restored. They are not prosperous to-day, but they are existing only because of the indirect stimulation they receive from the battle-field prosperity that has come to us.

The conditions in Washington under the Underwood law before the awful conflict in Europe began is well stated by a mill owner in a letter that he wrote a few months after the Underwood law had gone upon the statute books. I quote from it a few sentences:

Belgium structural steel and Swedish high-grade and tool steel has practically captured our market. I am using Swedish steel in the blacksmith shop, feeding our men Australian beef, New Zealand butter, and Chinese eggs. You can not borrow money now unless you have gold bullion to put up for security. In other words, we have just about the same d—d Democratic times as 20 years ago. I have not seen a business man smile in three months, and we are all wearing our old clothes.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Is the gentleman going to leave the subject of shingles now?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Before the gentleman leaves that I should like to ask him one question. As I understand him, the shingle industry has suffered very materially by reason of the fact that shingles have been put on the free list.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. That is certainly correct.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Is it not a fact that one of the Republican colleagues of the gentleman on this floor

voted to put shingles on the free list and was thereupon elected to the United States Senate by the people of the State of Washington?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The gentleman has his facts a little bit twisted. It is true that a distinguished gentleman who now represents the State of Washington in the Senate [Mr. POINDEXTER] voted for the Underwood tariff law, which put shingles on the free list, but he was over in the other end of the Capitol when he so voted. It is also true, as shown by the record, that he voted for free shingles once before upon roll call before he voted for the Underwood bill, but unfortunately in the State of Washington his voting that way has not made any difference in the injurious effect that free shingles has had upon that industry.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. He voted for free shingles before he was elected to the Senate.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. With all due respect to my friend, I must decline to yield further. I do not intend to be led into a discussion of the tariff record of the distinguished Senator to whom he refers.

The other day the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN], the distinguished Democratic leader, referred in one of his speeches to the prosperous condition of the lumber industry in Washington. One of my friends sent me a telegram from which I read. This telegram is dated July 7, 1916. He says:

Lumber not prosperous. Many mills and camps closing. Ninety-nine representative fir mills last week reported orders nearly 10 per cent below production and production 12 per cent below normal. This is a fair indication of the entire industry. Lumber prices, which were fairly normal in the spring of 1913, declined until rock bottom was reached early in the fall of 1915, when the market steadied and advanced to nearly normal in early spring, 1916. In past two months again declined, averaging loss from \$1.50 to \$2 per thousand feet.

I may say that two or three days ago I received a paper from my city reviewing the lumber industry, and the production of lumber in the State of Washington to-day is 50 per cent below normal. Fifty-five of the larger fir mills, if I recall the number correctly, have closed indefinitely.

On the other hand, I want to call attention to the fact that according to this telegram there has been an increase in what the lumber men have to purchase. He says:

Costing more to manufacture. Saws advanced 10 to 15 per cent, leather belting 25 per cent, bar iron 100 per cent, mild steel 100 per cent, high-speed steel 600 per cent. Shingle industry worse shape than lumber. British Columbia, which shipped in 2,500 carloads in the year 1912, under 50 cents duty, and when United States markets were taking more shingles than now, shipped in 7,500 carloads first 10 months of the Government's fiscal year which has just closed.

This telegram is signed by J. H. Bloedel, one of the leading lumbermen of the United States. The war prosperity, that has overcome some of the evil effects of the present tariff law in the East, has had but little effect on our coast. Free trade still oppresses us. There can be no great prosperity in the State of Washington until the Underwood tariff law is blotted from our statute books. [Applause on Republican side.]

The SPEAKER. Under special order of the House the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. ROBERTS] is entitled to one hour.

THE DEMOCRATIC ADMINISTRATION.

Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, you gentlemen on that side of the aisle, which separates the sheep from the goats, have for some time been engaged in lauding your candidate for the Presidency and lambasting ours, and while I am in a cheerful mood, and while some of your recent speeches are still fresh in my mind, I desire to make a few statements concerning the present administration, and which I trust will be received in the spirit in which they are given, my only aim being to promote harmony within your ranks, correct some false impressions, which have gone forth, and to call your attention directly to some things which you have neglected to talk about, but which the great masses of the people have not overlooked.

We have stood by your candidate for the Presidency many times when he needed help, and would stand by him oftener if he would only stand still once in a while, and right here I want to state that he is an excellent subject for the "movies"; but we have been mealy-mouthed about your shortcomings long enough, and from now on you must either "fish or cut bait." [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

You have boasted long and loud of prosperity and all its attendant blessings and have extended your remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD page after page for weeks upon that subject and the end is not yet, but my friends there is no real sound substantial foundation on which to base your pretended prosperity. It vanishes as a desert mirage when you approach it. The prosperity you claim is but a sham and a mere shadow of feeble pretense. There is no money in the Treasury with which to meet the unprecedented appropriations you are daily piling

up. You are enfeebling and impoverishing the Public Treasury instead of strengthening it.

Your free-trade law no revenue brings,
You must tax the people or borrow;
For you're going in debt to-day for things
You can't pay for to-morrow.

[Applause on the Republican side.]

Inexperienced in governmental affairs, you have plunged into all manner of reckless expenditures and swamped the Treasury almost in a day. You have squandered millions of dollars of the people's money for things they do not need. In the words of Mark Twain:

You have achieved the dearest wishes of your hearts, but in so doing you have drawn a white elephant in the political lottery and have nothing to feed it on.

Great guns and little fishes! You slid into office on a platform every plank of which has been demolished, but you have patched it up, oiled and veneered it, and are going to try to slide in again; but you will be disappointed. It will be a case of "slide, Kelly, slide," but you will not reach the home plate again. You reached home on an error in 1912, but the people will fool you in 1916. [Applause on Republican side.]

Your gross disregard of the promises you made will be resented at the polls in November. You have proven false to the trust reposed in you, and deserve to be defeated. You have sought, at the expense of our Nation's honor, to play petty politics in nearly every measure you have advocated and in nearly every act you have done. You declared for the rigid enforcement of the civil-service laws of this country in 1912, but by hook and by crook you have seen fit to destroy the efficiency of the rules and regulations and made of them a farce. You have enforced the civil-service laws by adding upward of 30,000 people to the Government pay rolls outside the civil-service rules and regulations, and the end is not yet. You do not dare to deny it.

You have demoted competent, honest, and faithful public servants of different political faith from yours and promoted inefficient political weaklings of your own ilk. You have dropped from the rolls of the various departments of Government able and conscientious men and women who differed with you along political lines and have added to the list the names of those whose chief qualification was a "pull" back home. You ought to be ashamed of yourselves. The American people are ashamed of you. You have sought through some of your leading Members to lengthen the hours of labor of the overworked and underpaid employees of the District of Columbia and have sought to destroy the organic act under which they live, or, rather, exist.

You have sought to make the Postmaster General a political censor, clothed with arbitrary powers with which to destroy the freedom of the press, muzzle editors, curb the circulation of newspapers and magazines, and ruin any owner of any publication who dared to oppose your administration.

You have done more during the last three and a half years of this administration to destroy the efficiency of the mail service on the rural free-delivery and star routes than any other party in our country's history. You have given the people who live in the remote farming, grazing, and agricultural sections of the West the worst mail service they have ever had. Instead of trying to encourage those who have the hardihood and ambition to settle up those great, rich, undeveloped sections of the country, you have ignored their prayers and petitions for a service which would bring them into closer communication with the outside world, and have seen fit to abolish their post offices, discontinue their mail routes, and have denied them the service to which they are entitled.

You have made of the Reclamation Service a football for contending parties, and instead of legislating so as to favor and encourage the development of meritorious projects, have made it possible for the development of only those projects located in sections where interested parties can muster the greatest political "pull," and for the truth of these assertions I would respectfully request that you read the statements of some of your leading Members of this House on the Democratic side made on the 29th day of July, 1914. The Members of the Western States, regardless of party affiliations, stood shoulder to shoulder in their efforts to see that all irrigation projects should be undertaken solely upon the grounds of merit, but were unsuccessful.

But what can the people expect? At Baltimore in 1912 you turned down the greatest living member of your party for the Presidency to suit the whims and fancies of the great apostle of peace, poetry, and grape juice. [Applause on the Republican side.] Thank Heaven, time evens up all things, and your candidate for the Presidency repaid his debt of gratitude, and for the only time during his administration put his words into

action and knocked the apostle into a "cocked hat." [Applause on the Republican side.] It is needless to state that Mr. Bryan will be out stumping the country for the Democratic standard bearer this fall. It will be remembered, however, that he also stumped the country for Judge Parker some years ago. I have never heard anyone say anything about Judge Parker's having been elected, or of his having thanked Mr. Bryan for the part he took. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

You have torn down the barrier of protection which has stood for more than a hundred years between the working classes of this country and the cheap coolie and pauper labor of the Old World. You have weighted down and handicapped our working men in the race of life and have entered them in a free-for-all in competition against the teeming, starving hordes of Europe and Asia.

You told the people that if they would place you in charge of the administration you would immediately reduce the high cost of living, but you have deceived them, for you have raised it still higher, and the Lord knows when it will stop, for it is still going up. You have not only raised the price of every food product that goes down their necks, but have added 2½ cents to every collar they wear around their necks. My good friend, the gentleman from Texas, "Cyclone" DAVIS, notwithstanding. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

You have throttled honest industry and have sought to array class against class, section against section, and race against race, apparently for no other purpose than continuing yourselves in office. You have wantonly maligned and insulted millions of our most patriotic citizens, naturalized and native born, simply because their hearts beat in sympathy with loved ones of their own flesh and blood in foreign lands, and, like all true Americans who believe in fair play, dared to insist that this country maintain a strict neutrality. You refused in this House to warn American citizens to keep off armed belligerent vessels, but, more than that, you refused to protect them when they did go.

Your party has been weak, wobbly, and vacillating in its policies. You have side-stepped and back-pedaled on every important subject that has come up before you. In diplomacy the Kaiser has outgeneraled you at every turn, and John Bull seems to own you body and soul. Poor old Huerta and Carranza and Villa have vied with each other in taunting and humiliating you and have turned the arms and ammunitions with which you so lavishly supplied them upon our own citizens, and the end is not yet. [Applause on the Republican side.]

You have spent millions upon millions of the people's money in mock demonstrations of awe by our Army and Navy, but, although being in a "fighting mood," yet too proud to fight, and imbued with the spirit of "watchful waiting," it has availed us naught. The same awful conditions of outlawry still prevail along our border and throughout our neighboring Republic. Our soldiers have been ordered in and ordered out. Your candidate has time and again ordered them to march right in and turn around and march right out again. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] Thousands of our young men from different States, half equipped, half clothed, and half fed, are speeding to the border. Judging from the way our troops have been treated in the past in Mexico, I am inclined to believe that they are now going there with some misgivings as to their future. Shades of Davy Crockett, when will this thing end!

We built the Panama Canal and paid for it, but it is not ours. You told the American people that we owned it, and that American vessels engaged in coastwise trade should have free tolls, but you deceived them. Why? Because Great Britain told you what to do, and you did it. [Applause on the Republican side.] How can you face the American people and ask them to believe you again? You can fool some of the people some of the time, but you can not fool all of the people all of the time.

According to late reports, your candidate for the Presidency, after a long period of "watchful waiting," is now in a "fighting mood" and is ready to fight, no matter what the cost, and we are informed that you have adopted as your new slogan for the coming campaign, "No matter what the cost." Now, my friends, that is what is the matter with your party now. You have been running this Government upon that principle ever since you came into power. You have taxed the people to death. You are striving to build up a great and powerful political machine, no matter what the cost. That is what has depleted the Treasury and forced you to raise revenue by a direct tax upon the people. [Applause on the Republican side.]

You are asking the people to continue you in power because you claim to have maintained peace, but it is noticeable that

you keep on levying what you are pleased to call war taxes just the same. You led the people to believe that you could run this Government on less money than our party could possibly get along with; that you would cut down appropriations materially; but you have done nothing of the kind. You have given the people the most extravagant administration in American history.

You made the people believe that by the passage of the Underwood law not only the cost of living would be reduced but taxes would be reduced, and they would not feel the effects of taxation at all; but you have taxed them "coming and going." In other words, you are trying to "double shoot the turn." You are trying to "play both ends against the middle," but it will not work. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The proof you present for their consideration reminds me of the tramp who knocked at a farmer's door and asked for something to eat. The good-hearted old farmer looked him over and asked, "Are you a Christian?" "Why, can't you tell?" answered the tramp. "Look at these holes worn in the knees of my pants. Don't they prove it?" The farmer's wife promptly brought out a "hand-out," and the tramp turned to go. "Well, well," asked the farmer; "what made those holes in the seat of your pants?" "Backsliding," replied the tramp as he hurried on. [Laughter.]

Now, my friends, that is what is the matter with your party. You have all worn holes in the seats of your breeches by backsliding. You are genuine backsliders, but if I am not much mistaken some of you will have a different reason to offer for the porosity of the posterior part of your trousers after the people register their kicks at the coming election. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

You pledged your candidate for the Presidency to a single term, but the type was not cold until he was building up his fences for another; but then what do promises and platforms mean to you in the mad scramble for public office. You said in your platform of 1912:

We favor a single presidential term, and to that end urge the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution making the President of the United States ineligible for reelection, and we pledge the candidate to this convention to this principle.

Gentlemen, you have kept that promise faithfully, have you not? And yet, not fully satisfied that the people would believe you, you went them one better in order to make them "sit up and take notice" by saying, in conclusion:

Our platform is one of principle which we believe to be essential to our national welfare. Our pledges are made to be kept when in office as well as relied upon during the campaign, and we invite the cooperation of all citizens regardless of party who believe in maintaining unimpaired the institutions and traditions of our country.

Strange to say, you did not insert either of those planks in your last platform. I wonder why. [Laughter on Republican side.]

You further stated in your platform, as follows:

We believe in the preservation and maintenance in their full strength and integrity of the three coordinate branches of Federal Government—executive, the legislative, and the judicial—each keeping within its own bounds and not encroaching upon the just powers of either of the others.

Yes; you have lived up to that, too, have you not? You have done more to destroy the strength and integrity of the three separate and distinct branches of government than any political party in all history. [Applause on the Republican side.] In fact, it might be truthfully stated that under your administration the executive and legislative branches of the Government have been merged into one. Your candidate for the Presidency is the "whole show." You pass through both Houses of Congress what the President wants, how he wants it, and when he wants it, and those of you who dare to vote according to your own convictions and in opposition to his are blacklisted and marked for slaughter, and many of you on that side of the aisle will bear witness to the truth of my assertions. If you do not believe me, ask some of the Members from the "Lone Star" State. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Time and again your candidate has come before both Houses of Congress and whipped you into line upon the pretended grounds of patriotism. Congress alone has the power to declare war, and yet your candidate for the Presidency has time after time gone off on a tangent and taken unto himself the right to virtually declare war without the advice and consent of Congress, and then when he has blundered along until he is at the end of his rope he comes in here and prayerfully asks us to back him up. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Well, we have patriotically come to his rescue and backed him up in virtually every mistake he has made, so far as any questions of patriotism were concerned, but we are getting sick and tired of it. We followed him to Vera Cruz, foolish as was the mission, to exact an apology and salutation from poor old

Huerta, the man he had refused to recognize as the de facto head of the government. There was nothing else for us to do, for he had made another blunder, and we had to stand behind him. Well, after we had spent millions upon millions of dollars of the people's money and lost a number of precious lives and killed a few ignorant and half-starved Mexicans, and obdurate old Huerta would neither apologize nor salute, your candidate for the Presidency, realizing the awful mistake he had made, turned around and marched right back again. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Well, not long ago we followed him on another mission. It was not only punitive but puerile. We started out with the express purpose of capturing Villa, "dead or alive." Well, at last accounts Villa is not dead, but very much alive. But what has become of our puerile expedition? It has all gone up in smoke. Our puerile expedition is over. We lost some more precious lives and accomplished nothing except to show that we are pursuing a weak, wobbly, and vacillating policy, and your candidate for the Presidency has made another blunder and is ready to turn around and march right out again. He said that we went to Vera Cruz to force a salute to the flag. Secretary Lane said that we went there to serve mankind. At any rate, we did not get the salute and I am unable to see wherein we rendered any service to mankind. I would like to have some of you gentlemen on that side of the aisle explain to this House and to the people of this country just what you have accomplished on either of these expeditions that has resulted in the betterment of mankind. I do not think that we will follow him on any more of those puerile expeditions. We are tired of it, and so are the people who elected us. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Your party has no domestic policy whatever. It has no foreign policy. You are simply drifting, like Jack London's *Snark*, in the doldrums, with sails all set to catch some vagrant breeze. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

You have talked long and loud about State rights. That seems to be your main stock in trade, but never in the history of this Government has a party done so much to take from the States their several rights, and especially is it true with reference to the question of taxation. You have tied up the great natural resources of the West, retarded development, and confiscated the revenues which rightfully belong to the several States.

You have not only sought to muzzle the press and make it subservient to the partisan views of the Postmaster General, but you have seemingly sought, through various administrative officers, and especially through your partisan Comptroller of the Currency, whose arbitrary actions have recently been challenged in the courts of this city, and successfully, too, in the minds of all fair-minded men, to hamper and embarrass, to say the least, the banking institutions of this country in the pursuit of their regular business and in a roundabout way compel them to "line up" behind the administration. No one at all familiar with the proceedings in the Riggs Bank case or with current events for one moment doubts your purpose or the objects sought to be accomplished.

Your administration might be said to be one great big family affair. Your Secretary of the Treasury, a most excellent and pleasing gentleman of good parts, chances to be the son-in-law of your distinguished candidate for the Presidency and naturally has much to do, directly and indirectly, by virtue of his position, with the placing of Government deposits, but, of course, no one would for a moment intimate that there would be any favoritism shown any particular section or locality of the country or any particular class of bankers. It is noticeable, however, that the Southern States have not been overlooked in the general disposition of the public funds.

Your distinguished Secretary of the Interior is a great and good man, and it is hard to believe for a moment that he would seek to do politics in the position he occupies. And yet, I presume, I may quote from an editorial which recently appeared in the *Tonopah Bonanza*, one of the rugged pioneer papers of my State, and for whose editor I have the highest regard, the following editorial, which speaks for itself:

THROTTLING THE PRESS.

Some attention has been paid to recent efforts of the Democratic Party to muzzle the press, but the statesmen who take tricks at the helm of the ship of state unite in saying the party is not responsible for the acts of a few individuals, even though the list includes members of the Cabinet and the Postmaster General. In any event, the fact remains that the administration at Washington has sedulously essayed to secure a strangle hold on the molders of public opinion in a manner that had not been attempted by any previous administration. The Wilson administration stands on record as the first from the time of Washington that ever deliberately tried to prostitute the press by offering a bonus for the perversion of sentiments and the construction of opinion. This order evinces such contemptible meanness that it is difficult to comprehend how any administration could stoop to the

infamy which, nevertheless, is a fact that can be established by reference to the files of the surveyor general's office or the register of lands at Carson City. It is a matter of record. No one has ever tried to deny it or to clear the skirts of the administration of the charge. Simmered down the statement is that the Wilson administration was the first in power to issue a direct order to all officials of the land office that applications for patent, all public printing, and all patronage emanating from that source for the printer must be given to a publisher friendly to the administration.

[Laughter on the Republican side.]

So far as I am advised, no one in authority has ever yet denied or refuted the statements contained in the above editorial.

You claim that times are prosperous and that our factories are running full blast and working overtime. In a sense that is true, but what are they doing? They are principally engaged in manufacturing munitions of war and near munitions of war for destructive purposes. Your prosperity comes through furnishing the very means by which whole nations are being destroyed and whole countries devastated. That is what has made your pretended prosperity. Ah, my friends, you are cutting coupons from the shrouds of the dead on the fields of battle while you are chanting "Peace on earth, good will toward men." [Applause on the Republican side.]

Our great farming communities will long be able to point with pride to the achievements you have made along the lines of cheap competition. You have opened up their markets to Mexico and South America on the south, to Canada on the north, and to China and Japan on the west, and the cheap meats and other farm products of Mexico, Argentina, and Australia and other countries will, after this war, put them out of business.

The farm products from Argentina and Australia alone will make it impossible for them to compete, pay their help living wages, and live according to our standard of living. The manufactured products of Japan alone will, after this war, drive thousands upon thousands of our workmen out of employment and upon the streets. The other countries will not be far behind in the fierce competition when the war is over and they settle down to their industrial pursuits. Millions of orientals will, under our present free-trade laws, enter into competition with our own workmen, not only on their farms and in their factories abroad but upon our farms and in our factories at home. [Applause on the Republican side.]

And, by the way, your candidate for the Presidency has some strong convictions concerning orientals, and judging from what he has said and written, I would like to ask some of you gentlemen on that side of the aisle how he feels concerning the questions of exclusion and immigration, for his attitude on those questions can only be by us surmised. It will be remembered that your candidate once wrote a book entitled "History of the American people," and in commenting upon the Chinese exclusion act, in volume 5, page 213—and, by the way, one can not help but notice your candidate's lucky 13—among other things, he says:

The Chinese were more to be desired as workmen, if not as citizens, than most of the coarse crew that came crowding in every year at the eastern ports.

And while we are on this subject, let me ask what classes and nationalities of our foreign-born immigrants from Europe belonged to that so-called "coarse crew," and it might be well for those of you who are planning on doing some political speech making during the coming campaign to read his aforesaid history and study what he has to say concerning the so-called "coarse crew," that came crowding in every year at our eastern ports. You will doubtless be called upon to answer some very pertinent questions on different subjects embraced in that book. To save you some trouble I will quote his exact words, which are to be found on page 212 of volume 5:

But now there came multitudes of men of the lowest class from the south of Italy and men of meaner sort out of Hungary and Poland, men out of the ranks where there was neither skill nor energy nor any initiative of quick intelligence.

Now, in view of his strong leaning toward the orientals, would he favor the repeal of the Chinese exclusion act, or is it at all likely that he would favor the restriction of Japanese immigration? These are very important questions in the minds of our American workmen.

The people of this country would like to know just where he stands on these questions, and they have a right to know; and if any of you know, you ought to come forward and tell us. And again, our immigrants who have come here from Italy, Hungary, and Poland would like to know and have a right to know what he meant by referring to them as the "lowest class" and the "meaner sort." And we want to know and have a right to know whether or not he favors the exclusion of the people who come from Hungary, Poland, and southern Italy. At any rate, the immigration bill is still in the Senate and will not be

acted upon until after the next election. At least, that is the Democratic program according to all reports. I have not heard or read of any "spectacular visit" made by the President to the other end of the Capitol in which he insisted upon its passage. I wonder why. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

England makes our flags for us now, and in the light of what has taken place during the last few years, well she might, for we have virtually acknowledged her right to dominate and control the affairs of this Government. Of course, I do not mean to insinuate that this country has shown any disposition to follow her ideas concerning the control of the Panama Canal, or her rights concerning blockades, blacklisting, right of search, and contraband of war. Oh no, we have maintained a strict neutrality between our rights and those of Great Britain. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

And while we are on this subject let us pause and listen to the following poem written by Jack Wiley, and which appeared for the first time in the American Economist:

THE LIMIT.

Shall the flag be made in England?
Kinder riles one up a bit;
Kinder starts the blood a-billin'
Just to merely think of it.
Shall the flag we call "Old Glory"
In a foreign land be made?
This is certainly the limit
Of the foul work of free trade.
Shall the flag be made in England
Far away across the deep?
Down with sentiment and feeling?
Buy your bunting where its cheap?
What care free-trade foes of country?
They've no patriotic pride.
What's the flag but so much dry goods?
Make it on the other side.
Shall the flag be made in England?
Kinder riles one up a bit;
Kinder starts the blood a-billin'
Just to merely think of it.
Work and wages they have taken.
And in idleness men lag;
Taken industry to England;
Now they want to take the flag.

[Laughter.]

That poem should be read in every public school in the land and on all public occasions, and I trust that those of you who voted for the Underwood tariff law will commit it to memory and recite it to your constituents when you start in campaigning next fall. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Now, let us think for a moment of how appropriately we celebrate our national independence in these days of free-trade doctrine. In addition to our English-made flag, English bunting, English festoons, and other draperies, and our Japanese lanterns, Japanese candles, Japanese shields, and Japanese anchors, we find our boys and girls all "dolloed" up in Japanese clothing, flying Japanese kites and Japanese balloons, and firing off Japanese firecrackers and Japanese torpedoes, and sending up Japanese skyrockets and other punk-illuminating combustibles, and if you examine closely enough you will find most of our patriotic free-trade participants wearing Japanese suits, Japanese shoes, and Japanese hats, and smoking "bum" Japanese cigars. [Laughter on the Republican side.] Of course the money which went to pay for all these Japanese-made goods, wares, and other articles, which you have noticed, came from the pockets of our own workmen and went into the pockets of the Japanese laborers abroad. The money we paid for those manufactured articles went to build up great industries across the sea, to the detriment of our own people and institutions. Take a look at our Goddess of Liberty and you will find her wearing Japanese-made clothing and carrying a Japanese parasol, and it is a hundred-to-one shot that she is fanning herself with a Japanese fan. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

In order to more fittingly observe the occasion during this "watchful-waiting" period it might be well to cut out the reading of the Declaration of Independence and have some pussy-footed gentlemen on that side of the aisle read your candidate's declaration of the "New Freedom," or some one of his notes to Carranza or the Kaiser. It will not make much difference which [laughter and applause on the Republican side], for—

His notes are a fine sample, on the whole.
Of rhetoric, which the learn'd call "rigamarole."

And by all means, whatever you do, omit singing "America" and the "Star-Spangled Banner" and all hands join in singing "I Didn't Raise My Boy to Be a Soldier." [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Such a celebration of our national Independence Day may be safely sane and democratic and in line with your ideas of a lofty patriotism, but I think, seriously speaking, that it is about time for us to return to the good old days of protection, when

we wore homemade clothes, ate homemade food, used homemade flags, homemade bunting, homemade festoons, and other decorations, and flew homemade kites and homemade balloons and set off homemade firecrackers and homemade torpedoes, and recited the Declaration of Independence and patriotically sung "America" and the "Star-Spangled Banner." On such occasions our own workmen, as well as their wives and children, could fittingly celebrate the occasion and each be able to spend a little homemade money for home-grown peanuts and circus lemonade, but we will never be able to do that as long as you continue to follow out the principles you are advocating and the policies you have pursued. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

You are now laying everything that happens to the war; but when the war is over and the foreign countries settle down to their industrial pursuits, and turn their munition plants into factories for the production of such articles of commerce as are most in demand during times of peace, and our markets become flooded with their cheap products, the American people will begin to feel the effects of your un-American principles of free trade. And, lest we forget, I desire to quote from our old friend, Jack Wiley:

AFTERWARDS.

Oh, yes, the war in Europe will
Help to increase our trade,
For folks must now use lots of goods
That right at home are made.
Biz will pick up along the line;
We all know that is true.
But what's agoin' to happen

When
The
War
Gets
Through?

[Laughter on the Republican side.]

Just now there is a bully chance
To start in and produce
The same goods that they make abroad
Which are in gen'ral use.
'Twould be all right at present time;
They'd sell like hot cakes, too.
But what's agoin' to happen

When
The
War
Gets
Through?

When Europe settles down to peace
And starts to making things,
Our profits from the sale of goods
Will suddenly take wings.
Unless we have Protection—see?
We'll all go up the flue.
That's something sure to happen

When
The
War
Gets
Through.

[Laughter.]

And while you are proclaiming to the voters of this country your so-called unparalleled prosperity, why not take them into your confidence for a while and explain something of the causes of the great number of recent business failures throughout the country? And in order to set you right I will insert some tabulations from Bradstreet's record of business failures recently appearing in the American Economist:

BUSINESS FAILURES.

The claim of free traders that the country is now enjoying the greatest prosperity it has ever known is hardly borne out by the increase in business failures noted by Bradstreet's of May 27:

	Week ending—		Weeks corresponding to this week—			
	May 25, 1916.	May 18, 1916.	1915	1914	1913	1912
Middle.....	83	85	86	86	90	75
New England.....	38	27	21	28	26	21
Southern.....	88	82	83	61	36	47
Western.....	76	61	72	57	32	45
Northwestern.....	25	23	19	20	12	17
Far Western.....	38	24	40	38	22	26
Total.....	348	302	321	290	218	231

An increase of more than 50 per cent in failures for the week ending May 25, 1916, over the corresponding week in 1913, protection period, tells whether the country is now as prosperous as it was when a protective tariff was in operation.

An increase in commercial fatalities is shown in Bradstreet's record of business failures:

	Week ending—		Weeks corresponding to this week—			
	June 22, 1916.	June 15, 1916.	1915	1914	1913	1912
Middle.....	90	81	107	87	68	91
New England.....	26	23	38	26	30	24
Southern.....	71	72	92	65	58	53
Western.....	64	57	78	62	61	34
Northwestern.....	22	21	21	12	10	16
Far western.....	31	31	40	28	31	21
Total.....	304	285	376	280	260	239

The 304 failures of the third week in June, 1916, as against the 239 failures in the corresponding week of June, 1912, full protection period, do not bear out the claim of the free traders that the country is enjoying a period of "unparalleled prosperity."

Bradstreet's of June 3 reports business failures in the United States for the weeks named below as follows:

	Week ending—		Weeks corresponding to this week—			
	June 29, 1916.	June 22, 1916.	1915	1914	1913	1912
Middle.....	66	90	81	82	70	44
New England.....	21	26	27	25	18	27
Southern.....	81	71	76	43	46	38
Western.....	65	64	58	46	26	34
Northwestern.....	15	22	18	15	12	5
Far Western.....	30	31	32	33	22	22
Total.....	278	304	292	249	194	170

A wide difference will be noted between the 170 failures for the same week of 1912, protection year, and the 278 failures of the week of 1916, free-trade year.

And, following up your usual custom about election time of being all things to all men, and realizing that your Underwood law was a failure, and that the people were beginning to understand that your so-called prosperity was but temporary and owing entirely to large orders from abroad for armament and munitions of war, and that when the war was ended the business of the country would be in a chaotic condition and our market flooded with cheap goods from foreign countries, and that the revenues collected on imports and by direct tax were insufficient to meet the running expenses of the Government, you conceived the idea of passing through this House a new revenue law which might tend in some degree to appease the righteous indignation of an enraged people. The bill which you introduced and which has just passed reminds me of a story. A number of young college boys who were studying "bugology" concluded that they would play a joke on their old professor, and set about the preparation of a new specimen which they proposed to take to him for classification. So they took the legs of a spider, the antennae of a moth, the wings of a grasshopper, the thorax of a bee, the abdomen of a beetle, and the head of another insect and carefully fastened them together in such manner as to present to all appearances an insect theretofore unclassified and unknown. They took their newly created insect to the professor and laid it on his table. They sheepishly gathered around and asked him to what particular class of insects the newly discovered specimen belonged. The old man was familiar with all kinds of insects, for he had been a professor of entomology for 10, these many years. He put on his glasses, looked it over carefully, and smilingly told the boys that in his opinion it was a "humbug." [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Now, that is what is the matter with this omnibus revenue measure which you have just presented and passed. You have taken a few good ideas from the Republican Party, another from the Progressive Party, another from the Socialist Party, and have added the stinger of your own party, and have presented it to the people for classification, and if I am not much mistaken when they put on their glasses and carefully glance it over they will readily classify it as a Democratic "humbug." [Laughter.]

But your candidate for the Presidency can do one thing, and that one thing to perfection. He can talk and write notes. [Laughter on the Republican side.] With him it is notes, notes, notes, and words, words, words; in fact, he has talked so much and written so much that no one any longer pays much attention to what he writes or what he says. He has strained his vocabulary in labored attempts to coin catchy phrases and thus

popularize himself with the reading public; but, to quote, they say:

Words are like leaves; and where they most abound,
Much fruit of sense beneath is rarely found.

[Laughter on the Republican side.]

He has to all appearances given more consideration to the question of succeeding himself in office than to strengthening and upholding the fundamental principles upon which this Republic is founded. Instead of adopting a strong and firm national policy, with a determination to uphold the traditions of our forefathers, he has seen fit to follow a zigzag course of least resistance, maintaining only a partial neutrality, which has aroused the enmity of many strong nations and created the friendship of none. We are looked upon as a weak, "wishy-washy" Nation, bent on enriching ourselves at the expense of our principles, and ready to sacrifice our rights on land and sea in order to further enhance the value of American securities, and thus add to the material wealth of our public coffers. Foreign countries, each and every one of them, have come to the conclusion that our destiny is temporarily in the hands of one who is "too proud to fight," and are vying with each other in their efforts to weaken and discredit us in the eyes of all mankind. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The Sacramento Bee, one of the greatest independent newspapers in the West, and which was a strong supporter of President Wilson in the past, under the caption "A marvel of inconsistency is Woodrow Wilson," recently contained an editorial, from which I desire to quote brief excerpts:

Whenever Woodrow Wilson has conceived the idea that the sentiment of the American public is toward the punishment of Mexico he has declared himself as "feeling in a fighting mood." Whenever he has thought that sentiment has waxed and waned and that the American people want peace, practically at any price, he has become as dovish as a combination of William Jennings Bryan and Henry Ford.

Woodrow Wilson consistently, if not conscientiously, has trailed after what he believes to be the shifting waves of sentiment of the people of the United States. He is declaring now that we should not intervene in Mexico.

It is all nonsense for any of his partisan defenders to declare that Woodrow Wilson has the courage of his convictions.

He has shown in the first place that he has no convictions, and, in the second place, he has demonstrated that he lacks courage.

Woodrow Wilson is doing what he is doing to-day in direct opposition to what he did yesterday, simply and solely because he believes what he conceived to be the popular thing yesterday has become the unpopular thing to-day.

In another editorial appearing in that same paper complaining of the fact that the National Guardsmen were not well equipped, I find the following terse statement:

These facts furnish the severest condemnation of President Woodrow Wilson and force the public to believe that he is either a demagogue, playing upon the string of popular sentiment for his own benefit, or, if sincere and misled, then so hopelessly incompetent as Chief Executive as to offer a grave menace to the country in time of danger.

I noticed in the Washington Post of yesterday the following headline:

HIGH COST AT ITS APEX.

And carefully reading the article appearing thereunder, I ascertained that our esteemed friend, the genial Secretary of Commerce, who has long been known as the President's "harbinger" of prosperity, has at last discovered the apex to the high cost of living; and I am pleased to note that the apex of the situation has been located on Democratic ground. We have always known that such was the condition, but it remained for the Secretary of Commerce to come forward and admit the facts. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

"The situation reminds me," Mr. Redfield explained, "of a certain mountain range I know of. You climb gradually for a long time until finally you reach the summit. Instead of finding a descent starting immediately, you find a wide tableland, which goes along practically level for a considerable distance. But finally the descent begins."

Now, in many respects the gentleman is correct. The people of this country have been climbing uphill for three and a half years, looking for that apex [laughter on the Republican side], and it will be something of a relief for them to know that they have at last reached the summit; but it will be somewhat of a disappointment to them to learn that they will be compelled to travel for a long time across a wide tableland before their burdens will be lightened and they can hope to find relief. I am of the opinion, however, that the descent will not be reached until after the 4th of March, 1917, and then the weary and footsore travelers can come down from the high altitude of Mr. Redfield's tableland, otherwise known as "the high cost of living," and bask once more in a congenial clime of Republican plenty and prosperity. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

It is particularly interesting to some of us who have been interested for years in labor legislation and who are in a position to know something of the attitude of the President on certain labor questions which have heretofore been taken up with him person-

ally by different labor organizations to note the marked interest he is taking at this particular time in the general welfare of the laboring classes. [Laughter.] He is particularly solicitous about the child-labor law. At least he has attempted through the press to convey that impression, and were it not for the fact that he once wrote a book entitled "Constitutional Government of the United States" we might be inclined to take some stock in his sincerity; but on pages 178 and 179 of that work he is squarely on record as being opposed to the Federal regulation of child labor, and for the benefit of those of your number who are interested in that question I will quote his exact words:

Its power is "to regulate commerce between the States," and the attempts now made during every session of Congress to carry the implication of that power beyond the utmost boundaries of reasonable and honest inference show that the only limits likely to be observed by politicians are those set by the good sense and conservative temper of the country.

The proposed Federal legislation with regard to the regulation of child labor affords a striking example. If the power to regulate commerce between the States can be stretched to include the regulation of labor in the mills and factories, it can be made to embrace every particular of industrial organization and action of the country. The only limitations Congress would observe should the Supreme Court assent to such obviously absurd extravagances of interpretation would be the limitations of opinion and of circumstances.

Now, gentlemen, you will notice that he states in words the meaning of which can not be misunderstood that child labor is not a proper subject for Federal legislation. It is a pretty plain statement of his position, is it not? Perhaps some of you who are close in his confidence can tell us why he has changed his mind at this late date and apparently departed from the traditional doctrine of his party. Perhaps some of you can tell us whether or not he is also ready to change his mind with reference to the woman-suffrage question. From all accounts he is about ready to turn a complete somersault on that question. I wonder why. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

The Washington Post of this morning's issue said that two of the woman suffragists who visited the President yesterday expressed themselves as "encouraged," while another said she felt "hazy." [Laughter.] Now, gentlemen, you will try your best to put that question off until after election, but, seriously speaking, I will say to you that you might as well "face the music" and quit your dodging, for they now hold in their hands—

A weapon that comes down as still
As snowflakes fall upon the sod;
But executes a freeman's will,
As lightning does the will of God;
And from its force, nor door nor locks
Can shield you; 'tis the ballot box.

[Applause on the Republican side.]

Your candidate for the Presidency puts his actions into words, but our candidate for the Presidency puts his words into action, and when the ballot boxes are opened on the 7th day of November of this year and the votes are counted and recorded it will be found that the American people, having at last tired of hesitation and indecision, have arisen to the occasion in a manner becoming a great people and have selected for the Presidency a man with a head, a heart, and a backbone—the Hon. Charles E. Hughes, of New York.

Forever float that standard sheet!
Where breathes the foe but falls before us,
With freedom's soil beneath our feet,
And freedom's banner streaming o'er us?

[Applause on the Republican side.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Saturday I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Dixon). The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that on Saturday next he may be allowed to address the House for 30 minutes.

Mr. MANN. That is subject to all other previous orders. I doubt if there will be time.

Mr. Sisson. I have no desire to displace anybody else.

Mr. MANN. We commence a special order at 3 o'clock.

Mr. Sisson. My understanding is that there are two orders, but that all the time will not be taken up before 3 o'clock.

Mr. MANN. There may be time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Foster] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, In the campaign of 1908 the Republicans promised a revision of the tariff. They were successful in electing the President and a majority in both branches of Congress. After the inauguration of President Taft, Con-

gress met in special session and took up for consideration in the House what was known as the Payne bill. The House was permitted, under a special rule adopted by the majority, to vote upon five items out of four thousand in the bill, thus preventing a proper discussion or an opportunity to amend the bill. It went to the Senate, where a large number of amendments were made to the bill, and in nearly all cases increasing the rates of duty over those in the House bill. It was discussed and denounced vigorously in the Senate by the progressive Republicans, who believed the duties were too high and did not carry out the promise made by their party in the campaign of 1908. The bill was finally enacted into law, and bears the name of the Payne-Aldrich bill. There came a revolt throughout the entire country at the action of the Republican House and Senate against this bill. Mr. Taft, then President, apologized for many of the rates in it. It was claimed by the progressive Republicans that this act had been written in the interest of the beneficiaries of a high protective tariff.

In 1910 a Democratic House was elected, which passed several bills revising single schedules, but none of them ever became a law, President Taft vetoing those which were presented to him for his signature. In 1912 the Democrats gained the Presidency, the House and Senate promising to revise the tariff and to take out of it the special privilege. They passed a tariff law based upon revenue demand and not upon protective principles which guarantee to the manufacturer an enormous benefit and the right to lay tribute upon the consumers of this country. The Democrats believe the day of special privilege for industries is over and American manufacturers do not need this high protection. We have raw material in abundance; we have the highest inventive genius in the world, vigorous and skilled workmen, who are able to produce all manufactures in competition with all the world. We have come to a place in the commerce of the world where we are no longer limited to the home market, but sell our manufactured goods all around the globe. The day of high tariff and special privilege in this country is over. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The day of revenue tariffs will always be with us, because we must raise a certain amount of our revenue through the customhouse.

We believe in millions for necessary revenue, but not one dollar for special tribute. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Under the Democratic tariff bill the duties were reduced on woolen goods from 99 per cent to 35 per cent; window glass, from 46 per cent to 28 per cent; woolen clothing, from 79 per cent to 35 per cent; house furniture, from 35 per cent to 25 per cent; files, from 60 per cent to 25 per cent; pocketknives, from 78 per cent to 40 per cent; woolen blankets, from 73 per cent to 25 per cent; cotton underwear, from 60 per cent to 25 per cent; stockings, from 75 per cent to 50 per cent; shirts, from 64 per cent to 25 per cent; ready-made clothing, from 50 per cent to 30 per cent; chains, from 46 per cent to 26 per cent; and so on through more than a thousand articles of common everyday use—articles used by all the people and articles that should not be taxed to enrich their producers.

Republican tariff rates averaged on woollens as high as 96 per cent. The Democratic average is 40 per cent.

Woolen blankets that Republicans taxed from 71 to 105 per cent are now taxed at from 25 to 50 per cent. Woolen hats have been reduced from 86 to 35 per cent; flannels, from 86 to 113 per cent to from 25 to 35 per cent. These reductions would have given the people permanent benefits in reduced cost of living but for the European war.

The woolen tariff used to be called the keystone of the arch of protection. The key has fallen and the whole structure has tumbled down.

Democrats have always said that the tariff on farm products was a sham, and was only placed there to try to fool the farmers. Why, they used to say that a Democrat could not look a sheep in the face. Now, under the Underwood tariff the sheep go to the roadside to greet them as their friend when passing. Do you complain of free wool? No; you do not even mention it, much less talk about it.

Mr. DENISON. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, for a question.

Mr. DENISON. I want to ask my colleague if he supported the tariff on dyestuffs provided in the recent bill for revenue or protection?

Mr. FOSTER. I will say that I did support the revenue bill with the tariff on dyes; but it is entirely different from what the protectionists contend for. That bill provides that the duty shall be gradually reduced after a definite time, and, if your party had written it, it would have provided that the rates should be higher and continue indefinitely. That is the difference between your way and ours in writing a tariff bill. I

want to say to the gentleman from Illinois that his party has been in favor of a tariff commission, and yet he voted against the tariff commission in this bill, and he voted against the provision in that bill repealing the special stamp tax.

Mr. COX. And did not the gentleman vote against the duty on dyes?

Mr. FOSTER. The gentleman voted against the duty on dyes and for higher duties, and against the laying of an extra tax for preparedness on ammunition manufactures. The gentleman voted against laying an extra tax on the large incomes of the people of this country, and when the distinguished gentleman heard the speech of his colleague from Iowa [Mr. Goop], it had no effect upon him, but he followed the standpatters and voted against the progressive measure taking taxes off the backs of the poor and placing them on those who were more able to bear them.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FOSTER. I can not yield further.

The door opened to special privilege for manufactures has been closed and the door of an equal chance for the millions has been opened and it will never be closed.

The convention at which Justice Hughes was nominated in Chicago adopted a platform. What is there in it? Is there any criticism of Democratic measures? Nothing but the tariff. Special privilege again seeking to get back into power. Do they criticize the banking act, Federal Trade Commission, rural credits, or any other bill of importance? No; they dare not do so. The patriotic Members on that side voted for them.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. COX. In the platform adopted by the Republican Party at Chicago, did they not specifically declare for a tariff commission?

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, yes; they declared for a tariff commission.

Mr. COX. And on the 10th day of July was there not a bill presented on the floor of the House containing a tariff commission?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. COX. And did not 139 Republicans vote against it?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not remember the number, but all but 40 voted against it.

Mr. COX. Including the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON]?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; I think my good friend voted that way.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman now yield?

Mr. FOSTER. I yield for a question.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain to the House why the majority did not give us a chance to vote on these different issues separately instead of putting them altogether in one bill, so that we would either have to vote for or against the whole conglomerate mass?

Mr. FOSTER. We gave you a bill that took the burdens off the backs of the producers of this country. We gave you items in the bill which proposed to pay for preparedness by taxing the large incomes instead of upon the poor man's labor, and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Goop], whom I will quote again, said that when he wanted to raise money he would not go to the poorhouse but would go to the financial institutions that had it, and so we gave you an opportunity to do this in this bill, and yet the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON] complains because we did not pick out the things the he might have voted for and give him an opportunity to vote upon them. Revenue bills are not passed through this House in that way, and I am surprised that my good friend from Illinois should think or imagine for one moment that a tariff bill is made up by taking each separate item and permitting each Member to vote upon those things that he thinks ought to pass and letting those things go that he thinks ought not to pass. There was ample opportunity given to amend the bill and to strike out any item in it.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. Is it not true that there were separate bills introduced for the dyestuff proposition and the tariff-commission proposition by Members of the House?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman be good enough to explain to the House why the majority did not allow a chance to vote on these bills separately?

Mr. FOSTER. I will tell you why, because the bill was so good in its entirety that we did not believe that there was any

Progressive Republican on that side who would be able to stand before his people and tell them that he had voted against it. This was a righteous bill.

Mr. HELVERING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. HELVERING. Is it not a fact that the Republican side of the House engaged in the game of creating all of the indebtedness they could and not having the nerve and backbone to vote to take care of that indebtedness?

Mr. FOSTER. That is partly true. Some of them voted for it; most against it.

Mr. MANN. Oh, my colleague surely will not make that statement.

Mr. FOSTER. What is that?

Mr. MANN. That there is anyone on this side who has voted for preparedness who has not been willing to vote to pay for it.

Mr. FOSTER. I would make exceptions. I will not put all of them on the blacklist. No; of course not.

Mr. KELLEY. And I want to say to the gentleman that I voted for about \$200,000,000 less, and I think most of the people on the Republican side voted for about \$200,000,000 less than the entire budget will show.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I have taken some trouble to look up some of the bills that Members on that side have introduced, by which they expected to take money out of the Treasury which would go largely into their own districts, and I find that it runs all the way from \$15,000 a Member to over \$30,000,000 a Member, and I want to say that the total amount which these men wanted to take out of the Treasury amounts to over \$250,000,000. Of course I do not mean to say every Member introduced some of these bills. Some did not introduce any.

Mr. KELLEY. How much would the appropriations have amounted to if all had passed that were introduced on the Democratic side?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know; I could not give the gentleman those figures; but I do know that on the Republican side of the House if men who have tried to take money out of the Treasury, who introduced bills for their own districts, had been able to get them passed, it would have amounted to over \$250,000,000, and I dare say there is not a Member on that side of the House who will rise in his place now and say that he introduced a bill for buncombe, who will not say that he really wanted to get the money out of the Treasury that he might take it home to show to his people what he had to his credit. If there is one, I pause for a reply.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. The question is not how much the Republican Party has introduced—

Mr. FOSTER. Did the gentleman introduce any bill that he wants to apologize for?

Mr. STAFFORD. I am not apologizing. I am making an assertion.

Mr. FOSTER. But I am not yielding for that purpose. If the gentleman wants to apologize for anything, all right.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have no occasion to apologize for any of my actions.

Mr. FOSTER. I have not yielded to the gentleman except to apologize.

Mr. STAFFORD. But the gentleman has nothing for which to apologize.

Mr. FOSTER. If the gentleman is ready to do so, I will allow him to apologize to the House now for introducing bills to take money out of the Treasury that he might take it home to show to his people.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman knows full well that I have no occasion to apologize.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not yielding for that.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman knows that I have no reason to apologize.

Mr. FOSTER. I am yielding to the gentleman only to apologize, if he desires to do so.

Mr. STAFFORD. But the gentleman knows full well that I have no occasion to apologize.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois refuses to yield.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. The gentleman yielded to me.

Mr. FOSTER. No; I did not for a speech.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. FOSTER. I yielded to the gentleman for the purpose of apologizing. When the gentleman is through with his apology I will proceed. [Laughter.]

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, that is the only apology I will make.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, in Chicago, when the convention met, they did not criticize the banking act; they dared not do it. They did not criticize the Federal Trade Commission. They did not criticize the rural-credits bill, because all but 12 of their men voted for it; nor did they criticize any other bill of any importance except the tariff law.

Mr. GLASS. May I interrupt my colleague for a moment?

Mr. FOSTER. Certainly.

Mr. GLASS. The gentleman is mistaken. They did criticize the rural-credits bill, and then every one of them, except 12, on that side voted for it.

Mr. FOSTER. I said the Chicago platform did not criticize it. They did mention it, because they have gone back so far and there were so many things that they were unable to criticize in this administration that they finally said they were for a real rural-credits bill, and on that side of the House they interpreted it to mean that our bill was a real rural-credits bill, because they came back and nearly all voted for it.

Mr. FERRIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOSTER. I will.

Mr. FERRIS. The gentleman from Illinois does not expect a Republican, when a roll is called, to do what he said in Chicago at the convention?

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, no.

Mr. KELLEY. We are not like you folks; we do keep our pledges.

Mr. FOSTER. You have not done it in the past.

REDUCED REVENUES.

It was expected by the Democratic Party, with the Underwood bill, with the reduced rates, it would produce less revenue, and so announced at the time. Under the law passed October 3, 1913, it was estimated to produce \$270,000,000.

There was actually produced from customs the first year \$292,320,014, or a sum \$22,320,014 in excess of the estimates. It should be remembered also that the estimate of \$270,000,000 took into account the estimated revenues for three months under the old law and nine months under the new. It was intended and openly stated that the Underwood tariff law, in removing the duties entirely from certain necessities and reducing them upon others, would produce less revenue at the customhouse.

In 1913 the Payne law produced \$318,891,335, and the Democratic estimate for 1914, the first year of the Underwood law, was \$270,000,000, or a difference of \$48,891,335. This was the estimated deficit on customs. The Underwood law, however, was a better revenue producer than was expected by its friends. It actually produced \$292,320,014, so that the deficit from customs, instead of being \$48,891,335, as estimated, was \$26,571,321.

A deficit from customs was foreseen, and that deficit was estimated at \$48,891,335, which dwindled as the receipts came in to \$26,571,321.

The deficit was not only foreseen, but provided for. The loss in revenue from customs was to be made up by a new law creating an income tax and an amendment to the law for corporation taxes. The tax on incomes produced \$28,253,534.85, while the tax on corporations produced \$43,127,739.89, or a total of \$71,381,274, to meet an estimated deficit of \$48,891,335 and a real deficit of \$26,571,321. The income tax alone provided for the actual deficit and left an excess of nearly \$2,000,000 in the Treasury. In other words, the Underwood law was a success.

This is better shown in the bird's-eye tabulation of the Secretary of the Treasury:

Revenue from—	For year ended June 30, 1914.	For year ended June 30, 1915.
Customs.....	\$292,320,014	\$318,891,335
Corporation and income tax.....	71,381,274	35,005,299
Total.....	363,701,288	353,897,691

The Secretary of the Treasury says:

This makes an amount of revenue raised under the act of October 3, 1913, greater by \$9,803,594 than the amount collected the previous year under the preceding revenue measure.

In other words, the Underwood law was a better revenue producer than the Payne law, and no sophistry can hide or change this truth.

The war in Europe and the question of preparedness now call for increased revenue. The standpat answer to this is "Re-enact the Payne law and the revenue will be sufficient." In other words the only panacea for our ills is a protective tariff.

In the light of history this assertion is not worthy of those who assert it. In other words, no tariff ever passed has been sufficient to meet the demands of ordinary expenditure, and the reenactment of the Payne law, while it might add to the profits of certain manufacturers, would not make up the deficiencies of our revenue under the pressure of the European war and national preparedness.

It must be remembered that the tariff has always been supplemented by an internal-revenue law, and that the latter law was not changed by the Democrats until October, 1914, when the emergency revenue law was enacted. Following is the revenue collected from both these laws, as given in the Statistical Abstract of the United States, for each year from 1900 to 1915:

	Receipts from—		
	Internal revenue.	Customs or tariff.	Average ad valorem.
			Per cent.
1900.....	\$295,327,326	\$233,164,871	49.24
1901.....	207,180,393	238,585,455	49.04
1902.....	271,880,122	251,441,708	49.79
1903.....	230,310,124	284,709,581	49.03
1904.....	232,904,119	261,274,564	48.77
1905.....	234,095,740	261,798,856	45.24
1906.....	249,150,212	300,215,577	44.16
1907.....	269,666,702	332,233,382	42.55
1908.....	251,711,126	286,113,120	42.94
1909.....	246,212,643	300,711,933	43.15
PAYNE LAW.			
1910.....	289,933,519	333,683,445	41.52
1911.....	322,529,200	314,697,671	41.22
1912.....	321,612,199	311,314,672	40.12
1913.....	344,416,965	317,891,335	40.05
UNDERWOOD LAW.			
1914.....	380,041,007	292,330,014	37.60
1915.....	415,609,646	209,786,672	
1916.....	512,740,769	211,866,222	

Now, when it is considered that the total ordinary Government disbursements for 1913, the year of the Payne customs law were \$748,703,574, it becomes evident that the Payne law did not pay 50 per cent of the ordinary disbursements of that year, a normal year, and that its reenactment would not meet 50 per cent of the demands of any normal year, much more the demands of war and preparedness.

The actual disbursements for 1914 were \$762,942,758. A reenacted Payne law would have paid 41 per cent of this, and, if war demands and preparedness be considered, less than 25 per cent. In this way the arguments of the standpatter are shown to be absurd.

The Republican argument is based upon an increase of imports under the Underwood law over the Payne law amounting to \$357,000,000 and that the Payne rates applied to the increase would supply all the necessary taxes growing out of war and preparedness.

Admitting that this increase is correctly stated and that it represents an increased quantity of dutiable merchandise corresponding to the increased valuation, the argument that the Payne rates, whose equivalent ad valorem was about 41 per cent, applied to these figures would supply the necessary taxes falls to the ground.

But these figures do not show an increased quantity valuation but merely an increased price valuation. The Payne tariff rests almost entirely upon fixed rates per pound, per yard, per ton, or some other quantitative unit which has no relation to value. The protectionists have always argued against flat ad valorem rates and have based their rates to the largest extent on quantitative units. Having done this, we can not permit them now to select a flat ad valorem rate and apply it to an increase of values to the extent of \$357,000,000. It has been shown that of this so-called increase \$248,000,000 of it grows out of increases of value entirely, the quantities remaining relatively the same. It has also been shown that \$134,000,000 of increased imports were on the free list under both laws. Adding them together they more than absorb the \$357,000,000 without increasing the revenue even when jacked up by the Payne law.

What are our ordinary disbursements? They include our expenses for the maintenance of two Houses of Congress; the Library of Congress; the Botanic Garden; the Executive office; the Civil Service Commission; the Department of State, the consuls, and foreign ministers; the Treasury Department, covering the mints, the customs service, the internal-revenue depart-

ment, Bureau of Engraving and Printing, Public Health Service, Life-Saving Service, public buildings, interest on public debt; the War Department; the Navy Department; the Interior Department, covering the General Land Office, the Indian Office, the Pension Office, the Patent Office, agricultural colleges, Geological Survey; the Department of Labor; the Department of Commerce; the Judicial Department, and a large number of independent bureaus and offices. While the Post Office Department is a part of the machinery of Government, it is supposed to pay for itself, and the disbursements which follow are for the ordinary departments of Government, exclusive of the general post office.

Following are the actual disbursements of these departments for several years up to the beginning of the European war in August, 1914:

1905.....	\$593,671,513
1906.....	595,171,125
1907.....	694,956,141
1908.....	733,988,226
1909.....	798,740,637
1910.....	726,666,720
1911.....	726,424,850
1912.....	718,529,662
1913.....	748,703,574
1914.....	762,042,758

The Underwood tariff law was passed to meet ordinary expenditures based on past experience, and, as has been shown, met every expectation of its projectors. It was not passed to meet the demands of war, especially such a war as has been in progress in Europe for the last two years, nor for the demands of the trouble in Mexico. The Underwood tariff did its service admirably, but it could not be expected to produce revenues from imports which the war kept away from our ports. Every nation on earth has learned that during a period of general war no system of tariff legislation is reliable as a revenue producer. The standpatters of the United States are the only people that learn nothing from their defeats at home nor from the common experience of mankind. They eat tariff, drink tariff, think tariff, and prescribe tariff for all political ailments, just as the old-time physicians did with calomel and jalap. The tariff hydrophobia is an incurable illness, dangerous alike to the patient and the people.

TARIFF DUTIES INSUFFICIENT.

Some Republicans have freed themselves from the disease, and they are to be commended. The Member from Iowa [Mr. Goon] had the courage to say on the floor during the present month these words:

A comparison of the appropriation bills for the Army, Navy, and fortifications of this year (1916) with the years 1909-1912 (the years of the Payne law), inclusive, shows that we would have paid during each of these years, if we had engaged in preparedness then instead of now, at least \$420,000,000 a year in excess of the amount actually appropriated for such purpose.

Mr. KELLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOSTER. I will.

Mr. KELLEY. I should like to inquire of the gentleman whether or not, leaving out increases for the Army and Navy and fortifications, it is not true that the appropriations for this Congress will be \$200,000,000 more than any other Congress in the history of the country except the last one?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know what the amount is, but I will tell the gentleman this: The Government is growing and its activities are increasing, requiring a larger expenditure each year.

Mr. KELLEY. I thought perhaps the gentleman had the figures.

Mr. FOSTER. If the gentleman will take the record of the Congress he will find we passed a law providing agricultural extension or vocational education. We have passed a law which provides for good roads, which take considerable money out of the Treasury. We have also passed other laws which are in the interest of the people and which have taken money. I do not know what it all amounts to; the gentleman may be right. But many on that side voted for most of these bills.

Mr. FERRIS. However much we may have appropriated, practically every one of those bills passed by unanimous consent. Is not that true?

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, yes; at least with Republican votes.

Mr. KELLEY. Oh, no; that is not true. There is the shipping bill with \$50,000,000 to start with.

Mr. FERRIS. The appropriation bills were passed by unanimous consent, practically.

Mr. FOSTER. Probably not unanimous consent as to all, but I will say this to the gentleman, that all of them passed with Republican votes.

Mr. FERRIS. Is it not also true in the preparedness program in each and every instance that side moved to recommit with instructions to report an increase?

Mr. KELLEY. I do not think the \$50,000,000 flood-control bill passed by unanimous consent.

Mr. FOSTER. It passed by votes on both sides of the House.

Mr. FERRIS. There was not a roll call on them.

Mr. STAFFORD. Because that side would not give a roll call.

Mr. FERRIS. One-fifth of the Members could get it.

Mr. FOSTER. I will be glad to yield later if I have time. But the gentleman from Iowa says further:

Where would we have obtained the money to pay for the increased cost of preparedness? Certainly we would not have increased the tariff duties. The defeat of the Republican House in 1910 was so universally charged to excessive duties in the Payne law that in 1912 in our Republican platform we said "Some of the existing import duties are too high and should be reduced," but with the provisions of the Payne law in force to-day it is estimated that we could not hope to collect under it more than \$100,000,000 a year in excess of the annual collections under it when it was in force.

The absurdity of prescribing the Payne law for a cure of extraordinary and emergency needs has been shown to be absurd from a number of viewpoints and ought to be dismissed from all further consideration.

THE INCOME TAX.

The Republican Party in 1909, in passing the Payne law, found that it would not produce sufficient revenue and added to it a law taxing corporations. The Democratic Party, in passing the Underwood law with its numerous reductions, found themselves confronted with the same loss of revenue but to a greater degree. The Democrats amended the corporation tax to make it yield more revenue and then passed the income tax. Taxation is a serious study, and no matter how it is applied produces objectors.

The people objected to paying what they considered to be more than their fair share of taxes as expressed in a tariff law on articles of everyday consumption. The Democrats removed or reduced the taxes on consumption and transferred them to individual incomes. And why not? Students of taxation everywhere declare it to be the most equitable tax that can be conceived. I agree with these students, and am proud of my vote for the income tax. It exempts all incomes of \$3,000 and less a year, and taxes all incomes of more than \$3,000 1 per cent. Then as the income increases this 1 per cent is increased until both incomes and rates have reached a maximum. Those who are so unfortunate as not to have an income of \$3,000 a year or less are deprived of the privilege of paying this particular kind of tax. Some objection is made to the tax because only a few pay it. It is charged that less than one-half of 1 per cent of the population pay the tax. This is erroneous.

Over 2,500,000 stockholders in the 190,000 corporations reporting pay the tax besides 357,000 individuals who make returns, or nearly 3,000,000 people. Inasmuch as the family is practically the unit in this law, these figures should be multiplied by five—15,000,000 people are now taxed by an equitable tax whose possessions for many years have escaped taxation.

Mr. WM. ELZA WILLIAMS. May I interrupt my colleague just there?

Mr. FOSTER. Certainly.

Mr. WM. ELZA WILLIAMS. If my colleague will yield, I desire to call his attention in this connection to the fact that candidate Hughes, when governor of New York, on January 5, 1910, delivered a special message to the New York Legislature advising against the ratification of the income-tax amendment to the Constitution, and prevented its ratification for that entire session, and that the amendment was not ratified by the New York Legislature until after the expiration of Mr. Hughes's term of office and the election of a Democratic legislature.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; I think that is not denied by anyone.

During the year 1914 the tax yielded \$71,381,274.74, of which the individual income tax yielded but \$28,253,534.85. It was evidence that many people were dodging the payments of this tax as well as the internal-revenue tax. The Secretary of the Treasury, with his usual energy, set about to round-up the tax dodgers and nontaxpayers with most pleasing success.

For the year ending June 30, 1915, the total receipts from the personal-income tax were \$41,046,162, an increase of \$12,792,628.24, or a total for both of about \$85,000,000. The great apparent increase in the personal-income tax was due more to the fact that the returns for 1915 were for 12 months, while those of 1914 were for 10 months. The decrease in the corporation tax is ascribed to the European war and to the disturbances in Mexico. The Secretary of the Treasury still pursued his investigations of inaccurate returns and palpable evasions of the law, and on June 30, 1916, reported a total for both taxes of \$124,867,430, or an increase of nearly \$40,000,000. In the nature of things this income tax will increase rather than decrease, but the returns of 1915 and 1916 show that the framers of the

Underwood law in reducing the tariff wall made ample provision for all deficits growing out of the reduced revenues by the enactment of the present income-tax law. All these calculations, however, are based on years of normal expenditure, and the actual workings of the law justify and support the calculation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, how much time does my colleague wish?

Mr. FOSTER. I could get along with 15 minutes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my distinguished colleague may have 20 minutes more.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the time of his colleague be extended for 20 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague very kindly.

EXTRAORDINARY DEMANDS.

The European war introduced new phases of thought demanding extraordinary action. Henry E. Dunn, president of Bradstreet's Commercial Agency, in a letter to the Secretary of the Treasury on November 13, 1915, said:

Our own position as that of the leading neutral country was, of course, bound up in the general debauch. All our stock and cotton and most of our other exchanges, excepting grain markets, promptly closed. Securities of whatever kind were practically unsalable, fear of hostile action swept the sea of our ships, and a blockade of our export and import commerce resulted until British sea power was demonstrated. Our domestic financial position, fortified by the recent adoption of a real national banking system (the Federal reserve law), was strengthened by the courageous and patriotic action of our bankers working in harmony with the Federal authorities, and the arrangement for the settlement of the great balance we owed abroad was a triumph of skill and of cooperation between our public men and our business interests.

The blockade made serious inroads on our dutiable as well as other imports, thus curtailing the revenue derived from customs. In October, 1914, Congress passed an emergency internal-revenue act, which in the first six months of its existence yielded approximately \$40,000,000, and about \$80,000,000 for the year 1915.

On the heels of the European war came the disturbance in Mexico and the country-wide demand for preparedness. Provision was made by a Democratic Congress for a greater Army and Navy, for a prudent and effectual development of our military power in every line, and for the protection of the Mexican border. All these things called for an extraordinary outlay of money. The appropriations for these things exceeded the appropriation for normal years by from \$300,000,000 to \$450,000,000.

The passage of the revenue bill this month provides for all these demands, and taken with other laws already passed assure us that the revenues of the Government, ordinary and extraordinary, are on a sound, healthful, and most satisfactory basis.

On account of the extraordinary expenditures for preparedness, it became necessary to raise additional revenue, and, as said by Mr. Good, of Iowa, if the same proportion of expenditures had been made under Republican administration when they were in power, the revenue tariff would have been \$1,600,000 short; if now, the revenue of the tariff would not afford sufficient money to pay these additional expenses, so the rates on incomes have been raised and an inheritance tax has been levied. The tax upon munitions of war certainly no one ought to complain of, when we realize the enormous profits that have been made by these manufacturers in the last few years.

Mr. Good, of Iowa, said on this subject:

I have here the Wall Street Journal for February 28 and 29, 1916, the most conservative financial paper in the world. On February 29 it gives a list of 26 munition manufacturers in the United States, and those concerns state their war orders for 1916 will aggregate \$2,000,000,000, and these concerns state that their profits on their war orders for 1916 will aggregate \$1,000,000,000. And yet we are against a little tax on that kind of concerns. Where will we raise it? Oh, some one says under his breath, we will put a tax on tea and on coffee. If you tax the breakfast table of the American laboring man to pay the burden of preparedness, there will not be enough Members on this side to ask for a quorum.

He further said:

That same article on February 28 gives a statement of the Du Pont de Nemours Powder Co. for 1914-15. In 1914 the profits of the Du Pont de Nemours Powder Co., according to their own statement, was \$5,000,000. In 1915 their profits were \$57,000,000. And yet we are unwilling to lay a little tax on this kind of an institution. We have built up in the North, in the East, and in the South a very magnificent school system of the United States, and how did we do it? By putting a tax on consumption? No; we put a tax on property. That is the only way we can pay for preparedness. And, Mr. Chairman, when you analyze this bill, why did not we strike out provision after provision as it was read?

THE TARIFF COMMISSION.

A tariff commission has been provided which is expected to study the tariff question and endeavor to secure unbiased information that would be nonpartisan and accurate. Thirty-

nine Republicans and 1 Independent voted for this bill, showing again that the bills which the Democratic Congress has proposed meet with the approval of a large number of Progressives upon the other side of the House.

OUR UNEXAMPLED PROSPERITY.

Henry G. Dunn, in November of last year, said:

Industry has gained steadily through the year, an especially marked surge forward being noted as the fall advanced, resulting in many new monthly records of production and a whipping into line of laggard trades, seeming to guarantee the setting up of new records in a year beginning in hardship and gloom. Of late domestic demand, which has seemed to lag behind export trade has expanded; bank clearings, railway traffic, iron production, and wheat exports have all set up new guideposts, unfilled orders have banked up in our barometric industry, car shortages are already present, rail and ship terminals are congested with freight shipments, failure and liabilities are decreasing, commodity prices are at the highest level ever known, with a minimum of complaint as to high cost of living, optimism is well-nigh universal, and what was apparently at its inception a prospect of threatening import to the world's progress has become a stimulant such as never before witnessed to the country's productive energies.

What was thus so graphically outlined by one of the country's greatest commercial agencies in November, 1915, has gone on with increasing force through all the year 1916, until it can be truthfully said that the country is in the midst of an unexampled prosperity, cheering to all American hearts, and only dampened by the groans of the pessimists, who are glad only when all others are in pain. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Four years of Democratic administration have made the people glad, the best index possible of a party's wisdom, as well as the best pointer to its future continuation in power.

OUR EXPORT TRADE.

The monthly summary of Foreign commerce of the United States for March, 1916, shows our export trade for nine months ending March, 1914, 1915, and 1916, as follows:

1914	\$1,859,116,144
1915	1,853,659,736
1916	2,949,106,335

or a grand gain in 1916 of more than a billion dollars over the corresponding period in 1915.

Our farmers have profited largely in this tremendous gain. Comparison of exports of farmers' products for nine months ending March, 1916, with a like period in 1915 and 1914:

	1916	1915	1914
Cattle, hogs, mules, and sheep.....	\$82,275,204	\$46,444,376	\$4,042,418
Corn.....	18,227,180	25,536,514	5,341,757
Barley.....	16,437,313	16,298,901	3,284,705
Wheat.....	167,659,137	261,305,690	71,149,401
Wheat flour.....	64,505,330	69,387,298	62,922,694
Eggs.....	5,941,628	4,192,510	3,175,621
Fruits.....	30,161,498	29,926,751	27,189,495
Nuts.....	741,423	491,399	662,482
Hay.....	2,329,661	918,290	472,924
Hops.....	3,748,495	2,895,891	6,502,360
Beef.....	20,164,575	9,319,322	574,209
Bacon.....	57,727,706	31,223,218	21,078,189
Hams.....	29,241,755	17,934,653	18,426,284
Fresh pork.....	6,170,572	231,439	363,623
Total meats.....	190,205,794	137,866,833	111,975,196
Butter.....	3,212,118	1,289,295	639,395
Cheese.....	4,204,948	3,336,629	324,268
Milk.....	6,968,630	2,339,195	1,011,597
Vegetables.....	11,174,502	8,449,378	4,853,680

BANKING AND CURRENCY.

For 50 years, under Republican rule, the country existed under a banking and currency law of Republican origin which gave us an absolutely inelastic currency, first, and, second, a fictitious bank reserve. Under the old law all the revenues throughout the country were deposited in the great cities, where it was used for stock speculation.

The Hon. Carter Glass calls these the Siamese twins of disorder, and charged the Republican Party with failure to remedy the evils.

Five times between the years 1870 and 1912 the country has passed through financial panics resulting in nation-wide business catastrophes. Each of these panics came when we were in apparent business prosperity, and each of them was due—in part, if not altogether—to our defective banking and currency system. The Republicans knew this, acknowledged it, but were afraid to remedy it; at least, though long in power, they did not remedy it. The Democrats were not afraid to remedy the evil, and at once passed the Federal-reserve law, the most important piece of legislation of the last 50 years. It sounded the death knell of the money trust, and in all human probability the death knell of financial panics. It has been in operation nearly three years and has given general satisfaction.

GOOD-ROADS LAW.

Constructive legislation of the highest nature is shown by the passage of the Democratic highway bill. It will conduce to the

establishment of a more effective highway machinery in each State, strongly influence the development of good roads, stimulate large production and better marketing, promote a fuller and more attractive rural life, add greatly to the convenience and economic welfare of our people, and strengthen our national foundations. Such are the results which those best qualified to speak ascribe to this law, and with which opinion I am in strict accord.

The law appropriates \$75,000,000, in five annual payments, as follows:

First year.....	\$5,000,000
Second year.....	10,000,000
Third year.....	15,000,000
Fourth year.....	20,000,000
Fifth year.....	25,000,000

The States are expected to make available an equal amount, or its equivalent, so that the highway bill in its totality involves the expenditure of \$150,000,000 in five years.

While Republicans are criticizing the Democratic administration for keeping us out of war with Mexico, a war involving the expenditure of treasure and blood uselessly and needlessly, the Democrats have marched calmly forward to the greater questions of better highways, better banking, rural credits, and a better business understanding. The real and lasting interests of the common people have had their first inning in legislation and have won the game. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION ACT OR VOCATIONAL TRAINING.

By a unanimous vote of both Houses of Congress this Democratic measure encouraging agriculture in a practical way by appropriations became a law.

This very important law grants an appropriation the first year of \$10,000 to every State in the Union, which sum is to be increased year by year for a definite period until the Government will contribute annually about \$4,000,000 for the support of this important work. It is proposed to carry directly to the farm all the scientific discoveries and best practical developments of the Department of Agriculture and the colleges. Agriculture adds about ten billions a year of new wealth to our Nation, and the producers of such an enormous amount of wealth deserve the fostering care of the Nation. This care can be best expressed by methods prescribed in this new law. It is confidently believed that this legislation will at no distant day double the agricultural productivity of the United States, while increasing the self-respect, the thoughtfulness and the power of the farmers. It means not only getting the most out of the soil without looting it but putting into our farmers and their children the best of all the world's wisdom, vigor, and initiative.

THE TRADE COMMISSION BILL.

This law is a part of the Democratic program for the regulations of trusts. In the House 41 Republicans and 15 Progressives voted for the bill, leaving 98 Republican standpatters to vote against it. The wisdom of the bill is best attested by the number of the opposition who supported it and stands out as a signal triumph for those who have always maintained that the best examples of constructive legislation as shown historically are those originated, vouched for, and passed by the Democratic Party. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The bill carries out the principle enunciated by President Wilson: "A square deal for business, the eradication of the unsquare from business, and a real square deal for all the people." Business has handicapped itself by a lot of bad practices and programs; it has tied itself hand and foot by "unfair methods," if not by fraudulent procedure. This bill removes all the handicaps, bonds, and chains from a sound business program, and starts business ahead untrammelled, unshackled, and without a handicap. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It begins the go-ahead era of sound business life and promises much for our commerce and industry. This law is a good running mate for that other Democratic masterpiece—the Federal reserve act—and the two running either tandem or side by side will pull all our business into life, force, and profitable results. They will revolutionize business in every State and enable the total of American business to grasp opportunity by its foretop and create a larger business of profit in the greater sphere of the world. With all shackles cut out American business now has a chance to show itself the king bee in the world's mammoth business hive. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Another Democratic measure in the antitrust program was the Rayburn bill, now on the calendar, extending the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission over the issuance of railway securities.

The third measure of the program was the Clayton Antitrust Act, the whole making a symposium of legislation controlling and regulating the trust problem. The Clayton bill defines the Sherman law more clearly; strikes at the evils of interlocking directorates in corporations; prohibits price discrimination and

destructive price cutting. It also settled a controversy over the issuance of injunctions in labor disputes that had been a bone of contention for many long years. It gave to labor its magna charta.

THE RURAL-CREDITS LAW.

For a number of years the question of legislation providing for loans upon farm credits has been agitated throughout the country, but it was left for a Democratic administration to whip these ideas into practical form and to give the country a law expressing the result. In European countries such laws have been in force for many years, and Government credit has been extended to worthy farmers with the most satisfactory results. The American law is the pioneer in the country and is expected to go far toward the fullest development of our land and its resources.

THE SHIPPING BILL.

The shipping bill provided for Government ownership of ships, which will enable the products of the farms, factories, and mines to be shipped to all parts of the world at a less freight rate than now charged. Since I have been in Congress I have seen the attempt made to pass through this House a subsidy to those shipowners. The shipping bill passed the House with the aid of the votes of the Republicans who were honestly trying to serve their constituents by providing a means for carrying their products to the markets of the world. Did those who opposed this bill advance their claim for subsidies? Neither have they offered any other solution of this problem. We believe if this bill becomes a law that it will relieve this situation and that our people will have ships to transport their goods to foreign lands at less freight rates than they are now compelled to pay.

CHILD-LABOR LAW.

This Democratic House has passed the child-labor law, which protects the children of this country from being placed in factories and sweatshops at an age when they ought to be in school. This law will save the children and make them better men and women when they are grown. I can recall the investigation of the Lawrence, Mass., strike, when it was shown that these mill owners worked these little children in the factories at starvation wages, their pale faces and frail bodies showing every evidence of such treatment. This law will put an end to such conditions.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION LAW.

Many States now have a workmen's compensation law, giving fair compensation to those who are injured during their employment. This House has passed an adequate compensation act insuring the man who toils, if he becomes injured, that he will be properly cared for, or if he lose his life those dependent upon him will not be turned out upon the charity of the world. We are fast approaching a time in this country, and this Democratic administration has done much to hasten the day, when we think more of those who toil and create the wealth of the country, and not so much in trying to pass laws for the special benefit of those who may grow rich at the expense of the consumers of the country.

The Democratic Party does not oppose business, but wants to encourage it, and to build up the trade and commerce of our country throughout the world, and a legitimate business of any kind or character need not fear legislation which has been passed in the last three and one-half years; but those who seek special laws that they may lay tribute upon the toilers and producers of this country will not have a place in the Democratic program.

Our Republican friends have criticized the administration on account of the Mexican situation. They have seen fit to charge incompetency and lack of patriotism for our own country and its people. Would they have marched the Army of our country into that Republic, uselessly sacrificing our boys upon the altar of war? They had the opportunity, and yet they did not raise their voices in demanding that we should go to war during the administration of Mr. Taft, who at that time wisely kept us out of war. The President will not be changed in his determination to solve this problem in a peaceful way if possible by the barkings and howlings of these jingoes [applause on the Democratic side], who would not go to war themselves but who would be willing to sacrifice the young men of our country for their own selfish interest. [Applause on the Democratic side.] To-day we are at peace with all the world, and our people are enjoying the greatest era of prosperity known in its history. Wages are higher than they have ever been; the products of the farm, the mine, and factory are in demand and at good prices. Shall we disturb this prosperous condition of our country by placing again in power those who would enact laws for special privilege that they may reap

from the honest toil of the millions of our people that to which they are not entitled. The laws we have passed give to every citizen an equal opportunity and an equal right for life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and the right to enjoy the fruit of his own labor without paying tribute to anyone. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I can not believe the American people are again willing to put the Government in the hands of standpatters and reactionaries. But I believe the intelligence and patriotism of the American people is such that they will continue in power an administration and Congress, to see that these beneficial laws are strengthened if necessary and honestly enforced in the interest of all the people.

The Democratic Congresses from March 4, 1913, to the present hour have been Congresses of work—being in almost continual session during that period. Some of the work of these Congresses has been analyzed in these remarks, but by no means all of it, and time forbids that I should go further into details.

The President has had the support of Congress in his wise and patriotic efforts to serve the whole people of the country. During a period filled with the gravest questions of both national and international importance, he has stood four square to all the winds of criticism and reproach that have been heaped upon him. He has stood for the country's power and the country's peaceful relations with all the world. He has kept us at peace with all the world, enabling us to create and sustain a prosperity unexampled and heretofore unapproached. Peace and prosperity—twin sisters born of wisdom and patriotism—are now the country's glory, forming the greatest asset any President can give the people, and a glorious crown to his work. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. WM. ELZA WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on next Saturday, at a time when it will not interfere with preferential matters, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will suggest to the gentleman that the probabilities are that all that time will be taken up. At 3 o'clock the House takes up the presentation from North Carolina of the statue of ex-Senator Vance.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I think my colleague would hardly get in Saturday, but I have no objection if it is understood that it does not interfere with the other orders.

Mr. WM. ELZA WILLIAMS. On what day will we probably be in session next after Saturday?

Mr. MANN. Tuesday or Wednesday, probably, but I can not tell for certain. Probably not on Monday.

Mr. STAFFORD. Ask unanimous consent for the day following.

Mr. MANN. I would suggest to the gentleman that he let it go for the present.

The SPEAKER. Two hours and a half of speeches are provided for Saturday after the reading of the Journal, and so forth, and there are only three hours between 12 o'clock and 3. So it would probably cut the gentleman off right in the middle of his speech.

Mr. WM. ELZA WILLIAMS. I amend my request, Mr. Speaker, and make it the first day when in session following Saturday.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that on the first day after Saturday the House is in session, after the reading of the Journal and the clearing up of the business on the Speaker's table, not to interfere with conference reports, he shall be permitted to proceed not to exceed 30 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, I am going to ask my colleague to withdraw his request for the present until we know when we shall meet. We expect to have some ceremonies next week in connection with the unveiling of the statuary in the pediment here on the House wing of the Capitol; and I am not sure whether it will be while the House will be nominally in session or previous to the meeting of the House. Thursday or Saturday the gentleman can get his request, when that is known. There will not be any difficulty.

Mr. WM. ELZA WILLIAMS. Very well, Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw my request.

Mr. MANN. There will be no difficulty, in fact, about getting in.

Mr. WM. ELZA WILLIAMS. Thank you.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by printing a short article on the establishment of a department of aviation, with a statement of my colleague, Mr. LIEB, on the same subject.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the creation of a department of aviation. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 21 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Thursday, July 27, 1916, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on reexamination of Chicago River, Ill. (H. Doc. No. 1294); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed with illustration.

2. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting item of suggested legislation for incorporation in the general deficiency bill (H. Doc. No. 1295); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of War, recommending that appropriation for increasing storage facilities at San Antonio Arsenal, San Antonio, Tex., be made for the fiscal year 1917 instead of for 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1296); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of E. Belle Piatt, widow of Abraham Piatt, v. The United States (H. Doc. No. 1297); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Assistant Secretary of War, submitting a report of a claim against the United States, which has been adjusted and settled by the Chief of Engineers and approved by the Secretary of War (H. Doc. No. 1298); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

6. A letter from the Chief Clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Benjamin T. Blakeney and Mae Blakeney Moore, children and sole heirs of Thomas J. Blakeney, deceased, v. The United States (H. Doc. No. 1299); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

7. A letter from the Chief Clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting certified copy of order of the court dismissing the petition in the case of Margaret C. Lamms et al., heirs of Moses C. Bayles, v. The United States (H. Doc. No. 1300); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

8. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, urging that further consideration be given to the matter of making an appropriation for the removal of the wharf in connection with the quarantine station at Honolulu, Hawaii (H. Doc. No. 1301); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

9. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from Maj. Brown, general purchasing officer of the Panama Canal, written by direction of Gen. Goethals, requesting that the present limitation in the sundry civil appropriation act, approved July 1, 1916, limiting the cost of the two new Panama Canal colliers to \$1,300,000, be increased to \$1,510,000 each (H. Doc. No. 1302); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

10. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on reexamination of Chicago Harbor, Ill. (H. Doc. No. 1303); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

11. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, calling attention to an error in the Diplomatic and Consular act approved July 1, 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1304); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. CULLOP, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 16912) granting the consent of Congress to Trumbull County, Ohio, to construct a bridge across the Mahoning River in the State of Ohio, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No.

1035), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CARAWAY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 10110) to increase the salary of the United States district attorney for the district of Rhode Island, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1036), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SLAYDEN, from the Committee on the Library, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 5) for erecting a suitable memorial to John Ericsson, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1037), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CALDWELL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 6625) authorizing the Secretary of War to make certain donations of condemned cannon and cannon balls, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1038), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CRAMTON, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13570) to amend sections 5 and 6 of an act entitled "An act to authorize the drainage of certain lands in the State of Minnesota," approved May 20, 1908, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1039), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. VOLSTEAD: A bill (H. R. 17123) to authorize the Secretary of War to make certain donations of condemned cannon and cannon balls; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRAY of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 17124) to establish in the States Relations Service of the Department of Agriculture a Division of Farm Information; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GANDY: A bill (H. R. 17125) to increase the efficiency of the Medical Corps of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17126) conferring upon the tribes of Indians wholly or in part within the State of South Dakota the right to recall their agents or superintendents; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BRITT: A bill (H. R. 17127) providing for the improvement of the French Broad River in North Carolina; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. VAN DYKE: A bill (H. R. 17128) fixing the rate of pay of compositors, bookbinders, and folding and gathering machine operators in the Government Printing Office; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. JACOWAY: A bill (H. R. 17129) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Russellville, Ark., two condemned bronze cannon and suitable outfit of cannon balls; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17130) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the city of Morrillton, Ark., two condemned bronze or brass cannon, with the carriages and a suitable outfit of cannon balls; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17131) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Charleston, Ark., two bronze or brass cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17132) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Confederate Park at Charleston, Ark., four bronze or brass cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17133) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Ozark, in the county of Franklin, and State of Arkansas, two bronze or brass cannon or fieldpieces, with their carriages; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GARDNER: Resolution (H. Res. 323) requesting the Secretary of War to send to the House of Representatives certain information with regard to the number of organizations of the National Guard now on duty on the Mexican border which are not up to the prescribed war strength; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PADGETT: Resolution (H. Res. 324) providing for the consideration of H. R. 15947; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CAPSTICK: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 274) to provide service honor flags to the Volunteer soldiers now in service along the Mexican border; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. WHALEY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 275) authorizing the Secretary of War to loan, issue, or use, and to purchase quartermaster's and medical supplies for the relief of destitute persons in the districts overflowed by the Santee River and its tributaries; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ADAMSON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 276) authorizing the Secretary of War to loan, issue, or use, and to purchase quartermaster's and medical supplies for the relief of destitute persons in the districts overflowed by the Chattahoochee River and its tributaries; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOWARD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 277) authorizing the Secretary of War to loan, issue, or use, and to purchase quartermaster's and medical supplies for the relief of destitute persons in the districts overflowed by the Chattahoochee River and its tributaries; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BRITT: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 278) for relief of destitute sufferers from flood waters in the State of North Carolina; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BELL: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 279) authorizing the Secretary of War to loan, issue, or use, and to purchase quartermaster's and medical supplies for the relief of destitute persons in the districts overflowed by the Coosa River and its tributaries; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HARRISON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 280) authorizing the Secretary of War to use such means as he has or may be furnished him for the relief of distress and need among the people of Alabama and Mississippi occasioned by the recent storm; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 281) directing the Public Health Service to conduct investigations with reference to the injurious effects of the use of alcoholic liquor, opium, and other narcotic drugs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 17134) granting an increase of pension to James M. Pulver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17135) for the relief of William S. Russell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 17136) to authorize the Washington & Old Dominion Railway Co. to acquire by purchase or condemnation the land and property necessary for terminal facilities and trackage in the District of Columbia, at or near Thirty-sixth and M Streets NW.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 17137) granting an increase of pension to James W. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: A bill (H. R. 17138) granting an increase of pension to Samuel P. Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 17139) granting a pension to Capt. John H. Dorsey, Glencoe, Minn.; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GARD: A bill (H. R. 17140) for the relief of Perry E. Borchers because of losses suffered, due to destruction of property and termination of contract for services because of smallpox, while in the employ of the Navy Department in Cuba; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17141) for the relief of James H. Tucker; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HULBERT: A bill (H. R. 17142) granting an increase of pension to Mary V. Harrmann; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 17143) for the relief of James S. Huntington; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KENT: A bill (H. R. 17144) for the relief of Arthur Wendle Englert; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MATTHEWS: A bill (H. R. 17145) granting an increase of pension to Margaret I. Reider; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MEEKER: A bill (H. R. 17146) granting an increase of pension to Alois C. J. Sick; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NEELY: A bill (H. R. 17147) granting an increase of pension to Stephen Higgins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17148) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Tomlinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17149) granting a pension to Mathias Kennedy; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17150) granting a pension to Carey Nation; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17151) granting a pension to Francis A. Keelan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OVERMYER: A bill (H. R. 17152) granting an increase of pension to Michael M. Walters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17153) granting an increase of pension to Amelia C. Doty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17154) granting an increase of pension to John Nesbitt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17155) granting a pension to Margaret C. Miller; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. POWERS: A bill (H. R. 17156) granting an increase of pension to George McDaniel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICKETTS: A bill (H. R. 17157) granting a pension to Sarah H. Matheny; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17158) to correct the military record of Isaac S. Bartlett; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 17159) granting an increase of pension to George Reynolds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17160) granting an increase of pension to John C. Gooch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17161) granting an increase of pension to Madison Ross; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17162) granting an increase of pension to W. S. Bray; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 17163) granting an increase of pension to Ignatius Boff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEELE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 17164) granting an increase of pension to Lorenzo Bell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWIFT: A bill (H. R. 17165) for the relief of Alexander T. Graham; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17166) for the relief of Humphrey D. Jones; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TALBOTT: A bill (H. R. 17167) granting a pension to Annie M. Everett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17168) granting a pension to Christine Boesch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHALEY: A bill (H. R. 17169) for the relief of the legal representatives of Sylvester Jancovich; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 17170) for the relief of the legal representatives of Charles Baker, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: A bill (H. R. 17171) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Keligher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Papers to accompany House bill 16329, for the relief of Luther Sealey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COLEMAN: Petition of Tabernacle Presbyterian Church, Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring censorship of moving pictures; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of Tabernacle Presbyterian Church, Pittsburgh, Pa., against polygamy in United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Tabernacle Presbyterian Church, Pittsburgh, Pa., against mailing liquor advertisements in newspapers into dry territory; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Tabernacle Presbyterian Church, Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring prohibition in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of Tabernacle Presbyterian Church, Pittsburgh, Pa., against Sunday work; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Tabernacle Presbyterian Church, Pittsburgh, Pa., against sectarian appropriations; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, petition of Tabernacle Presbyterian Church, Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring bill to prohibit exportation of rum, etc., to Africa; to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Petition of sundry women of the United States, favoring woman-suffrage amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of National Association Union Volunteer Officers, relative to Volunteer officers' pay bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FLYNN: Petition of New York Photo-Engravers, Union No. 1, against section 7 of the Post Office appropriation bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Modern Woodmen relative to the Mexican situation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of National Society for the Promotion of Industrial Education, favoring vocational education bill—House bill 11250; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. KETTNER: Petition of H. H. Hoss, secretary chamber of commerce, Corona, Cal., favoring appropriation for ocean-to-ocean highway; to the Committee on Roads.

Also, petition of Powam Lodge, Mesa Grande, Cal., favoring House bill 11864, to aid indigent consumptives, to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of William J. Lankow, San Bernardino, Cal., and 350 others, protesting against House bills 6468 and 491, to amend postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of San Diego & Southwestern Railway Co., Read G. Dilworth, and E. S. Babcock, San Diego, Cal., favoring amendment to Post Office bill (H. R. 10484); to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of A. J. Newsom, Garden Grove, Cal., protesting against training of youths for military service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Mrs. Ray R. Shore, secretary L. A. N. A. L. C., Branch 91, and 87 others, San Diego, Cal.; Mrs. L. F. Golay, San Diego; and Mrs. Mary B. Ritter, president La Jolla Women's Club, Mesa Grande, Cal., favoring Penrose-Griffin leave-of-absence bills (H. R. 6915 and S. 3081); to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of E. W. Hardy, and three others, Santa Ana, Cal., favoring prohibition in Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. MCARTHUR: Petition of 71 citizens of Multnomah County, Oreg., favoring Christian amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of Delaware: Evidence in support of House bill 17110, for the relief of Thomas R. Henthorn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORES of Indiana: Petition of 10 surviving Volunteer commissioned officers, of Kokomo, Ind., relative to officers' pay bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OVERMYER: Petition of Tiffin Missionary Union, against polygamy in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PARKER of New York: Petition of sundry citizens of the State of New York, favoring Federal censorship of motion pictures; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. RAKER: Memorial of Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, relative to differences between railroads and employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Petitions of sundry citizens of Idaho and Oregon, against the Sunday observance bill for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Idaho, against bills to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of Department of Idaho, Grand Army of the Republic, Pocatello, favoring passage of the Volunteer officers' retirement bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Papers to accompany House bill 16442, for pension for Alice Root; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 16935, in case of Jabez Lumbert; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, July 26, 1916.

(Legislative day of Tuesday, July 25, 1916.)

The Senate reassembled at 10 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

ARMY APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 16460) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, we can not proceed right now, with so few Senators in the Chamber, and 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:

Brady	Husting	Overman	Smith, S. C.
Brandeggee	Johnson, S. Dak.	Page	Smoot
Chamberlain	Jones	Penrose	Sterling
Clapp	Kenyon	Pittman	Stone
Colt	Kern	Ransdell	Taggart
Culberson	La Follette	Reed	Thompson
Cummins	Lodge	Robinson	Townsend
Curtis	McCumber	Shafroth	Vardaman
Dillingham	Martine, N. J.	Sheppard	Wadsworth
Fletcher	Myers	Sherman	Walsh
Gallinger	Nelson	Simmons	Warren
Gronna	Norris	Smith, Ga.	Williams
Harding	O'Gorman	Smith, Md.	Works

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-two Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The bill is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President—

Mr. KERN. Will the Senator from Oregon yield to me for a moment?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. KERN. I understand that the District of Columbia appropriation bill will be ready for consideration by the time the pending measure is disposed of. I desire to give notice, as the representative of the majority, that immediately after the disposition of the District of Columbia appropriation bill I shall move to take up for consideration the House bill known as the child-labor bill, and ask that it be made the unfinished business of the Senate.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will state to the Senator that the District of Columbia appropriation bill is ready to be taken up.

Mr. KERN. I assumed that it was.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have no objection to that at all, except that the Military Academy bill, I understand, will have the right of way immediately after the Army appropriation bill. It will not take very long to dispose of it.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I will simply express my gratification at the announcement made by the leader of the majority. The minority, or a large proportion of the minority, are quite as anxious that the child-labor bill shall be considered as the Senator from Indiana or his associates on the other side of the Chamber.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, if I may be permitted—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. In connection with the observations of the Senator from New Hampshire, I hope, Mr. President, that the Senate will be gratified in like manner by an announcement from the leader on the other side in the course of a day or two, as soon as matters are adjusted, that the immigration bill will likewise be taken up and be made the unfinished business to follow the child-labor bill.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, reciprocating the observation of the Senator from Wisconsin, I join with him in the hope he has expressed.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President—

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PENROSE. Just for a moment. On an inquiry addressed to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], he positively assured the Senate that he intended to make a motion to bring up the immigration bill, and I am a little surprised that any other legislation is permitted to take precedence of the immigration bill after the positive assurance made by the Senator from South Carolina that he intended to move to bring it up. But I do not ask for any explanation at the present time. I simply want to record the status of the matter, that the Senate was assured that the Senator from South Carolina would move to bring up the immigration bill.

Mr. KERN. I will state that by the time the child-labor bill is disposed of we will make an announcement regarding the disposition of the immigration bill that I think will be entirely satisfactory to the Senator from Pennsylvania and all the other ardent friends of the immigration bill.

Mr. PENROSE. Does the leader of the majority intend to ask the Senate to act on the immigration bill prior to final adjournment?

Mr. KERN. The majority is entirely independent to act on any bill it desires to act on. It has manifested that independence all through the session I am sure, and it will continue to do so.

Mr. PENROSE. The Senator from Indiana announced his intention regarding the child-labor bill, and I did not know