

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, June 1, 1916.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

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

We seek Thee, our Father in heaven, for that inspiration which shall disclose to us the real values of life, that we may put our souls into our work and make every thought, every act count for the best interests of mankind, that we may be strengthened to bear the burdens of life and guided to a happy solution of all its difficult problems, and so honor ourselves by honoring Thee in the best use of the gifts Thou hast bestowed upon us; in His name. Amen.

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

## LEAVE TO PRINT.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print in the Record an abstract of some remarks made by the Secretary of the Treasury last night at Raleigh, N. C.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record by printing an abstract of remarks made by the Secretary of the Treasury at Raleigh, N. C., last night. Is there objection?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does this address print a full résumé of the performances of the Democratic Party during the last few years?

Mr. ADAMSON. No, sir; that could not be done in a short space.

Mr. MANN. They could not get in all the foolish things that the Democratic Party has done. I will ask the gentleman from Georgia is this abstract furnished by the Secretary, so that it is correct?

Mr. ADAMSON. Yes. It is correct. The leading thoughts are Wisdom and Prosperity.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

## QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARDNER. In its issue of yesterday, May 31, 1916, The Fatherland, a newspaper published in New York, in commenting on my course in Congress, uses the following expression:

The Hon. AUGUSTUS GARDNER, in other words, is interested in war contracts, and his loud-mouthed patriotism has a string to it.

On those words I base my question of personal privilege.

The article to which I refer is a somewhat long one, but I shall insert it in full in the Record. It relates entirely to certain former holdings of mine in the General Electric Co., a corporation which has received ammunition orders from the allies. The article charges that I was forced to admit at a certain hearing before the Committee on Rules that I owned stock in a munition company. It then misquotes the hearing, which took place on January 19, and, furthermore, it states that I did not sell the stock which I used to hold in the General Electric Co. until January 22, three days after the hearing.

The article in full is as follows:

The Hon. AUGUSTUS P. GARDNER, Member of the House from Massachusetts and son-in-law of Senator LODGE, has strangely subsidized since his memorable attack on the German-Americans and his frequent outbursts of righteous indignation at the policy of the Germans during the war. And the reason is not far to seek. GARDNER has been convicted out of his own mouth of being a patriot of the Col. Sellers stripe, who always shouted "for the old flag and a small appropriation." The Hon. AUGUSTUS GARDNER, in other words, is interested in war contracts, and his loud-mouthed patriotism has a string to it.

The unpalatable truth came out in a committee hearing, the proceedings of which have since been printed, but in such small quantities that it is difficult to secure a copy. The revelations came out in the hearing of the Committee on Rules, charged with the consideration of House resolution No. 7, "to inquire into the organization, membership, expenditures, receipts, and sources thereof of the Navy League, Labor's National Peace Council, the National Security League, and the American Defense Society."

The hearing took place on January 19. Representative TAVENNER, of Illinois, who has made two important speeches exposing the workings of the Navy League and other similar organizations, was one of the witnesses examined. Present also was Representative GARDNER, who was examined and made to admit that he owned stock in a munition company, and that his near relatives continue to be interested in the sale of munitions. On page 12 of the committee proceedings, known as "The Peace Propaganda Investigation," the facts are printed, as follows:

"Mr. TAVENNER. I believe that an investigation would reveal that the Navy League originated at 23 Wall Street, in the office of J. P. Morgan & Co.

"The CHAIRMAN. You mean to say that in your resolution you will charge that Members of Congress and Senators own stock in munition-trafficking concerns?

"Mr. TAVENNER. There was an investigation in 1914-15 by a committee of the United States Senate into lobbies, and two Members of the Senate testified under oath that they owned stock in such concerns; others that their relatives owned stock.

"The CHAIRMAN. You want to broaden this resolution?

"Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir. I want to broaden this resolution to take in everything, because I realize that nothing would be gained by the public if we investigated only the unimportant part.

"Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Are those Senators present Members of the Senate?

"Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir; they are Senators now.

"Mr. GARDNER. Did you ask what the stock was they owned?

"Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir; the stock was that of the General Electric Co. and the United States Steel Corporation. The General Electric Co. had drawn down \$2,500,000 worth of contracts from the Navy Department, receiving orders every year, and it is reported in the Standard Corporation Service Reports as having profited largely from the European war, and it is so reported in the Wall Street Journal and in Financial America. They all have it down as a war trader. I think the orders from the United States Government were received during the time Senators held stock. If not, let us ascertain when they bought the stock, how long they held it, and all about it.

"Mr. GARDNER. But the other orders?

"Mr. TAVENNER. From these various countries?

"Mr. GARDNER. Yes.

"Mr. TAVENNER. I would not be surprised if there had been some withdrawals since the European war.

"Mr. GARDNER. The General Electric Co. is in my county. I sold out my stock. [Note—Jan. 22, 1916—I am a trustee of certain trusts containing General Electric shares. My wife is a small beneficiary and my married daughter is a substantial beneficiary.]

"Mr. TAVENNER. Did you sell out your stock before the General Electric received contracts from the Navy Department?

"Mr. GARDNER. I never heard until this minute of any contracts with the Navy Department. That is the trouble; a man makes investments and he can not get into everything, but I got rid of my General Electric Co. stock when I found out that they had contracts to make munitions.

"Mr. TAVENNER. I would like to ask you what relation George Peabody Gardner is to you?

"Mr. GARDNER. He is a first cousin.

"Mr. TAVENNER. He is a director in the General Electric Co., which is a J. P. Morgan concern; is not that correct?

"Mr. GARDNER. Yes.

"Mr. TAVENNER. You have called these matters to the attention of the Committees on Naval Affairs and Military Affairs and asked them to make an inquiry?

"Mr. GARDNER. No; because I thought the proper way to do this would be by a special joint committee of Congress."

One interesting feature of the hearing is the insertion, evidently by GARDNER himself, of the statement that he disposed of his General Electric stock on January 22. The hearing was held on January 19, and his statements, taken in connection with the inserted line, indicate a strange state of mental confusion on the part of the witness. It is furthermore interesting to record that the General Electric Co. has a \$69,000,000 contract for war munitions, in which Mr. GARDNER's wife and his married daughter are "beneficiaries," the latter "substantially." Also that he holds an unnamed quantity of this stock "in trust"—for whom?

It is understood, and openly stated here, that Mr. GARDNER's father-in-law, Senator LODGE, is also a stockholder in General Electric, and that this can be substantiated by his own testimony in the lobby investigation.

These facts are regarded as throwing a glaring light on the causes operating in determining the Senator from Massachusetts and his son-in-law to become the most belligerent Members of either House in denouncing Germany and advocating measures to have the United States enter the war on the side of the allies.

Early in the winter Mr. GARDNER made his famous speech on this subject which at the time created a sensation and brought Representative COOPER to his feet. It caused him to hurl back the retort that the only fitting place for such a speech was the British House of Commons, and caused Mr. STAFFORD, of Wisconsin, to make a sharp retort, in which he said that no man with a drop of German blood in his veins could sit still without answering him in kind—which he proceeded to do in masterly fashion.

There has been comparatively little comment on the committee hearing. There is such a thing as congressional ethics, which estops Members from repeating committee-room secrets; but the cat is out, and the American people now may know what significance to attach to the patriotic outbursts of certain Members of Congress.

Now, the exact facts with regard to my investments are as follows: To the best of my recollection and belief, ever since the General Electric Co. was organized, until August 30, 1915, I have been either a stockholder or a bondholder in the concern. Its second largest plant is situated in the county in which I reside. Last summer I saw in the papers that the General Electric had received orders to make munitions of war for the allies, and on August 22 I was given definite information that war orders amounting to \$30,000,000 had been received. Even before the receipt of this definite information I had begun to dispose of my shares of General Electric in view of the fact that I had made up my mind to fight against the propaganda in favor of prohibiting the export of munitions of war. Directly after my daughter's marriage I put in trust as part of her marriage portion 325 shares of General Electric. The balance of my holdings, amounting to 300 shares, was sold through a stockbroker, the last of my interest in the General Electric Co. being disposed of on August 30, 1915. This statement accounts for the entire amount of my interest, direct or indirect, in the General Electric Co., except for 10 shares which, as a trustee, I held for the benefit of my wife, among a collection of miscellaneous securities. My wife's trust arose under an instrument executed by my wife's grandmother many years ago.

The existence of these 10 shares of General Electric Co. had escaped my memory until January 20, 1916, when, in response to my telegraphic inquiry, the day of the hearing, I was informed of the facts. I promptly secured consent from my cotrustee, and these 10 shares were sold. I have sent for my agent's accounts and have examined them carefully, and I find to the best of my knowledge and belief that none of the concerns in which I am interested financially are or have been engaged in the manufacture of munitions of war except as described above in the case of the General Electric.

Now, a word as to the origin of this libel. On January 19 the Committee on Rules held a hearing at which Mr. TAVENNER of Illinois, Mr. HENSLEY of Missouri, and I were each of us heard in behalf of our own resolutions for the investigation of the activity of certain organizations and individuals interested for and against the preparedness propaganda.

Without being questioned at all I voluntarily stated that the General Electric Co. was situated in my county, but that I had sold out the stock which I formerly held. In answer to a question by Mr. TAVENNER, I stated the fact that one of the directors of the General Electric Co. is my first cousin, Mr. George Peabody Gardner. Furthermore, Mr. TAVENNER asserted that the General Electric Co. had received over two and one-half million dollars' worth of contracts from the Navy Department, a circumstance which was entirely new to me. I could not help fearing that the imputation was to the effect that I was secretly a beneficiary of these contracts.

The matter having taken the turn which I have described, it occurred to me after the hearing that I had not mentioned the fact that I was a trustee of General Electric for the benefit of my married daughter. It also occurred to me that it was possible that my wife had an interest in the same corporation, either outright or as a beneficiary of some trust. I telegraphed to Boston and found that my wife was interested to the extent of 10 shares, as I have described. Thereupon, on January 22, when I corrected the official report of the hearing, I inserted a statement to the effect that I was trustee for some shares of General Electric of which my wife and my married daughter were beneficiaries. So that there could be no misunderstanding I wrote to Mr. TAVENNER, calling attention to my insertion.

Since that time I have been pestered with misrepresentations of the whole transaction. Evidently the story was told to Mr. William Jennings Bryan in a distorted form, for he telegraphed to me about it. Furthermore, I remember noticing an allusion to the matter in a Bridgeport, Conn., newspaper. I have also heard some rumor that student debaters were prepared to make the accusation that I was interested in munition contracts. Now comes the Fatherland article. I am forced to the conclusion that some one has been systematically misrepresenting me with malicious intent.

As to these General Electric contracts with the Navy Department, after hearing Mr. TAVENNER's statement I wrote to the Secretary of the Navy, and I found that in a period of eight years the Navy Department had paid out two and a half millions of dollars to the General Electric Co. for electrical apparatus, wiring, and so forth, on competitive bids in the ordinary course of business. Furthermore, about a half million dollars more is due, or about to become due, to the General Electric Co., of which some \$400,000 is on the contract for the electric wiring apparatus, and so forth, of the battleship *California*.

The letter of Secretary Daniels is as follows:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,  
Washington, January 29, 1916.

MY DEAR MR. GARDNER: Replying to your inquiry of January 24, 1916, relative to the total amount of money spent with the General Electric Co. by the Navy Department, payments have been made to that company during each of the fiscal years beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908, down to this date, as follows:

1908	\$263, 676. 79
1909	421, 218. 58
1910	434, 380. 20
1911	432, 107. 44
1912	347, 669. 26
1913	165, 912. 41
1914	158, 884. 38
1915	182, 008. 23
1916 to date	85, 946. 48
	2, 511, 803. 83

The above amount represents machinery, material, and supplies in the electric line manufactured by the General Electric Co. and purchased for the Naval Service. In each case covered by this statement the article called for was duly advertised according to law and the award was made to this company as the lowest satisfactory bidder under the specifications. The statement includes all purchases under formal contract paid for through the Navy disbursing office. It does not include material purchased and paid for through Navy pay offices, but such amounts are comparatively small.

The above amounts represent material already paid for. There are outstanding contracts and contract balances with the General Electric Co. amounting to \$513,019.60 for which payment has not been made.

Of this amount \$409,450 is covered by the contract for the electrical apparatus for battleship No. 10 the *California*.

Respectfully,

JOSEPHUS DANIELS,  
Secretary of the Navy.

Hon. A. P. GARDNER, M. C.,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

H. SNOWDEN MARSHALL.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the select committee appointed to investigate the charge of an alleged breach of the privileges of the House by the district attorney for the southern district of New York, Mr. H. Snowden Marshall, I ask unanimous consent that the report of that matter be taken up for consideration after the reading of the Journal on June 20, and that the debate shall proceed during not exceeding four hours, one half of the time to be given to the chairman of the committee and the other half to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. STERLING].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the H. Snowden Marshall contempt case be taken up on June 20 immediately after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of necessary business on the Speaker's table, and that the debate be confined to four hours, one half to be controlled by himself and the other half by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. STERLING]. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, I do not see my colleague [Mr. STERLING] on the floor at this time. Has the gentleman from Tennessee conferred with him in reference to this?

Mr. MOON. Yes. The committee met this morning. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. STERLING] was present, and that was the agreement we came to. All of the members of the committee were present except the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], who I am sure will have no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the chairman of the special committee why this delay about considering the report?

Mr. MOON. Well, there are two or three reasons for it. To be candid with the gentleman from Illinois, the committee have delayed up to this time because they thought it probably best that the Committee on the Judiciary, which had another matter affecting the same party, should report; but that has not been done, and we have not desired to delay any longer than was absolutely necessary. Gentlemen are going to the Republican convention and to the Democratic convention, and we would like to have the membership of the House present. We take it that until those two conventions are over we can not do very much business anyway, and we thought it best to fix this date.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the gentleman from Tennessee if he would be satisfied not to put a limitation of time on this matter? I do not think that we know yet what the issues are in that case, or what will be done. They will probably be quite simple, and can be disposed of briefly; but I really do not like a limit of time assigned on so important a matter.

Mr. GARNER. The gentleman understands that under the rules and practice of the House the committee could call it up to-day, and take an hour, and go on to a vote on the matter.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I suppose you could; but I know you would do the fair thing, and I am only asking whether it would not be better to leave it as to time until the matter develops.

Mr. MOON. The report has been on file since April 14. Probably the matter ought to have been disposed of before; but for the reason stated it has been delayed. We think that four hours is ample time for the discussion.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOON. Yes.

Mr. MANN. My recollection is that the report of the committee is a unanimous report.

Mr. MOON. A unanimous report.

Mr. MANN. Some gentlemen, I think, desire to be heard in opposition to the report.

Mr. MOON. I am sure that the gentleman from Illinois, as well as myself, will be glad to divide the time with anybody who wants to be heard in opposition.

Mr. MANN. I assume that anyone who wishes to be heard in opposition to the report, the gentleman from New Jersey or anyone else, would be entitled to a part of that time.

Mr. MOON. Surely. I think we can give you all you want.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOON. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. June 20 is the day fixed in the gentleman's request for unanimous consent?

Mr. MOON. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is not one of the days on which the Democratic convention will be in session at St. Louis? Mr. MOON. I think not.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am asking because some of us have been talking over the question of those days when the conventions are in session, the Senate having resolved to adjourn for three days at a time, and it having been suggested that the House may remain in session notwithstanding.

Mr. MOON. I understand it is regarded as certain that both conventions will be over by that date.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will permit me, it is but fair to say publicly, especially to this side of the House, that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] and myself have reached an agreement, as far as we are concerned, which I think will be observed by the House, that during next week, the week of the Republican convention, business may proceed in the House, but practically by unanimous consent. What will be done during the week of the Democratic convention I can not say. There has been no agreement reached about that yet. Of course we will do whatever the other side of the House wants to do.

Mr. KITCHIN. That is correct. The gentleman from Illinois has made a correct statement about that.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think it is fair to say that some Members on this side who may not have spoken to the gentleman from Illinois have been suggesting the propriety of having a quorum present here during the period of the conventions if the House is to remain in session, the Senate having agreed to adjourn every three days.

Mr. MANN. I hope that no gentleman on this side will ask for that. Of course if gentlemen want to be obstreperous, I know of no way to prevent it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It is not necessarily a matter of being obstreperous, it is a question of individual right. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole the other day refused to entertain a motion on the ground that he was a Member of the House and had a right to object.

Mr. MANN. Here is the situation. There probably will be a quorum in town next week, but it will be mostly on the Democratic side of the House.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. But that will be reversed during the Democratic convention.

Mr. MANN. This side of the House, in order that Republican Members may attend the convention who wish to go, wish to have some kind of an understanding. No one can prevent a Member over here from asking for a quorum, but probably it would prevent a good many Republicans going to the convention, as they desire, and would probably make it very unpleasant for those who did go. It is a concession from the other side of the House, and I think it is to our advantage to observe it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. There has been no unanimous consent request that the House shall remain in session?

Mr. MANN. There can be no unanimous request made as to that.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Very well; I have made the statement as to what some Members on this side think.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in explanation of my reserving the right to object, and also my inquiry of the chairman of the committee, I will say that I do not understand that this has anything to do with the proceedings before the Judiciary Committee of which the gentleman from Tennessee speaks. I have been studying the rights and authority of investigating committees of the House of Representatives in impeachment cases, and I find that they are clothed with the same powers and prerogatives as a trial court; in fact, in such cases, where these powers were at all questioned, the House very authoritatively and properly upheld and maintained them. I do not believe a trial court would delay action where a contempt of its orders had been committed until after the termination of the proceedings in which it was sitting; on the other hand, I claim that it is the custom of our courts to immediately take steps against those guilty of contempt. Neither would any court, in my opinion, permit the Bar Association of New York, or other pernicious influences, to delay or obstruct its action against the party guilty of that contempt, as has been done in this case. I have read the proceedings before the special committee and the statement of the party held in contempt, and the whole statement on his part was an attack on the subcommittee and myself. There was nothing said as to why he was not in contempt in the House. In fact, he reiterated a statement which was a malicious, libelous, unjustifiable statement against the subcommittee. Therefore it seems a question whether the House wants to protect itself and its dignity and standing of Members, especially those authorized unanimously by the House

to act as investigators, as Members of old did, or whether they are going to dillydally along with a crooked Federal official who has only reiterated his charges against it, that are libelous and contemptible. For my part, I have no patience with delay in matters of that sort. Of course, we know the power that is behind this fellow. I know that the administration is behind him and encourages him in it.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is not reserving his right to object. This is debate. I ask for the regular order.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Well, Mr. Speaker, I shall object to the proposition of the gentleman from Tennessee, and will state to the House now that I expect to call up this matter myself in another way.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I want to make a suggestion to the gentleman. The gentleman from Illinois is correct that courts sometimes take up contempt proceedings and dispose of them before the trial is over, but in the best-regulated courts that is not done, because they do not want it to affect the trial. This has nothing to do with the gentleman's impeachment matter. He may be guilty or not guilty, it does not affect the guilt of Mr. Marshall in this proceeding.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. That is exactly my position.

Mr. MOON. I will say that this delay has not been caused except for the reasons I have stated. Under the order made in the House the matter will come up on the motion of the chairman of the committee. I simply made the request to bring it up at the hour designated and divide the time. If the gentleman from Illinois objects, this being a question of the highest privilege, I will call it up on the 20th, and at the end of an hour I will move the previous question unless I want to withhold it for somebody to speak. I see no advantage to the gentleman in his objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered, and the order is that on the 20th of June, immediately after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of matters on the Speaker's table, the contempt case against H. Snowden Marshall will be taken up and debated for not more than four hours, one half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON] and the other half by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. STERLING].

#### NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The SPEAKER. The House automatically resolves itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House bill 15947, the naval appropriation bill, with Mr. FITZGERALD in the chair.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendments to correct the amounts of the appropriations incident to the amendments that were agreed to yesterday, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 6, line 19, strike out "\$862,000" and insert "\$882,940."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 8, line 24, strike out "\$174,600" and insert "\$184,477."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 36, line 22, after the comma after the word "men" insert the following: "And enlisted men of the Hospital Corps, \$857,405.75."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, that figure is changed by reason of the action of the committee yesterday?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Let us have the amendment again reported.

The Clerk again reported the amendment.

Mr. MANN. That should be "pay for enlisted men," should it not?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; insert the words "and pay of" before the words "enlisted men." The word "pay" is in the preceding part, but it would be better to insert it there.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be so modified.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 36, line 23, strike out "\$27,563,988.50" and insert in lieu thereof "\$28,421,394.25."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 67, line 9, strike out "\$8,848,933.85" and insert "\$9,087,823.85."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 100, line 4, strike out "\$30,707,000" and insert "\$33,896,060."

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, just at this point I wish to explain that that is on account of the increase of the 30 submarines in armor and armament. Yesterday we inserted for the hull and machinery, but overlooked the armor and armament.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I would like to ask the chairman how he arrived at that figure?

Mr. PADGETT. It is \$106,000 for each submarine.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I had in mind other figures given by the clerk of the committee, which included the armor and armament of other vessels besides submarines.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes. This is the amount given by the department.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Submarines alone?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 100, line 9, strike out "\$104,073,378" and insert "\$107,262,438."

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, yesterday morning the printed figures "\$98,859,378" were changed to one hundred and four million and odd dollars, but on account of this addition of three million and odd dollars by the preceding amendment it is necessary to change that figure.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, on page 98 of the printed bill, authorizing 20 submarines, there is a provision that 8 of the submarines shall be constructed on the Pacific coast. The Committee of the Whole House increased the total number of submarines to 50. Should that stand, I think it would be equitable to increase the number for the Pacific coast; and I move, in line 23, on page 98, to strike out the word "eight" and to substitute the word "fifteen."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 98, in line 23, by striking out the word "eight" and inserting the word "fifteen."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the bottom of page 8 add the following:

"Provided, That any person who may hereafter enlist in the Navy for the first time shall if he so elects, receive discharge therefrom without cost to himself during the month of June or December, respectively, following the completion of one year's service at sea. An honorable discharge may be granted under this provision; but when so granted, shall not entitle the holder, in case of reenlistment, to the benefits of an honorable discharge granted upon completion of an enlistment."

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] desired to offer an amendment, and I will yield to him to offer that amendment at this point, and let the amendment I have just offered be considered pending.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I will offer it as an amendment to the amendment. I think that would be entirely proper, and do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the amendment by adding the following:

"And in addition thereto, and as an inducement to the prompt recruiting of men heretofore authorized by law and of such additional force as may be authorized by this act, the sum of \$3,476,200, to be at the disposal of the Bureau of Navigation during the continuance of

the war in Europe for use as bounties for enlistment at the rate of not to exceed \$100 for each man enlisted during such period."

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, on that I reserve the point of order.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to address the committee for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent to address the committee for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can not take another Member from the floor by a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully submit that I addressed the Chair and the Chair recognized me before he did the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has no right to recognition.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. To make a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. SHERLEY. No. The gentleman from Pennsylvania can not take the gentleman from Connecticut off the floor by a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I submit I addressed the Chair and the Chair recognized me.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not recognize the gentleman. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut that he may address the committee for 10 minutes? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I have full confidence in the ability of the Chair, with his parliamentary knowledge, to rule this amendment in order.

The CHAIRMAN. That is to be determined later.

Mr. HILL. I have full confidence, too, in the chairman of this committee—in his wisdom, in his knowledge, and his conservatism—and I shall vote for every good feature of this bill. I have an equal confidence in the ranking member of the minority, and I shall vote for every proposition that he submits; and, gentlemen, I shall vote, if I have the opportunity, for every increase to this bill as it comes from the Senate. I am in favor of the largest Navy in the world. I think the chairman of the committee was mistaken in the statement that he made a day or two ago that he was making this bill for peace. I think that there is an emergency which requires consideration at this time. I have a very distinct recollection of a few years ago when I went to a meeting of the insurgents over here in the rooms which were formerly occupied by the Congressional Library, and I carried a telegram from Marcellus Hartley, of Schuyler, Hartley & Graham, which he asked me to read in the insurgent meeting.

The insurgents consisted of a majority of the Democratic side and a minority of the Republican side, and they controlled the House of Representatives and were determined to force war with Spain. I went into that meeting and read that telegram stating that there was not one pound of smokeless powder in the United States, and that it was necessary to have it in order to load small-arms cartridges, and that there was a consignment of 25 tons on the ocean which should arrive in the port of New York within three days and asking that meeting of insurgents to defer their demand upon President McKinley for intervention until that powder could be landed safely in New York Harbor and escape Spanish cruisers. I am keeping that telegram now among my papers at home as an evidence of unpreparedness in the United States.

Now, a few days ago the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] struck the weak spot of this bill, and that was the personnel. What is it—what are the present conditions? A few weeks ago I came from a bed of sickness to Washington to vote to sustain the President of the United States in his ultimatum to Germany, and when I got here I began to inquire about our condition and whether we were ready to back up the President of the United States by something more than votes. I found that of a boasted Navy of 250 or more ships that 70 of them were either on paper or on the stocks in process of construction. I found that in addition to that nearly 70 more were unmaned and unequipped, including craft of all kinds and character. I asked what was necessary in order to equip them and put them in commission ready for business if the President of the United States called upon us to do business, and I found that instead of 10,000 additional men being required to do it, 28,000 were necessary to put the ships that we have now, tied up to the docks, or anchored in midstream, back into working order ready for business.

And I made up my mind that when the time came I would try to do something to get this country prepared immediately, not three or four or five years from now, but to use what facilities we now have to maintain the honor and dignity of my country.

Now, what have we done? We passed an Army bill providing for an army of 175,000 men. We had a most eloquent speech from one gentleman opposing a Regular Army of 250,000 men, for which I voted, on the ground that it was buncombe, that the men could not be procured and that we were deceiving the American people. Well, I have been inquiring about that, gentlemen. Last winter we passed an authorization for 20,000 men to bring the Army up to the standard already provided by law and I found that the recruiting that we have had since has brought an increased army strength of 1,000 men, about, so that on the basis on which we are now recruiting it will take three years and four months to get the Army brought up to the old standard before one man is counted in the new Army bill, and if this new Army bill provides for a minimum of 200,000 men, on the basis of present recruiting it would take 41 years to get them. That is not preparation; that is criminal negligence. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Now, let me apply that thing to the Navy. According to the best authority I can get we are somewhere from 25,000 to 34,000 short of the men necessary to put our existing Navy in commission. You have a choice of leaving it where it is, wholly unprepared, or when the emergency arises of having 34,000 men, one-half of your force, wholly unprepared, undrilled, untrained.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I will if you give me some time. I can not yield unless I have more time.

It will take, on the same basis of recruiting which is now occurring in the Army, four years and four months to recruit those men whom the chairman of the committee says are necessary for present purposes in time of peace; and when he says that he refers to the manning not of the Navy as such but only to the ships in actual active service.

Now, why should we not offer additional inducements? An amendment passed this House yesterday providing for a 20 per cent bonus to build ships within a record time. That applies to \$180,000,000 worth of construction for the expediting of completion of the ships, guns, and so forth, authorized by this bill. That means \$36,000,000 under the terms of this bill, possible as a bonus for building ships and making guns and equipping them. I want to give a bonus to the man behind the gun, for he is the man whom we rely on to protect this Nation. [Applause.]

Now, the expenditure under this amendment is not compulsory. I am willing to trust the administration to use it wisely and discreetly. I believe they are just as patriotic as I am or any other Member of either side of this House. I want to authorize this bonus so that the Government, should any necessity arise at any time during the continuance of this war, can get the men and put them upon the ships and drill and train them and keep those ships cruising.

"Oh," but says somebody, "we do not need it." We do. I will tell you what I would do, gentlemen. I would immediately establish a battleship mail-delivery line if I had my way. I am tired, everlastingly tired, of picking up the morning paper and finding that the letters of business men in the United States, sent from a neutral port to a neutral port, are taken into a belligerent port and held up for three, four, and five months. [Applause.] And I would put those battleships into that service, either as mail carriers or convoys to neutral ships carrying our mails under contract with our Government. Why, we took six out of commission week before last in order to get men enough to supply crews for two newer and larger ones. I would man them and start them carrying letters from New York to Norway, Sweden, Denmark, and Holland, and if any belligerent demanded a different delivery of that mail from what we saw fit to give, and attempted to enforce that demand, I would deliver those letters out of the mouth of a 12-inch gun. I do not believe it is consistent or dignified for this great Government of ours to deliberately sit down here and say we have no power in the matter. If, as I believe, absolutely uncontested, acknowledged, international law is being violated every day, it is high time for this Nation not only to assert its rights but to maintain them at any cost.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry. I would be glad to make a few further appropriate comments on the article of Lord Cromer in the press of yesterday from which I quote as follows:

It is well that President Wilson should fully realize the fact that the meaningless and misleading phrase invented in Berlin about freedom of seas is generally regarded in this country as the destruction of naval supremacy of Great Britain.

If we emerge victoriously from the present contest, the victory will be mainly due to the British Navy. It is inconceivable that any responsible British Government would listen to or the nation be prepared to accept any proposals having for their object the diminution of the relative naval strength of this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard just a moment on the point of order.

My understanding of the amendment of the chairman of the committee is that it adds certain discretionary provisions to the last paragraph on page 8. That paragraph reads:

Expenses of recruiting for the naval service: Rent of rendezvous and expenses of maintaining the same; advertising for obtaining men and apprentice seamen; actual and necessary expenses in lieu of mileage to officers on duty with traveling recruiting parties, \$174,670.

My proposition is, Mr. Chairman, to increase the amount of that appropriation for the specific purposes named herein; in other words, instead of \$174,670 with which to obtain seamen, to add a provision providing that it shall be discretionary with the Bureau of Navigation to pay a bonus for enlistments while the war continues. It seems to me that it is strictly in accord with the purpose, the intent, and the provisions of the bill, and that it is wise legislation at this time.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I insist upon my point of order.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman what the point of order is?

Mr. PADGETT. The point of order is that it is not germane to the provisions to offer a bounty. I do not think it is legislation germane to the bill.

Mr. MANN. It is germane to the bill; there is no question about that part of it. It may be subject to the point of order that it is not germane to the amendment. I would like to make this suggestion to the gentleman from Tennessee. There are a great many provisions in this bill which are subject to a point of order under the ordinary rules of the House. The majority has brought in a rule making all of those provisions in order. In reasonable fairness the gentleman ought to be willing to let some one on the minority side offer a proposition fully germane to the bill, even if it be subject to a point of order.

Having put so many provisions in, and made them in order under a special rule, the majority ought to be fair, notwithstanding that on a thing of this sort I do not know whether the House wants it or not. I think it ought to be submitted to a vote of the committee.

Mr. PADGETT. I do not want to take any technical advantage. I have been very liberal, I think, in dealing with these matters, but the question of offering a bounty would entirely destroy our enlistments, because no man would enlist after that unless you gave him the bounty. If in time of peace you provide for a bounty, immediately it will go abroad throughout the country that there is a bounty to be had if they will hold out, and nobody would ever enlist at all, and we are having good enlistments, and I see no occasion for it. And the point of order would—

Mr. MANN. The gentleman himself has just offered an amendment subject to a point, to which no point of order was made, but it is not to increase enlistments.

Mr. PADGETT. As we have been dealing liberally, I will withdraw the point of order and let the House determine the matter.

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman pardon me for just a moment? I want to call the attention of the House to a mathematical proposition. After a careful calculation I think the proposition which the gentleman submits in shortening the enlistment from four years to three will cost the country more than if my amendment were adopted.

Mr. PADGETT. You will notice that this amendment does not give the \$160 man the benefit.

Mr. HILL. I understand the ultimate effect of it would be to cost a good deal more.

Mr. PADGETT. It does not cost anything at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL].

Mr. PADGETT. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that this bill has authorized something like a little over 19,000 men. The Navy to-day is fully enlisted and has a waiting list. It has not had any trouble to get enlistments so far.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, pardon me, does he not recognize the fact that the war conditions, where men are getting war wages, stops enlistments, and will during the continuance of the war in Europe?

Mr. PADGETT. It has not so far, and we find that for a year or more the enlistments have continued. We have a full

enlistment. In fact, day before yesterday the Secretary said to me that he was full up, and would have to stop the enlistments for a while unless this bill became a law, so that he would have an outlet for the enlistments.

And the proposition is plain that if we put on here a provision to give a bonus of \$100 for enlistments, not another man will enlist unless he gets that \$100. It would be a bad policy. It would destroy our enlistments, and all over the land the word would go, "Just wait and you will get \$100 for your enlistment." I hope the amendment will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] to the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT].

The question was taken, and the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT].

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard for a moment on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT].

I do not know that I am opposed to it, but I would like to ask the chairman of the committee where this amendment came from? It has never been brought up in committee, and, so far as I know, it has never been heard of in committee. What is its real purpose?

Mr. PADGETT. I will say to the gentleman that several days ago the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] talked to me about the amendment which he has just offered and which has been voted down. We discussed the matter of attempting to give some stimulus to enlistments. I told him that I would think over the matter very carefully and earnestly, with a view to trying to reach what I thought would be a correct solution of the matter.

The more I thought of it the more I was convinced that it would be improper to offer a bounty; and then I went up and talked with Admiral Blue and with the Secretary of the Navy. We three discussed the amendment submitted by the gentleman from Connecticut, and all of us agreed that it would in effect destroy our enlistments, and out of that suggestion Admiral Blue prepared the amendment which I have offered, giving a one-year enlistment and allowing the privilege to a man at the end of one year to be discharged honorably, but without any charge against him, and without getting any benefit. If he remains longer than a year, why he continues for the full period.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I desire information only on the proposition.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. If a man enlists, he enlists for the full period of four years; but under this provision, if it becomes a law, the man who has enlisted for the first time, after one year's service may, in the following June or December—not between those periods, but in those specific months—be discharged on his own application without paying anything?

Mr. PADGETT. He may ask for a discharge at the expiration of one year from the time of his enlistment, to be discharged the following June or December. Those two months were selected for the reason that at that time it would cause less inconvenience. The fleets in those months are less active than in any other months in the year, and it would cause less inconvenience for the changes to take place in those two months.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Now, this is not intended in any way to take the place of the departmental regulation governing discharge by purchase?

Mr. PADGETT. No, sir; it is not; nor the furlough provision that we have included in this bill.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. And under this provision the man enlisting for the first time will be given an outfit costing \$60, and 12 months after he receives that outfit he can leave the service without reimbursing the Government a penny?

Mr. PADGETT. That is it.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Does he get transportation like other men who are discharged from the service?

Mr. PADGETT. No, sir; I understand not.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Why should he not? There is nothing here to prevent it, as I read the amendment of the gentleman. I think, Mr. Chairman, under the terms of this amendment, if he enlisted at Boston and lived in the eastern part of the country and was discharged at San Francisco, he would have the transportation back to the point of enlistment.

Mr. PADGETT. I suppose he would receive transportation. I do not see anything that would prevent his receiving his transportation back to the point of enlistment. The advantage of the amendment would be that he would get the benefit, but instead of tying himself for four years the young man would

have the inducement of knowing that he would get out at the end of a year in an honorable way without any penalties; and then the department believes that if they enlist and get into the service and serve for one year, and become accustomed to it, a very large number of them will continue in the service, and that benefit is given to them in lieu of the proposal for the bounty.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Really, under the working of this amendment, if it becomes a law, would it not be possible for some men to be held 17 months before they can get their discharge under the terms of this act?

Mr. PADGETT. It would run from 1 year to 18 months. Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. That would depend, of course, upon the time a man enlisted?

Mr. PADGETT. Absolutely so. Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. So that if a man enlisted in June or the latter part of May, a year from that time he could ask to be discharged in the following month of June, and he would be in only 13 months, and the man who enlisted in January would have to serve practically 18 months before he could get out?

Mr. PADGETT. That would be the way. Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. That does not seem to me to be fair.

Mr. PADGETT. The law determines the time of his discharge, but not the time at which he shall enlist.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. How are you to help your enlistments if you give him the notice that they may wait a certain number of months and get a more favorable time to enlist?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be increased five minutes. We should have an understanding of this radical legislative proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection. Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I will say that if there should be a change of law covering enlistments in the departmental regulation, I would be in favor of it.

Mr. PADGETT. Under this provision they can get out without buying their way out.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I understand.

Mr. PADGETT. Then there is another provision in the bill, going along with it, that allows a man to be furloughed and go out of active service into the reserve, and subject to be furloughed without pay in the reserve.

Mr. STAFFORD. Where is that in the bill? I remember reading it, but I can not find it at this minute.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I do not know that I will object to or oppose this provision, but I have grave misgivings about its results.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. MCKENZIE. I simply desire to ask the chairman whether, under his amendment, a man would pass out into the reserve at the end of the year?

Mr. PADGETT. Not under this amendment. He would under another provision in the bill. If he did not choose to go out under this provision at the end of the year, later under the other provision he could go out into the reserve.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Under your amendment we would lose the man's services.

Mr. PADGETT. At the end of 1 year, or 18 months; whatever that period was.

Mr. MCKENZIE. One other question. Is it possible for a man to become an efficient seaman in one year's service?

Mr. PADGETT. For many, even most of the ratings, yes; for some of the higher ratings, no.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Is it not possible that by the adoption of your amendment we will demoralize the personnel of the Navy rather than improve it?

Mr. PADGETT. I think not. I think if a young man, when he has been in the service a year, is dissatisfied with the service to the extent that he wants to get out of it, the service is not hurt by letting him get out. Many of them when they get in there and get accustomed to it and get into the drill will go right along and continue the four years, and reenlist later.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] called my attention to a feature of this amendment that had not at first impressed me. It is only intended for the man who enlists for one year. That is, at the completion of

one year he may, at the following June or the following December, resign.

Mr. PADGETT. No; that is not an accurate statement of it. At the end of the year he can ask for his discharge, and the discharge will take place in the following June or December after the completion of his year. But at the end of the year he must make known his desire to take advantage of the relief.

Mr. BUTLER. Does the gentleman think the amendment is broad enough to cover his view or interpretation of it?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Suppose a sailor man serves two years. He can not take advantage of it then?

Mr. PADGETT. No. Then he comes under the other law.

Mr. BUTLER. I understand. Then, after he serves one year, he may, if this amendment is adopted, elect to retire from the service, but he will not receive his discharge—

Mr. PADGETT. He would get his discharge in the following June or the following December.

Mr. BUTLER. Very well. But then he will not have to serve 18 months.

Mr. PADGETT. It will depend on when he enlisted.

Mr. BUTLER. Very well. Now, there is where I am confused. If a sailor should enlist in the month of January, 1917, his term would expire in January, 1918.

Mr. PADGETT. At that time he would make known his wish to retire under this provision and would retire in the following June.

Mr. BUTLER. Yes; but he still would continue his service in the Navy?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; until the following June.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. PADGETT. I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that his time be extended five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object—

The CHAIRMAN. It is too late.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Reserving the right to object—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee has been recognized.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The Chair stated the question, and the Chair did not hear me.

The CHAIRMAN. That may be the Chair's misfortune.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I reserved the right to object to the request.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. PADGETT. When I have yielded to my colleague on the committee [Mr. BUTLER].

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The committee is occupying the time. I would like to know when the committee does get through.

Mr. BUTLER. I will forego the privilege.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] has the floor.

Mr. BUTLER. My colleague [Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania] may have the opportunity of asking the question. I only want information, and I do not want to be criticized for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee has the floor, not the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PADGETT. I have offered to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania in every way that I could.

Mr. BUTLER. I am not criticizing the gentleman from Tennessee. I was endeavoring to get some information that I thought would be useful to me in voting upon this, but the question is raised whether the Naval Affairs Committee propose to occupy all the time; therefore I will forego my privilege.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. PADGETT. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. HILL. I would like to understand this amendment. If I understand it correctly it cuts out the bounty for the second enlistment, from these men who retire—

Mr. PADGETT. What we call continuous-service pay.

Mr. HILL. The three months' bonus that is given if a man reenlists?

Mr. PADGETT. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. I think the exigencies would require that the man be paid the bonus to begin with. Now, what I want to know is

this: Does it cut out also the extra pay for the second enlistment?

Mr. PADGETT. He would not get that unless he served the four years.

Mr. HILL. Is there anything in the amendment that prevents his drawing \$5 a month extra if he reenlists?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; because he would not be counted as having enlisted for a full period. He does not get it. It says here—

But when so granted shall not entitle the holder in case of reenlistment to the benefit of an honorable discharge granted upon completion of enlistment.

Mr. HILL. Does that specifically cover anything more than the three months' extra pay for reenlistment?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; it covers all the benefits of reenlistment.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a departure from the policy persistently followed by the Military Affairs Committee in their method of enlistment for the Army. I wish to inquire whether the Secretary of the Navy and the Chief of the Bureau of Navigation and the gentleman from Tennessee considered the advisability of having these men who elect to be relieved of service within one year continue as reserves for the balance of their enlistment?

Mr. PADGETT. We have a provision in this bill taking care of that.

Mr. STAFFORD. That does not take care of this identical condition. That provision is found on page 40; that only secures a man's release at the option and discretion of the Secretary of the Navy. I can conceive of many men wishing to enlist in the Navy who will be guaranteed their release under a term of one year and be willing to be a member of the reserve force during the remaining three years. Why should we, under the provision that the gentleman submits, allow a man to be mandatorially discharged after service of one year, with full training, full equipment, transportation paid to his home, without having the Government control his activities in case of an emergency during the remainder of his original enlisted period?

Mr. PADGETT. This provision and the one in the bill takes care of both situations. This provision authorizes enlistment, and at the end of the first year of his first enlistment he may be discharged, and he is completely separated from the service if he does not want to remain in the service. Under the other provision he may during the first year, or after the first year, retire and go into the reserve and remain in the service, so that both situations are cared for.

Mr. STAFFORD. They are not cared for; why should not the Government have control of his activities after he has served one year?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Tennessee be extended three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Tennessee be extended three minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Tennessee if this request is granted, how many more amendments the committee has to offer, five days having been used for the committee and only one day remaining for the rest of the Members of the House?

Mr. PADGETT. I have only two or three amendments to offer, and that is all. I do not know whether other members of the committee may have any.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Still reserving the right to object, I would like to know how many amendments the minority of the committee has, since only the committee has offered any amendments?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. The minority has no more amendments to offer.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Tennessee, whether the other 425 Members of the House, under the rule and the agreement and the peculiar conditions prevailing, will have an opportunity to present amendments at all?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; I think so. I hope to get through in a very short time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that hereafter gentlemen can not indulge in debate under the guise of reserving the right to object to unanimous-consent requests. The Chair will enforce the rule.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does the gentleman believe that it would be a deterrent to enlistment if the amendment proposed by him

had the further provision that he should become a portion of the reserve force in case he elect to be discharged?

Mr. PADGETT. I think it would destroy the purpose of the amendment. This is to afford an opportunity for a man to get out after one year. We have a provision that if he wants to stay in, or if he wants to go into the reserve, he can go in during the first year or after the first year. This is to take care of a man who does not want to go into the reserve. It is to get trained men, believing that after they are once familiar with the service they will continue during the full period.

Mr. STAFFORD. Are not discharges and going into the reserve under the furlough feature contingent on the exercise of the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy?

Mr. PADGETT. Certainly; and it ought to be. You would not want, if the emergency should arise, to have every one of them to say, "I want to go into the reserve."

Mr. STAFFORD. I think this should have a contingent provision that they should go into the reserves.

Mr. PADGETT. I think not.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman from Tennessee permit a question?

Mr. PADGETT. Certainly.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. If I understand the purport of the gentleman's amendment, after one year a man can leave the Navy absolutely on the following June or December, irrespective of whether we are in a state of peace or war. Is that correct?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. As I read the amendment, he has an absolute right by giving notice to be released from the Navy with an honorable discharge in June or December following his year of service?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. He can be discharged whether we are at peace or at war?

Mr. PADGETT. I am going to modify my amendment by putting in "in time of peace."

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. That will correct it.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to modify my amendment, in the second line of the amendment, after the word "shall," and before the words "if he so elects," to insert the words "in time of peace," so that it will read:

*Provided, That any person who shall hereafter enlist in the Navy for the first time shall, in time of peace, if he so elects—*

*And so forth.*

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the modification as stated by the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman from Tennessee yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. As I understand it, if this amendment goes into law, a man who enlists for a four-year period can, at the end of the first year, make application for his discharge on the following June or December and get it without expense.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. If he served his country two years or three years, he can not at the end of that two or three years get his discharge except by paying for it.

Mr. PADGETT. He can do that and go into the reserve.

Mr. CRAMTON. He will be penalized for his additional service.

Mr. PADGETT. Oh, no; it is not a penalty, but there must be some time fixed, and this is to give the young man that goes in without experience a period of a year to adjust and adapt himself to the service and if he does not like it to retire.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee, as modified.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 100, following the amendment inserted after line 9, insert the following:

"In the event the Secretary of the Navy is unable to secure from the shipbuilders contracts for the expeditious construction of the ships herein authorized at a fair and reasonable price, the sum of \$6,000,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated to enable the Secretary of the Navy to equip the navy yards at Puget Sound, Philadelphia, Norfolk, Boston, Portsmouth, Charleston, and New Orleans with suitable and necessary machinery, implements, buildings ways, and equipment for the construction of such of the ships herein authorized as may be assigned to such yard for construction."

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I wish to state to the committee that I have offered that amendment because I think it is proper, in view of the amendment which I offered yesterday morning and which was adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

It will be recalled that yesterday morning the committee adopted an amendment providing that the Secretary should have authority to pay bonuses not exceeding 20 per cent of the limit of cost of the ships for expeditious construction and for expeditious delivery of material. It occurred to me in reflecting over that that the shipbuilders, with the enormous program that we are authorizing this year, already providing for more than \$182,000,000 worth of new construction—yes, \$190,000,000 of new construction—

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Not just now; I will in a moment—that it would be proper that we should put in the hands of the Secretary the opportunity and the means of preventing a combination among the shipbuilders. For instance, we are authorizing five battle cruisers. If the shipyards that are prepared to build battle cruisers should say, "We will take one apiece and we will make our bids for a long-time period of construction at a price and then ask a bonus to come down to the ordinary period of construction," the Government might be helpless; but if we have in the hands of the Government power to say to these gentlemen, "If you do not submit to us contracts for a proper time and charge reasonable and fair prices we will equip these yards and be ourselves able and ready and prepared to build these ships," we will have a balanced proposition in the bill. You have offered the bounty for the expeditious proceeding of the private yards if they will properly avail themselves of it. If they seek to hold up the Government, the Government will have the opportunity and the power to equip itself to relieve itself from that situation.

I want to state that I did not include the Mare Island Navy Yard and the New York yard for the reason that heretofore we have made an appropriation at a former day in this session equipping the navy yard at Mare Island and also putting in the amount that was necessary to add the additional machinery at the navy yard in New York. They have already been cared for by previous appropriations and those two yards were not included.

Mr. CALDWELL. Why not put them in anyway, for fear there is not enough?

Mr. PADGETT. Oh, they have enough.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I want to ask the gentleman this question: Suppose that the situation should so develop that on the Atlantic coast the Secretary could find private yards for the construction of these vessels, but that on the Pacific coast he could not. Would he be authorized then to equip a yard on the Pacific coast, or would he have to equip all of them if he equipped one?

Mr. PADGETT. I suppose that under this amendment, under a fair and proper interpretation of it, if the private builders in the country submitted bids for expeditious delivery at a fair and reasonable price, he would be justified in accepting those bids and not exercising this discretionary power.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Will the gentleman yield further? I do not think that the gentleman quite understood the import of my question. What I want to know is whether or not the Secretary could equip one or more or all of the yards if he thought it necessary? Would he have to equip all of them or could he equip as many as he thought necessary?

Mr. PADGETT. If he did not get proper bids and he had ships enough to assign to all of the yards he would equip all of the yards under the provisions of this amendment. It is stated that he shall equip a yard with machinery, implements, building ways and equipment to construct the ships assigned to that yard for construction.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. CALDWELL. Does the gentleman not think it would be advisable to include the New York yard for the reason that it may develop from an efficiency standpoint that the department may desire to expend a part of that money for the development of that yard. The gentleman must understand that the Brooklyn Navy Yard is one where they are doing some very very important work at this time.

Mr. PADGETT. Some very very important work, and we have spent some very very large sums to equip that yard, and it is equipped, and they are building and have been building large ships there, and last January we at their request passed an emergency measure taking care of the navy yard at New York. I do not think it is necessary to include it now.

Mr. CALDWELL. For the immediate necessities now.

Mr. PADGETT. Oh, for all that is needed.



Mr. CALDWELL. As I understand it, the purpose of the \$6,000,000 appropriation proposed is to take care of something that may happen in the future.

Mr. PADGETT. To equip the yards that are not yet equipped. I think the gentleman ought not to try to gobble up what we are providing for these other yards.

Mr. CALDWELL. We do not want to gobble anything, but we want a square deal.

Mr. PADGETT. You have already had your deal, and these others have been waiting. You have been building ships in New York for years and years.

Mr. CALDWELL. We are trying to square out the points.

Mr. PADGETT. You are trying to take up something that these others get.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. NOLAN. Considering the fact that we are now entering upon the largest program that this country ever undertook, does the gentleman not think it advisable to give the opportunity to the two yards already equipped to build dreadnaughts, to build the largest ships that the Navy needs, and, therefore, to give them additional facilities in the way of additional ways, providing the Secretary is confronted with a situation which deprives him from getting satisfactory bids from private contractors, even though these other yards are equipped. I am thoroughly in sympathy with that idea, but does the gentleman not think we ought to give the Secretary of the Navy the right to further equip both the Brooklyn and the Mare Island Navy Yards?

Mr. PADGETT. Well, the Mare Island yard has a ship on the ways at the present time and has another one assigned there that will take it, when this one gets off the ways, a year before they could get that one off.

Mr. NOLAN. That is just what I want to bring out. What we want is to expedite the building program. The committee is considering the offering of a bonus to expedite the building program. We have at the Mare Island Navy Yard and at the New York Navy Yard a certain amount of facilities to build these large, first-class ships. Now, as you want to get this building program through, does not the gentleman think it would be in the interest of efficiency and economy if they should have the authorization to further equip those yards?

Mr. PADGETT. If the House sees fit to put in the New York and Mare Island yards with the idea of putting additional ways to carry on the building of two ships at each yard, if those names are inserted, there ought to be \$1,000,000 added, and it ought to be \$7,000,000 instead of \$6,000,000.

Mr. NOLAN. I would like to see all the yards that have been enumerated here taken care of first—

Mr. GORDON. Especially San Francisco.

Mr. NOLAN. Let them be taken care of first, and in the event the Secretary, after equipping all of those yards, finds he needs additional facilities, then he ought to have the opportunity to enlarge the facilities at both the New York and Mare Island yards.

Mr. PADGETT. I think if that condition arises those two yards could be taken care of at the next Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I would ask for five additional minutes.

Mr. BUTLER. How about fixing the time?

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw that and submit another request that debate on this continue—

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, there are nine gentlemen here who have made requests for time on this amendment. How about an hour on each side?

Mr. PADGETT. That is entirely too much, is it not?

Mr. BUTLER. It would be too much for me if I had to make the speech.

Mr. PADGETT. I do not think we need that much. Say an hour, all told; the gentleman to have half an hour and I to have a half an hour.

Mr. BENNET. We will require at least 45 minutes on this side.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate upon this matter may be limited to an hour and a half, 45 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Pennsylvania—

Mr. BUTLER. No; I will not control the time. I suggest the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROBERTS] control it. I have not been successful in dividing time and will not divide any more.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. PADGETT. I am trying to secure—

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, if the minority leader does not wish to control the time, I have no objection.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask that one-half of the time be controlled by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROBERTS] and one-half by myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that all debate upon this amendment and all amendments thereto shall close in 1 hour and 30 minutes, one-half to be controlled by himself and one-half by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROBERTS]. Is there objection?

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, what opportunity will be given for offering amendments to the amendment? Does this simply apply to this amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. To the amendment and all amendments thereto.

Mr. BENNET. Any gentleman who obtains the floor can offer an amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. With the understanding that any gentleman who has the floor may offer amendments.

Mr. PADGETT. Amendments to this amendment; yes, sir; to be voted upon at the expiration of that time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. PADGETT. My request embraces the amendment and all amendments thereto. Amendments can be offered now or at the expiration of that time.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. I just desire to ask the gentleman from Tennessee one question. I want to ask the gentleman if he will not agree, instead of the words "a reasonable price," to substitute the words "at a price not to exceed the cost at Government navy yards"?

Mr. PADGETT. We could not tell what that was, and the bidder could not tell what it was when he submitted bids.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. They submit bids in the navy yards—

Mr. PADGETT. "Fair and reasonable" covers it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] is entitled to 45 minutes and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROBERTS] is entitled to 45 minutes.

Mr. PADGETT. I will ask the gentleman from Massachusetts if he will not use a part of his time now?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I had ready to offer an amendment to equip the Bremerton yard for battleship construction, but this morning the chairman of the committee [Mr. PADGETT] informed me that he would offer an amendment that he believed would care for that yard. I am certainly much obliged to the chairman for taking this attitude. The amendment that he has offered, I believe, will assure the equipment of the yard at Bremerton for battleship construction. I know the conditions on the Pacific. I know the desires of the Secretary of the Navy, and I have no doubt whatever that if the amendment that has been offered is adopted the Bremerton yard will be equipped for battleship construction. This will accomplish practically all that the amendment that I had proposed to offer would accomplish. For this reason I shall certainly support the amendment.

I appeared before the Naval Committee and urged an amendment for an appropriation sufficient to equip the Bremerton yard. At that hearing I was much surprised to find that, notwithstanding the recommendation of the Secretary of the Navy, practically all of my Democratic friends on the committee were opposed to such an amendment, and several of my Republican friends were also against it. In view of the attitude at that time, I am more than pleased at the change that has taken place, and that the chairman of the committee now offers an amendment that will give what I was asking for when I was before the committee.

For almost 14 years it has been my duty and my pleasure to work for the upbuilding of the Bremerton yard. I believe—in fact, I know—that, all things considered, it is the best yard in the country. Every session of Congress I have been before the committee asking for appropriations for the yard. It is true that the committee has given what they have always believed to be were liberal appropriations and against the action of the committee I have no complaint. But certainly their appropriations were never more than the yard merited. Outside of the legislation giving us the two dry docks, I believe that this amendment, if passed, as it certainly will be, is of greater benefit to the yard than anything that Congress has yet done for it.

Now, I want to call the attention of the committee to the condition as it exists upon the Pacific coast. It is not a question in this particular case of whether you are going to have Government construction or whether you are going to have private construction. It is a question of whether or not you are going to have any construction at all under the condition upon the Pacific coast, and it is largely the condition upon the Atlantic coast.

As I am informed, to-day upon the Pacific coast there is not a single shipyard but what has contracts for at least two years ahead. If the Government was ready at this hour to let a contract for the construction of a battleship there is not a private yard upon the Pacific coast that could commence its construction inside of two years.

What is the use of making appropriations for building battleships unless we are going to have some place to build them? If there is any necessity for a great Navy at all, it is necessary that we proceed to construct it at once, and we can not do that, at least so far as the Pacific Coast is concerned—I have not given so much attention to the situation upon the Atlantic—unless we equip the Government yards for that purpose. The Bremerton yard can be equipped to build battleships in a few months.

Now, another matter in regard to that yard upon the Pacific, the one at Mare Island has already been cared for. The one at Bremerton, as is known by everyone, is the one yard—to use the statement made by experts—is the one yard in the country that has deep water that can be approached and used at all times and under all conditions.

As to the character of the yard, I will take the time to read a few short statements from experts in regard to it.

Admiral Stanford says that the Bremerton yard is absolutely reliable and can be approached at all times and under all conditions by our largest ships without dredging or work on the channel.

The following are quotations from some of those who ought to know:

Admiral Stanford: "We have only one thoroughly reliable and excellent deep-water station, and that is Puget Sound."

Admiral Blue: "It is an ideal yard, and should be fully developed. Our largest dry dock is located there, and all buildings are new and modern."

Admiral Strauss: "An ideal yard and well protected."

Admiral Taylor: "It is a very satisfactory yard, well located, and should be developed to its fullest capacity."

Admiral Badger: "A very fine yard, and is the only yard that vessels can go into at any time of the day, excepting, of course, a dense fog."

Admiral Winslow: "If you are going to equip any of the yards for construction, this one should be so equipped. A large force of well-trained workmen there would be a great advantage in case of trouble in the Pacific. At this time it is the only place on the Pacific that our largest and deepest draft vessels could be taken into."

Surely it needs no further evidence to satisfy the Members of this House that if any yard is equipped for the construction of battleships it should be the Bremerton yard.

In addition to the authorities above quoted, as I have already stated, Secretary Daniels and Secretary Roosevelt have both said that the yard should be equipped. I feel certain, in the light of all the facts, that the Bremerton yard will be one of the first that the Secretary will proceed to equip.

Now, it does seem to me that the one yard that has every facility, the only yard upon the Pacific coast that has a dry dock that can take one of the modern vessels, ought to be equipped for construction if the Secretary of the Navy thinks it is necessary. And the Secretary, when I first came down to Washington, told me he was in doubt whether he would recommend that the Bremerton yard be equipped for battleship construction. Later on he told me that after making an examination, owing to the condition of the private yard, he thought it was necessary that the Bremerton yard be equipped at once.

And I want to take occasion now to extend to the chairman of the committee [Mr. PADGETT] my appreciation for the action he has taken in this matter. By so doing he has helped to relieve a situation that is really serious upon the Pacific, and I certainly appreciate that help.

I only want to say this much in conclusion: We hear gentlemen continually making arguments on this side and on that side about the cost. Well, I submit, that is one of the arguments that does not appeal to me very strongly when used against preparation for national defense. When it comes to this question of preparedness, I do not believe the people of this country are so much concerned as to the cost as they are to know whether or not it is for the protection of the Nation.

We have heard a great deal said about the tremendous sum of money that has been spent by England for her great navy. I wonder if there is any patriotic citizen in all that great Empire

to-day who regrets the tremendous sum of money that England has expended to construct her navy. If it had not been for that great expense, the great British Empire to-day would be crumbling. We talk about the great cost of our Navy. We spend more money in this country by millions of dollars every year for automobile tires than we do for our Navy. Talk about the great cost of the construction of a navy. Why, the cost of a single modern battle would be more than the cost of a great battleship squadron. The cost of a single year of war would keep us prepared for a century. The cost of a single modern war would be greater than to be prepared for a thousand years. When you talk about the question of cost, I want to ask you who is going to stop and ask about the cost in the day of battle? Who is going to measure in money the value of the dead and the dying? Who is going to place a value in money upon the sufferings of the widow and the orphan? What is human blood worth, anyway, measured in money? What patriotic citizen is going to weigh the dollar against the safety of the Nation? It is not a question of cost in the construction of a navy, but the sole question is, Does a great navy tend to produce peace and to protect the country? It is an insult to the patriotism and the intelligence of the American people to prate about the question of cost when the safety of the Republic is being weighed in the balance. [Applause.]

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I want to submit an amendment to this amendment and incorporate it and let it be considered at the time. At the end of the line add:

The navy yards at Puget Sound, Philadelphia, Norfolk, and Boston to be fitted to be equipped for the construction of capital ships.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. That will be satisfactory, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I think, Mr. Chairman, with that amendment in we can obviate this debate. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

Mr. SULLOWAY. May I be recognized to ask a question of the gentleman, the chairman of the committee?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. I do.

Mr. SULLOWAY. Why is the Portsmouth yard kept from that amendment? Has not the harbor the deepest water that there is?

Mr. PADGETT. Simply because the yard at Portsmouth is not equipped for battleship construction, but it would be equipped for the smaller ships, the cruisers, the torpedo boats, the submarines, and boats of that kind. The yard is not of that character. The ones that we take up are equipped for battleship construction. The conditions are such that this appropriation would make them so.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I wanted to ask the gentleman if this readiness to surrender the debate that we were so eager for a while ago is not due to an eagerness to take care of certain shipyards and not others? I should think that was so from the inquiry made by the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. SULLOWAY] as to the Portsmouth yard.

Mr. PADGETT. This is to equip yards in such a situation that they are suited and adapted for the construction of capital ships.

Mr. SLAYDEN. And also suited to the gentleman—

Mr. PADGETT. That may be true, but that has nothing to do with the question of the yards. Other yards can not be equipped for the construction of capital ships and for that reason they are not put in there.

Mr. WHALEY. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. Under this amendment would the other yards be permitted to build ships of smaller construction?

Mr. PADGETT. Certainly. That is what I stated. They could build the scout cruisers, the torpedo boats, and the auxiliary ships, and submarines. They can take care of those.

Mr. WHALEY. And the only two classes that would be taken out of them would be the battleships and the battle cruisers?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee has control of the floor.

Mr. SLAYDEN. The gentleman yielded and sat down. I wanted to ask the gentleman if I might not have four or five minutes.

Mr. PADGETT. I yield to the gentleman five minutes.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, what has happened here in the last few minutes indicates the happy conclusion of a deal. I do not mean to say that it is a deal that is going to be of any particular personal profit to the gentlemen engaged in it. I would not insinuate that, and would not believe it of the gentlemen concerned. But it shows their zeal for the interests of their respective communities, and when they united in one of these combinations and trusts, I will say to my colleague over there, they reached a conclusion that induced them to abandon an opportunity for debate which they were so eager for a few minutes ago. Then comes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY], with characteristic zeal, hurling his contempt at economy when it comes to the construction of ships of war in his district. He is frank, open, and unashamed in his disregard of economy if his district is to benefit by the extravagance. Always alert and diligent in the effort to line the pockets of his constituents, the gentleman is now smilingly content.

There is one man that is forgotten in all this thing. In the anxiety to build up a shipyard at Brooklyn, or at Mare Island, or at Portsmouth, or on Puget Sound, or some other place, the man who pays for it all has been forgotten, and, I submit, there ought to be some little consideration given to him. He digs in the ground and in the mine; he develops and creates the wealth that we have in this country, and it is his contributions to the Government that support and pay for the extravagant program that we are entering upon; and I say, sir, that in his interest this disgraceful contest between the Pacific coast and the Atlantic, between Mare Island and the eastern shipyards each year, ought to stop, and one line of conduct, and only one, should be adopted and followed, and that is to build these ships for the people who pay for them, at the least possible cost, with due regard to efficiency, and for the purposes for which they were designed. And I think, Mr. Chairman, that so far as the taxpayers are concerned they may well exclaim, and be entirely justified in it, "A plague on both your Houses." You care nothing for the man who supports the whole project. [Applause.]

I never have been able to understand the audacity of Members who year after year stand up here and ask that ships of the Navy be built at greater cost than is necessary to procure them.

If they can be built at less cost and with equal skill on the Pacific than on the Atlantic, why, in heaven's name, build them there and send them to the Atlantic when finished. If they can be built more cheaply on the Atlantic, ordinary common sense and business judgment command their construction there. Then, sir, fairness and justice to the taxpayer demand it. But why talk about justice for the taxpayer when it does not exist in this Hall built for their Representatives.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee, the chairman of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois: "After the word 'a' in line 3 of the Padgett amendment, strike out the words 'fair and reasonable price' and insert 'not to exceed cost of construction in Government navy yards.'"

The CHAIRMAN. How much time does the gentleman from Illinois desire?

Mr. PADGETT. I yield to the gentleman five minutes.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I believe the committee will understand the purpose of that amendment. The Navy Department has had some experience recently in regard to prices in the construction of battleships and the inability to secure the construction of them in private plants at a reasonable price, because the Government navy yards in their bids have bid sufficiently low to justify the Secretary of the Navy in recommending and this Congress in granting the privilege to spend \$600,000, I believe it was, for the equipment of Mare Island Navy Yard, because a ship could be constructed cheaper in the Government yard than it could be in the private yard; and instead of putting in there "a fair and reasonable price," it seems to me like this has the same effect.

No one ought to object to this, because the private shipbuilders have been claiming all the time that they build cheaper than they do in the Government yards. Therefore those who are in

favor of giving the private yards an opportunity to build should not object to a provision of this kind in the amendment.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Would not the effect of the gentleman's amendment be to put private shipyards out of business, since four of the navy yards will now be equipped to build capital ships? Would there be any competition at all?

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. There would be competition between private yards and Government yards, and the representatives of private yards before our committee have stated that they can build cheaper than the Government yards.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Would not the effect be to say to the private yards, "Build the ship at our price, or not at all"?

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Build the ship at a not greater price, or a price not to exceed the cost of construction in a Government navy yard, which it is claimed is greater than that in the private yards.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. But there would be no competition in the private shipyards if this amendment passed.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. It makes competition between the Government and the private yards.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think the passage of the gentleman's amendment would mean that the ship should be built in a Government yard or nowhere.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. It would mean the ships would all be built in a Government yard. There would still be competition between Government yards, as you see in this House the efforts of Members of Congress to get work done in their yards in preference to the yards in another part of the country. That has also been proven beyond any doubt in the construction of the Panama Canal, where one part of the organization engaged in the work on that canal has endeavored to exceed the other part of the organization engaged in the work of construction of that canal; so that by having more than one yard for the construction of these capital ships, that in itself makes competition, and in any event we would have competition. But this amendment that I am offering makes competition between the Government navy yards and the private yards as well as competition between the different Government navy yards.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I simply wanted to say about this amendment—

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment can be disposed of at the end of the debate.

Mr. PADGETT. All I wanted to say was that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN] is wholly impracticable, to provide that a private yard should not have a contract for building a ship at a price greater than a navy yard would build it. That would make it impossible. We do not know at what figure a navy yard might build it.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. I wanted to ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that the Secretary of the Navy, in recommending the equipment of the yard, did know what it would cost to build a ship in the yard, or he would not have recommended it?

Mr. PADGETT. He knew what they submitted estimates for, or what they thought they would build it for. They would get a contract for a certain amount and would be penalized if they did not do it for that. The other navy yard simply submits an estimate, and if it costs more, the Government pays more.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Has not that been the usual practice in the Government navy yards? I ask the gentleman whether or not the cost has not been greater than estimated by the representatives of that navy yard?

Mr. PADGETT. In a great many cases it has been more.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Can the gentleman name one?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; in the case of the *Louisiana*.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. How much more, or about how much?

Mr. PADGETT. In the case of the *Florida* it was a million and a half more.

Mr. BUTLER. Yes; about a million and a half more.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Was there any case where it was less?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes. There was a case at Mare Island where they built a smaller boat at something under the estimates—about \$100,000 less.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Would not the private shipyards start in handicapped by overhead charges and things of that kind, in excess of charges that would be borne by the Government?

Mr. PADGETT. They could not tell at what figure the Government would build on an estimate of so much. If it did not do it and it took \$200,000 or \$500,000 additional, it would simply mean that private yards could not do it at all.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It is an unfair and impracticable condition.

Mr. PADGETT. That is all I have to say about this amendment.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. If the gentleman will yield, then if his position is correct, the Secretary of the Navy knew nothing about the facts when he represented to us that he could build these ships more cheaply in navy yards than he could by private construction.

Mr. PADGETT. He submitted to us the fact that the yards had represented to him that they could, but there was no guaranty—

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. And, of course, they did not know anything about it.

Mr. PADGETT. There was no obligation to do it, except that they would try to meet their estimate.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. If the gentleman's position is correct, it means that after all these years of experience they know nothing about what they can do in Government navy yards in the way of the cost of construction.

Mr. PADGETT. It does not mean that at all.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. It does mean that the Government navy yards, after years of experience constructing ships, can estimate quite accurately what it will cost to construct a ship, and from information at hand the estimated cost of a Government navy yard would be a reasonable and fair price for the Government to pay a private corporation or firm.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. NOLAN: Amend the amendment by incorporating the following proviso:

"Provided, That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to provide additional facilities as provided for in the event it is found necessary at the New York and Mare Island Navy Yards."

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, I do not represent the congressional district in which the Mare Island Navy Yard is located. It is not in my district and is a considerable distance away from it; but I recognize the fact that this naval bill carries appropriations running into hundreds of millions of dollars—the largest program the Government of the United States ever adopted—a great building program. I do not want to see the navy yards that have been enumerated here deprived of the opportunity to become shipbuilding plants. I think they ought to be taken care of first, before the New York and Mare Island Navy Yards get any additional facilities; but I do not think the Secretary of the Navy should be deprived of the opportunity of putting increased facilities into both Mare Island and New York if he finds it necessary. Now, it may be that before he gets very far he will find that it will take a considerable length of time to equip these four navy yards enumerated in the Padgett amendment, whereas he could for a slight expense in comparison to the other yards provide additional ways at Mare Island and New York, and put on those ways capital ships.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. NOLAN. I will.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman think they can provide new ways quicker than they can extend existing ways? And does he not know that there are existing ways in Philadelphia and Boston that can be extended very readily?

Mr. NOLAN. I do know this, that if you want to provide the right kind of ways for the building of a dreadnaught you can not do it by extending the Philadelphia or Boston ways.

Mr. VARE. Oh, yes; you can.

Mr. NOLAN. Because they are not built strong enough to carry dreadnaughts or other capital ships.

Mr. VARE. The gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. NOLAN. I do not want to deprive Boston or Philadelphia of the opportunity of becoming first-class yards, but I want to give the authority to the Secretary of the Navy to extend the facilities at New York and Mare Island; and if you adopt the Padgett amendment as written, the Navy Department will be handicapped.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I can simplify the matter, so far as I am concerned. I am willing to accept this proviso

here, and add some more money to take care of it, if it is necessary to do it, and leave it in the discretion of the Secretary.

Mr. NOLAN. I do not want to deprive New York and Mare Island of any opportunities.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I would like to see that amendment. I want to see how it is worded.

Mr. PADGETT. It provides that the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to provide additional facilities, as provided for, in the event that it is found necessary, at the New York and Mare Island Navy Yards.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. If the amendment gives that authority after he has provided for the other yards named, I will accept it.

Mr. PADGETT. Just put that in.

Mr. NOLAN. I do not want to deprive him of the opportunity.

Mr. PADGETT. It leaves it with the Secretary. He is going to take care of the other yards. You need not have any anxiety about that.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I am not sure.

Mr. VARE. For the benefit of the gentleman from California, I should like to say that the plans for the existing shipways at the California navy yard were drawn by the department with the express purpose that they could be enlarged for the purpose of building capital ships.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. We have the best of authority for that statement.

Mr. NOLAN. I would like to see your yard equipped immediately, and every yard that is capable of building first-class ships. I do not want to deprive you of that opportunity for the benefit of Mare Island or New York.

Mr. VARE. I want you to know that the existing ways are already planned for that purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PADGETT. I ask unanimous consent that the time be extended five minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. PADGETT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TAGUE].

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I can not see in the amendment by Mr. PADGETT where any of the yards provided for are going to get any expenditure unless the private shipyards of the country do not come up to the specifications required by the Secretary of the Navy. That is one thing that I, for one, representing the district wherein lies the Boston Navy Yard, have insisted upon—that we do become equipped under this appropriation in order that we may begin the building of battleships in the navy yard. That is what the navy yard was intended for. That is what the navy yards were built for. There is not a country in the world to-day that has so many of its navy yards lying idle and going to rot as this country. Mr. Chairman, under this amendment there is no benefit to be derived by any of the Government yards unless all of the private shipbuilding companies of the country fail to come up to the specifications. I contend that it does not use the people in the different parts of the country fairly. In the district that I represent we have just completed on the ways, appropriated for two years ago, a small supply ship. On the building of this ship alone we have saved the Government over \$250,000. The building of the ways cost the Government less than \$140,000, and we have saved the Government over \$250,000 on one ship.

All we ask is that the ways in the Boston Navy Yard be extended so that we can do the work that ought to be done in large cities. Just think of it: Great cities like Boston and Philadelphia you are asking to build little boats, while in the shipyards not equipped as well as we are they are building big battleships. Our navy yards are lying practically idle. It is a shame and a disgrace to this country to see mechanics walking the streets wanting employment and being deprived of employment in the cities where the navy yards are because the yards are not properly equipped.

Mr. Chairman, I think the time has come while we are making appropriations when these yards should be equipped to build, as far as they are able, the ships of the Navy. We can build them more economically than can private enterprise. We have proven this in our yard and we want an opportunity to prove it further on larger ships. There is at least \$20,000,000 in Government property at Boston Navy Yard practically worthless to the Government unless we can utilize it. That is the condition that prevails there. We have built nothing since 1840 until last year, when we took the contract for the building of a supply ship, and this supply ship is now in the water three months ahead of the specified time called for in the contract. [Applause.]

The supply ship is within 50 per cent of completion and we have spent less than half the money appropriated in the original bill. I contend that we are entitled under this appropriation to have our yard equipped, and we will then be in a position where, when the Government needs us to build a battleship or a cruiser or whatever they desire, it can be done.

Mr. Chairman, I have presented this amendment, asking that at least one of the battle cruisers now authorized in this bill shall be built at the navy yard in Boston, Mass.

In a great appropriation bill of the size of this one I feel that I am not asking too much for the people of my district when I ask that one of these ships be built in a navy yard which for more than a century has been recognized as one of the best yards we have. I believe, in fairness to my people, that we are entitled to this consideration.

This institution, the Boston Navy Yard, has for years been neglected in the matter of building ships, without any reason being advanced by those who have been responsible for this condition.

The time has come when it must be decided to what extent our country is to use its navy yards. No other country of the world has ever been known to neglect these institutions in the manner in which the yards of this country have been neglected, and no country to-day in the world would for a moment permit a navy yard situated as this one is to remain in its present condition.

A few months ago I presented a resolution, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, asking that an appropriation be made in this bill for the equipping of the Boston Navy Yard for the building of battleships. The Secretary of the Navy, for some reason which I can not understand, has written to that committee asking that this appropriation be not included; and I, as a representative of the people of Boston, object, with all the force that I can control, to my district being neglected now, as it has been in the past, in the improvements to which this yard and my State are entitled in the many appropriations that have been made to improve the other sections of the country and in which we have not been permitted to share our equal part.

The question that comes from the people of my district is why Boston shall be overlooked in this great appropriation for the upbuilding of the Navy of our country. All navy yards of the country were established for the building and repairing of ships of the Navy. That is what they were intended for, and it is only because they have been neglected and have not been kept up to the high standard for which they were intended that to-day we find ourselves at the mercy of and competing with private interests, who are telling us what we shall pay for the building of our ships and when they shall be built.

What other country of the world can you point to that is in the same position? In the past the only work that has been done at our yard has been the minor repairs upon the ships of the Navy. This, to my mind, has been more of a detriment to the workmen of my district than it is of value, for they are deprived of the opportunity of steady employment, and it is a customary thing among them to expect at any time the message of a furlough, which comes when work has been completed.

We are told that we are unable to build our ships as cheaply as can private enterprises, and with this I take issue. In the small amount of work that we have had to do at our yard, namely, the building of a supply ship, which was launched a few days ago, we have proven that we are able, when permitted to do the work, to do our work in a manner that is not only satisfactory to our Government, but is economical to the highest degree.

This supply ship which we are now completing is being built at a figure 25 per cent less than the amounts bid by private shipbuilders, and she is now within 40 per cent of completion. She has been launched in less time than the contract required, and the splendid organization of officers and mechanics who have established such an efficient working force and have worked so earnestly and faithfully have nothing further to do, and the mechanics will be paid for their faithful service by a discharge.

Every yard in this country should be building ships at the present time, and with the building of new ships can be carried on the work of repairs, keeping intact an efficient force which will be able to do all our Government work in an economical and efficient manner.

We are entitled to this consideration and we ask it as a matter of fairness from this Congress that we be given an opportunity to develop the yard at Boston in the manner in which other yards of the country are being advanced. There can be no objection to our request, and to any objection we answer, "Give the mechanics of Boston an opportunity to show what they can do in the matter of shipbuilding, and this country will

be able to boast that they have established another branch of their many great institutions that are a credit to the Nation." I contend that there is no better way for us to prepare the men of our country in the handling of the ships of our Navy than by giving them an opportunity to work upon them.

This appropriation is the largest appropriation for the upbuilding of our Navy that has ever been made, and I am proud to be one of those who will vote for it; and gladly would I vote for a larger sum if necessary and give to us a Navy that we can be proud of. We are asking but for a small portion of it, less than \$300,000, of this great amount of \$240,000,000 to do our share in this great upbuilding. We are told that the control of prices is a most important consideration. We are also told that we are making an appropriation in the interest of the great Steel Trusts. I am not one of those who believe this to be so, and I believe that no better answer to this statement can be given them than that we intend, as far as we are able, to build ships of our own Navy in our own navy yards.

In the last Congress they wisely appropriated the sum of \$148,000 for the equipment of the Boston Navy Yard for small shipbuilding. How profitable this has been to our Government is shown when we realize that in the building of one ship it has saved the Government more money than it cost the Government to build these small ways. In the building of modern ships these ways are too small and should be enlarged, and if by the building of one small ship we can save for our Government almost 100 per cent more than the cost of the building of these ways, I believe I am safe in stating that in the extension of these ways the Government will be in a position to build their ships far more economically than ever before.

Mr. Chairman, the people of Massachusetts have always been liberal in their efforts to support improvements in any part of the country that would be for the welfare of the whole country. They have been unwilling to stint any appropriation, but have always been willing that all parts of the country should be developed. In the building up of our own section of the country they have always displayed this same liberality.

We have in Boston one of the best harbors in the country, made so by the liberal expenditure of the money of the people of the State of Massachusetts. From 1825 to 1915, a period of 90 years, the United States has expended \$12,668,000, or a total of \$143,000 per year, on the harbor of the State of Massachusetts, and in one-half of the time, from 1870 to 1915, 45 years, has expended the sum of \$15,000,000. Receipts from the customs of the port of Boston are over \$10,000,000 a year, and there was collected in the State of Massachusetts from corporation income taxes \$1,853,157.41, and from individual income taxes \$2,683,084.53, making up a total paid by the citizens of the State of Massachusetts of \$4,536,141.94 last year.

In the past few years we have expended \$9,000,000 in building docks, and to-day we are building the largest dry dock in this country. This dock will be built at an expense to the State of Massachusetts of over \$3,000,000, and the State has already agreed with the National Government that they will have the privilege of the use of the dock as against any private or commercial business.

We have built, at a great expense out of our treasury, the largest pier on the Atlantic coast, large enough to accommodate six of the largest ships afloat, and at each of these docks they have deepened the water to 40 feet to enable them to accommodate any ships that are now being constructed.

I am quoting these figures to show that Massachusetts is ever ready to do her share in protecting the commercial interests of the Nation by the building up of her harbor, and I believe that every part of the country benefits by these improvements.

The foreign commerce with the port of Boston for the year 1915 was \$290,516,803. New England manufactures one-seventh of the entire manufactured products of the Nation and the greater part of this goes out from this port to foreign countries.

I believe that the navy yard, which has not for a long time received any great improvements, should be improved in keeping with the rest of the harbor and it is the duty of the Government to do so. The Charlestown Navy Yard has been a repair yard rather than a yard for construction work, and the great amount of work that has been done in the yard has been repairs on ships sent there.

The property of the Government here is worth in the vicinity of \$20,000,000, and the location of the yard is right at the head of Boston Harbor at a point where the Mystic and Charles Rivers meet and close in a water front of almost one-half mile in the most desirable place in the harbor, which for commercial and shipping use would be invaluable.

If we are to depend on repair work entirely, it is only a question of how soon this yard will have to be closed, because any

business man can verify my statement when I say that no enterprise of this kind can exist upon repair work alone and can only be as an investment where construction work will go hand in hand with repair work. If the yard is to be continued, and it is the sentiment of the business interests of my State that it shall be, it should be equipped immediately for shipbuilding, and with this large expenditure now being made, without an additional appropriation or without any further expense to the Government, this could easily be done.

Mr. Chairman, from the earliest days of American history the men of Massachusetts have always been interested in shipping and shipbuilding, and from that day unto this it has been one of the leading ports of the Nation.

Previous to the establishment of the Charlestown Navy Yard a number of vessels had been built in the vicinity of Boston, several of which subsequently became well known. In the very earliest days of the settlement the importance of ships was recognized, and as early as 1629 we find records of six shipwrights having been sent out from London. Gov. Winthrop, who reached Boston Bay in 1630, records in 1631 the launching of the *Blessing of the Bay*, the first ship of the infant colony, and on August 9 of that year states:

The governor's bark, being of 30 tons, went to sea.

This small vessel was later converted into a cruiser against pirates and may, therefore, lay claim to the honor of having been the first American vessel of war.

The *Massachusetts* was built at Germantown, a promontory in the town of Quincy, in 1789. The frigate *Constitution*, launched in 1797, was built at Hartt's shipyard on the site now known as Constitution Wharf, and the frigate *Boston*—the second of that name—was launched from the same yard in 1799.

It was undoubtedly the work already accomplished in shipbuilding, as well as the importance of the settlement and the facilities offered by the harbor, that suggested Charlestown as a desirable location for a navy yard.

On January 25, 1797, a resolution was reported from the Naval Committee of the House recommending the establishment of a Government dockyard. There seems to have been no direct authority from Congress to purchase a site or build a dockyard; but, on February 25, 1799, an act was passed authorizing the building of six ships of war of not less than 74 guns each, and appropriating \$1,000,000 for this purpose. Hon. Benjamin Stoddard, then Secretary of the Navy, recommended the purchase of the site, which was approved by the President. The earliest record of the transaction was a letter from the Secretary of the Navy, dated June 2, 1800, to Dr. Aaron Putnam, of Charlestown—who appears to be the agent selected for negotiating the purchase—stating:

It is desirable, for the purpose of establishing a navy yard for building ships or vessels of war at or in the vicinity of Boston, to purchase, on account of the United States, from 10 to 50 acres of land, if it can be obtained on reasonable terms.

And inclosing a list of the property referred to amounting to about 47½ acres. A later letter from the Secretary to Dr. Putnam, dated August 13, 1800, states:

The President having determined that the 37½ acres of ground at Charlestown described in the plat herewith sent should be purchased for a ship and dock yard, I have the honor to request, upon satisfying yourself of the goodness of the titles, you will make the purchase, taking deeds to the United States for same, which, after having recorded, you will be pleased to send to me. \* \* \* I have already remitted you \$10,000 on this account, and will remit the residue when I am informed you want it.

In accordance with the above letter the first site of the Charlestown Yard was purchased, the original purchase amounting to about 34½ acres and the purchase price being about \$37,356. Further purchases were made, as follows: In 1817, from Isaac Hull, 5,186 square feet, for \$3,889.50; in 1862, from Oakman & Eldridge, 115,210½ square feet, for \$123,100; and in 1867, from A. Hull, 2½ perches for \$7,000. The amount purchased, with the filling in of the marshes and flats, made, in 1880, 87½ acres, and with the extension of harbor line and further filling in since that time makes the present area of the yard proper about 111 acres, of which 80 acres are land and 31 acres water.

The first commandment of the yard was Capt. (afterwards Commodore) Samuel Nicholson, who remained in office until his death, December 29, 1811. The records show but very few improvements in the yard up to this time. The commandant's house, afterwards the old museum, was built prior to 1808, the exact date not being recorded. There were also erected a brick store, marine barracks, a hospital, a powder magazine, a wharf, and a few temporary sheds.

Commodore Bainbridge was the next commandant, and he took a very active interest in the affairs of the yard and vicinity, surveying the harbor and recommending improvements, but the appropriations were very meager, the expendi-

tures for accommodations and improvements at the yard in 1811 and 1812 amounting to but \$5,742.43, although during the year 1812 13 vessels received repairs amounting to \$245,225.13. The first vessel launched at the yard was the sloop of war *Frolic*, on September 11, 1813, and the next was the *Independence*, on September 22, 1814, and from that time up to the commencement of the Civil War 21 vessels in all were launched at the yard.

Among these were several of historic fame—the *Cumberland*, which was sunk by the Confederate ironclad *Virginia—Merrimac*—in Hampton Roads in March, 1862; the *Merrimac*, the first steam frigate launched for our Navy was built at the yard in 1854-55. The history of this vessel need hardly be told to any American—how she was left at the navy yard, Norfolk, in 1861, and converted by the Confederates into an ironclad and created such havoc with our vessels until she was defeated by the little *Monitor* in 1862 and was afterwards destroyed by the Confederates.

On January 1, 1858, the keel of the historic ship *Hartford*, the flagship of Admiral Farragut, was laid, and she was launched in November of that year.

The cost of improvements at the yard up to 1859, including the cost of site and Dry Dock No. 1, which was built in 1827-1833, amounted to \$3,671,521.

During the Civil War there was great activity at the yard, and between 1861 and 1866, 39 vessels of war were built and 43 purchased vessels were equipped; the number of vessels repaired, provisioned, and so forth, is up in the hundreds. At times there were as many as 5,000 men employed. The *Monadnock*, a double-turreted monitor, launched in 1864, was the first vessel of the kind to go from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean, arriving at Mare Island in 1866, and being afterwards rebuilt and converted into the vessel now of the same name.

In 1874 the iron torpedo boat *Intrepid* was launched at the yard, and was the first vessel of that kind added to our Navy.

From 1832 to 1880, inclusive, \$10,618,716 was expended for general maintenance of the yard. This does not include the expenditures on ships built or repaired or pay of workmen employed on them. Only one vessel, a small training ship, the *Cumberland*, has been built at the yard since that time.

From 1880 until about 1900 very little was done to improve the buildings in the yard, but from 1900 on until the present time remodeling and building has been continuous.

The estimated value of the property is close to \$20,000,000. This includes only the property, building, and plant in the yard proper, and not the value of the hospital and other outlying branches of the station.

During the Civil War as high as 5,000 men were employed, although the facilities were not half what they are to-day. We find at the present time that a force of about 2,000 men is employed, not half utilizing the increased industrial facilities. The effect of this variation in the working force is bad in every way—for the employees in having irregular employment, breeding dissatisfaction and frequently causing distress to honest, hard-working men; for the Government, loss of efficiency, due to deterioration of plant and force, owing to lack of work and the dissatisfaction of employees. The history of this yard calls for some consideration for its employees. One of the means of maintaining a steady working force is by having new construction work—shipbuilding—done at the yard, and it would be to the interest of the Government to place such work at the yard instead of doing it by outside contract, even if the price was higher. But when bids were opened in December, 1913, for a supply ship, the bid of the Charlestown Navy Yard was found to be below all others—navy yards or private establishments.

To build this vessel at the yard it will be necessary to extend the present ways.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BENNET].

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from California, Mr. NOLAN, will prevail. I want to say that the members from New York I am quite sure join with me in the spirit of his remarks. There is no reason why any of us should desire to keep another part of the country from being equipped. When I was in Congress before it gave me great personal pleasure to assist in equipping the immigrant stations at Charleston, New Orleans, and Galveston.

Mr. WHALEY. The immigrant station at Charleston has never yet been equipped.

Mr. BENNET. That was not our fault, we voted it and did our best. Now, I want to call the attention of the committee to what this amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee does, as I understand it, and what the amendment of the gentleman

from California proposes, which the gentleman from Tennessee says he is willing to accept.

As I understand it, this simply provides that if the Government is faced with the position that it can not do all of the building it desires in private yards it can go ahead and equip with additional facilities all of these yards. The gentleman from Tennessee says he will provide in the amendment an additional sum to take care of New York and Mare Island if it is necessary to equip the two yards.

This amendment, as I understand it, is not to benefit any particular yard—Mare Island, Philadelphia, Boston, New Orleans, or any other yard—but it is to serve the best purposes of the Government. Am I right?

Mr. PADGETT. I tried to state that as fully and as clearly as I could.

Mr. BENNET. I thought so, but there appeared to be a misapprehension that this was a contest between cities.

Mr. PADGETT. The situation is this: We put a provision in the bill yesterday authorizing the Secretary to make contracts and provide bonuses not to exceed 20 per cent for the expeditious delivery of material and construction. With the enormous program we are authorizing in this bill it would be possible, if it was so desired, for shipbuilders to conspire and apportion among themselves the work and submit their own terms. We did not want the Government to depend on them, and so, in the event that they do not submit bids for the expeditious delivery at a fair and reasonable price, this amount of money is appropriated to equip the yards for the Government to build ships themselves wherever there is this situation.

Mr. BENNET. It seems very clear that we over here, who have been voting for even larger naval programs than most on the other side, should join with those on the other side and vote for this amendment. Otherwise we would be in an inconsistent position. We would be voting for an increase in the Navy, but when the chairman offered additional facilities we would be in a position of voting against it. Therefore, I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee, with the amendment offered by the gentleman from California, will prevail.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. POWERS].

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, ours is not only a representative Government but its business is conducted through the agency of political parties.

Four years ago the Democratic Party of the Nation went before the people of this great country upon a platform pledging it to the carrying out of certain principles in the event of election. On account of the unfortunate dissension in our own ranks, the Democrats won; and for more than three years now they have had complete control of all the departments of the National Government. There has been nothing to prevent the Democratic Party from putting into operation Democratic policies and theories of government. They claim to have done so, and are now asking a return to power because they say they have "kept the faith" and have painstakingly carried out all of their promises and pledges to the people, and that the people have been abundantly benefited and greatly blessed thereby. That is their claim. They are asking an indorsement of their record. They say they have accomplished much for which we should indeed be thankful, and that they can and will accomplish more if given a new lease of life. They say that they have given the world a shining example of economy and efficiency in government. I concede that if these claims be true they ought to be returned to power. Let us calmly and dispassionately look into the facts. Democratic, not Republican, performances are on trial.

In order to find out just what pledges the Democratic Party of the Nation has made to the people, we must turn to authoritative sources of information, to wit, the Democratic national platforms. Their acts alone speak as to their performances. The last platform adopted by the Democratic Party was at Baltimore, Md., on July 2, 1912. That is the one upon which President Wilson and the present Democratic régime were elected. Let us turn to some of its planks. Let us see what they are and see whether or not they have been faithfully kept or shamefully broken. The people are entitled to know the truth.

One plank of the labor section of the Democratic platform adopted at Baltimore July 2, 1912, declares that the "organization of industry makes it essential that there should be no abridgment of the right of wage earners and producers to organize for the protection of wages and the improvement of labor conditions" and that such organizations "should not be regarded as illegal combinations in restraint of trade."

In his speech of acceptance, the presidential nominee of the Democratic Party, the Hon. Woodrow Wilson, took occasion to say regarding the working people of America:

No law that safeguards their life; that improves the physical and moral conditions under which they live; that makes their hours of labor rational and tolerable; that gives them freedom to act in their own interest; and that protects them where they can not protect themselves, can properly be regarded as class legislation.

Believing in the assurances of the Democratic Party and its nominee for President, and accepting them at their spoken and written word, the labor leaders and labor organizations and laboring people generally throughout the country, including the American Federation of Labor, some 2,000,000 in number, went pell-mell into the Democratic camp and became among the most loyal and enthusiastic supporters of the candidacy of Mr. Wilson. They helped to elect him. But for them he would not have been elected. After his election and after the overwhelmingly Democratic House and Senate had settled down to business and undertaken the work, supposedly, at least, of carrying out the Democratic pledges to the country, labor expected the fruition of its dreams in the fulfillment of the Democratic pledges and promises to it. But it had a shock in June, 1913.

The sundry civil appropriation bill which passed both the House and Senate contained a provision setting apart and appropriating the sum of \$300,000 for the enforcement of anti-trust laws but provided that no part of it should—

be spent in the prosecution of any organization or individual for entering into any combination or agreement having in view the increasing of wages, shortening of hours, or bettering the conditions of labor, or for any act done in furtherance thereof, not in itself unlawful: Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the prosecution of producers of farm products and associations of farmers who cooperate and organize in an effort to and for the purpose to obtain and maintain a fair and reasonable price for their products.

Note the similarity in the language of this provision and President Wilson's speech accepting the Democratic nomination for President. Everybody believed that the President and the Democratic Party was irrevocably committed to the provisions of the bill to which I have just referred. But when the bill was presented to President Wilson for his signature that change of mind, for which the President has since become so widely noted, had come over him and he expressed, in no uncertain terms, his emphatic disapproval of the promised labor and farmer exemptions contained in the bill. He threatened to veto the entire bill on their account and would have done so had the exemptions in any way interfered with the Department of Justice prosecuting either laborers or farmers for attempting to secure, under the provisions of the bill, what they deemed to be their rights, and what was perfectly legal for them to do individually but not collectively.

I would have vetoed that item—

Said the President—

because it places upon the expenditure a limitation which is, in my opinion, unjustifiable in character and principle. \* \* \* I can assure the country that this item will neither limit nor in any way embarrass the actions of the Department of Justice—

In dealing with these farmers and labor fellows.

It will be remembered that the Supreme Court of the United States had held in the Danbury Hatters case, reported in Two hundred and eighth United States Reports, page 274, that the Sherman antitrust law did not exempt labor organizations from its operations; that such organizations were combinations in restraint of trade, and therefore unlawful and liable to triple punitive damages.

Both the farmers and the laborers wanted their organizations exempted from the operation of the Sherman law, on the ground that they were not a capitalistic trust organized for predatory profits; but the President said that such exemptions were "unjustifiable both in character and principle," although he had promised in his speech accepting the Democratic nomination for President that—

no law that safeguards their life (the working people), that improves the \* \* \* conditions under which they live, or that gives them freedom to act in their own interest \* \* \* can properly be regarded as class legislation.

Wonderful how the President changed his mind, and the planks of the Democratic platform were broken.

THE PRESIDENT HAS CHANGED HIS MIND, TOO, ON THE SUBJECT OF IMMIGRATION AND CAUSED THE IMMIGRATION PLANK OF THE DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM TO BE BROKEN.

For a decade immigration to our shores has reached the rate of about 1,000,000 a year. A tremendous influx! There has not been so many since the European war began, but it is on the increase and will doubtless, with the return of peace, far exceed the previous number. The official statistics just given out by the Department of Labor show that in March 11 per cent more

came than in February and 48 per cent more than came one year ago in March. Immigrants of the right sort have always been welcomed among us. For years an attempt has been made to curtail the number, at least, of the undesirable elements that land upon our shores and come into ruinous competition with our own workmen and producers. As a private citizen, as a presidential candidate, as an author and writer of books, it seems that President Wilson was strongly in favor of rigid restriction. In his *History of the American People*, volume 5, page 212, in speaking of the character of immigrants that come to this country, he said:

They come in numbers which increased from year to year, as if the countries of the south of Europe were disburdening themselves of the more sordid and hapless elements of their population, the men whose standards of life and of work were such as American workmen had never dreamed of hitherto.

He said that even the unwelcomed, and in some quarters the loathed and hated, Chinamen were more desirable citizens than this "coarse crew" (of immigrants) that come crowding in every year at our eastern ports.

Not only as an author, but as a candidate for the Presidency, on September 4, 1912, in New York City, when he addressed the Association of Foreign Language Newspaper Editors, so called, President Wilson said, among other things:

If we can hit upon a standard which admits every voluntary immigrant and excludes those who have not come of their own motion, with their own purpose of making a home and a career here for themselves, but have been induced by steamship companies or others in order to pay the passage money, then we will have what we will all agree upon as Americans. I am speaking to you as also Americans with myself, and just as much American as myself, and if we all take the American point of view, namely, that we want American life kept to its standards, and that only the standards of American life shall be standards of restriction, then we are all upon a common ground, not of those who criticize immigration, but those who declare themselves Americans. I am not saying that I am wise enough out of hand to frame the legislation that will meet this idea. I am only saying that it is the ideal, and that is what we ought to hold ourselves to. \* \* \* Of course, if the immigrants are allowed to come in uninstructed hosts and to stop at the ports where they enter and there to compete in an oversupplied labor market, there is going to be unhappiness, there is going to be deterioration, there is going to be everything that will be detrimental to the immigrant.

But notwithstanding his writings, notwithstanding his position as a presidential candidate, Mr. Wilson abandoned his position as a restrictionist when called upon to sign and vetoed the immigration bill.

It will be remembered that some few years ago Congress created an Immigration Commission to investigate the whole subject of immigration, particularly the feasibility of the literacy test as a restrictive method.

This commission of nine distinguished members was composed of both Democrats and Republicans, Members of this House and the Senate. It made an extensive investigation both in this country and in Europe. After investigating for a period of four years and spending \$1,000,000 it made a voluminous report of 42 volumes and, among other things, said:

A majority of the commission (eight out of the nine) favored the reading and writing test as the most feasible single method of restricting undesirable immigration.

The commission unanimously agreed and reported that there was "an oversupply of unskilled labor in the basic industries of this country."

On April 19, 1912, an immigration bill containing a literacy-test provision passed the Senate of the United States. A bill containing the same provisions was reported to the House by the House Committee on Immigration on June 7, 1912, and the Democratic leaders announced that the bill would be put through when Congress reconvened in December, a special rule having been agreed upon for that purpose.

Woodrow Wilson was nominated for President on July 2, 1912. The Senate immigration bill, with the literacy test therein, was pending before the House during the campaign and became an issue thereof. The Democratic leaders of the House had promised to pass that bill early in December. The Baltimore convention that nominated Mr. Wilson for the Presidency pointed in its platform with pride "to the record of accomplishment of the Democratic House of Representatives in the Sixty-second Congress." "We indorse its action," they said. The House had indorsed the literacy-test provision and the immigration bill. The Democratic platform, upon which President Wilson was elected, indorsed the literacy test as applied to immigrants in approving the House action. But after he was elected the President changed his mind and vetoed the immigration bill, in spite of his writings and his campaign speeches and the platform pledges of his party, although beseeched to sign it by labor leaders, farmers' organizations, and the public generally. The Boston Transcript in an editorial, speaking of the change of front of our President, said:

The somersault of Mr. Woodrow Wilson on the immigration plank should surprise no one. It is only the latest illustration of the politician

reversing the position of the historian. For 20 years, as teacher and writer of history, he wrote against the "alien invasion," and brought to bear the heaviest guns of his rhetoric against this "menace." But the President has changed his mind. He has reversed his own position and repudiated the platform upon which he was elected.

Whether the President has changed his position, if not his mind, because of the immense foreign vote in the United States, or for other reasons, I know not. The Democratic Party in its national platform, as far back as 1896, said:

We hold that the most efficient way of protecting American labor is to prevent the importation of foreign pauper labor to compete with it in the home market.

That declaration of principle by the Democratic Party, and since reiterated, has at no time been recalled or reversed; but it does not take President Wilson long to recall and reverse "things" when he changes his mind and decides to break the solemn platform pledges of his party.

#### MORE BROKEN PLATFORM PLEDGES.

The Democratic platform upon which President Wilson was nominated and elected said:

We favor national aid to State and local authorities in the construction and maintenance of post roads.

It has now been nearly four years since the making of that platform pledge, and still no national-aid road law has been enacted looking to its fulfillment. The prospects, however, seem good for a road law to pass, but the outlook is that when passed it will not go into practical effect for several years, and will benefit but slightly, if at all, people living in the rural districts, where roads are mostly needed, because many of them can be traveled with difficulty, while others can not be traveled at all. I voted for the Federal-aid road bill that passed the House in the hope that when the Republicans came into power it would be so amended as to make it workable and beneficial. For the House bill the Democratic Senate substituted an entirely different proposition. The Democrats are at sea on roads legislation. They feel, however, that they are compelled to pass some sort of a road law before Congress adjourns; otherwise they could not well face an outraged constituency. The road law passed at this late date in the Democratic administration and on the eve of a presidential election can not be tried out before November. The people generally when they vote this fall will not know whether they have been handed a gold brick or not. They will be asked to take the road law "on faith." The passage of some sort of a road law, however, is regarded as a political necessity, and will no doubt be done. The fact remains, however, that the same Democratic Congress, at the instance of the same Democratic President, passed a law two years ago whereby the United States Government is spending \$40,000,000 building a railroad in Alaska.

The President tried to put through, and would have put through but for Republican opposition, another bill appropriating \$50,000,000 with which to build ships and put the United States in the shipping business for the importers and exporters. It looks like they are going to put that bill through this Congress. They have money for these things, although the pledges of neither of them were contained in the Democratic platform, but so far they have failed to put one dollar into the construction and maintenance of post roads, pledged by the platform upon which the President was elected and which platform the President accepted in toto, saying the pledges were those of "honest men" and "intended to be kept when in office."

#### PANAMA CANAL TOLLS.

The President and the Democratic Party again broke their solemn promise to the American people on the question of Panama Canal tolls. They said in their Baltimore platform:

We favor the exemption from toll of American ships engaged in coastwise trade passing through the canal.

This is what Democracy declared for in its platform of 1912, and is what the President indorsed, stood for, and argued for in his campaign before he was elected President. President Wilson specifically indorsed this plank in that celebrated speech he made to 2,500 farmers at Washington Park, N. J., on August 15, 1912, in which he said:

Now, at present there are no ships to do that; and one of the bills pending—passed, I believe, yesterday by the Senate, as it has already passed the House—provides for free toll for American ships through that canal.

But after the President was elected, for some unknown reason that the country has never understood, for some mysterious reason that the President has never explained, he came, hat in hand, up on Capitol Hill one day when the House and Senate was in session and practically said: "Boys, we've got to take her back. We've got to break our platform pledges to the country and the people that elected us. Acting under your oaths as legislators, you said that American ships engaged in coastwise trade passing through the Panama Canal should not pay



any toll; that such exemption would tend to keep down railroad rates [which he has since helped get increased]. The Democratic platform upon which I was nominated and elected declared for free tolls. I declared for the same thing in my speeches before election. I have not forgotten what I said to those New Jersey farmers and the country when I was seeking votes, but we have got to take it all back. I can not tell you why this is so, but I have reversed myself on the question of tolls of American ships passing through the canal, and you must reverse yourselves. You made speeches on the floor of the House and on the floor of the Senate until you were red in the face expounding the benefit to the American people, especially the American farmer, to be derived from such a course, and you embodied and passed a bill through both House and Senate declaring for free tolls, a thing specifically promised by our 1912 platform, but you must repeal that law, introduce a new bill charging tolls to American ships engaged in coastwise trade passing through the canal, and make some more speeches, re-qualifying what you have already said and done and repudiating your and my solemn platform pledges to the American people."

This was done. The repeal law was passed. So it has happened to free sugar and the promised cheapening of the "poor man's" breakfast table. The "crow" was eaten, but few, if any, of the legislators have ever known why it was necessary. The country knows nothing about it on account of the silence and secrecy of the President, although he declared when he came into office that his administration should be one of "pitiless publicity," and the White House doors would swing open to all "forward-looking" men. All the President has permitted the world to know is that he changed his mind and that another solemn contract in the Democratic platform with the people was broken.

#### RURAL CREDITS.

What I have said tells but a small part of the sad story. The Democratic platform upon which President Wilson was elected declared:

Of equal importance with the question of currency reform is the question of rural credits, or agricultural finance. We favor legislation permitting national banks to loan a reasonable portion of their funds on real estate security.

A rural-credits or farm-loan bill has been passed, or will be before Congress adjourns. I love the country. I was reared on a farm. I have always been interested in legislation looking to the farmers' good. I voted for the rural-credits or farm-loan bill when it was before the House, although I am confident it will prove to be of little benefit to the farmers, especially those in moderate circumstances—those that need help most. The law is a very defective one. It contains no genuine Federal aid. It is passed on the eve of an election, and the Democrats hope the passage of it will help them politically.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania, Representative MCFADDEN, who knows as much about this measure as any Member of the House, said in a speech here concerning it:

It will only benefit well-to-do farmers, but furnish no help for the worthy farmer who has no capital and desires to follow farming as an occupation. \* \* \* This bill is an experiment and has no foundation. \* \* \* The operation of the system as proposed might develop into a political machine.

Representative HENRY, of Texas, one of the Democratic leaders of the House, gave out the following statement when the bill was reported by the joint congressional committee:

In many respects the bill is admirable and has some very strong features.

However, direct Government aid is ignored and excluded. The measure does not provide for the Government guaranteeing or purchasing the farm-loan bonds based on farm mortgages. Without this aid the bill would be worthless to the farmers.

There is no use in mincing words. The fight is on. The real friends of Government aid must rally their forces and prepare for the contest in the House.

It is generally understood here that President Wilson has all along been opposed to putting the Government back of and making available the farmer's credit to the same extent that the Federal reserve act puts the Government back of the business man's and the bankers' credit. This bill as framed and passed by this House on the approval of the President is sufficient proof of that.

It is certain that this bill will not help the man without means. It merely authorizes the farmers to loan money to themselves.

It is not at all certain that the farmers with means will enter into and help form local farm-loan associations, in order to enable them to borrow money under this act, especially in view of the fact that they will be compelled to take stock in the Federal land bank in a sum equal to 5 per cent of their

loan and then become liable for 5 per cent more to liquidate the debts of the farm-loan association.

It will be a makeshift law, to say the least of it; but the Democratic Party felt impelled to pass some sort of rural-credits legislation in order to appease the wrath and satisfy the demand of the 12,000,000 farmers in this country. The law can not be tried out before the November election. Its nonworkability can not be demonstrated before that time. Its futility to be of benefit to the farmer who needs it can not before then be made known to many. In the meantime the Democratic spellbinders can boast of the "wonderful blessings" of their rural-credits law.

#### TRANSPORTATION RATES.

The Democrats also said this in their Baltimore platform:

We favor legislation which will assure such reductions in transportation rates as conditions will permit.

At the time the Democrats made this platform declaration there was a Republican President in the White House and the country was enjoying the fruits of unbounded prosperity. The railroads were making lots of money. The Democratic Party had not been in office long until the country started to the "deminition bowwows." Receivers were appointed for one railroad system after another throughout the country, and the railroads applied to the Interstate Commerce Commission to have rates raised, business was so poor. All sorts of pressure was brought to bear upon the commission to grant increases in rates. Of course, the higher the rates the more the merchant and the farmer has to pay for shipping freight and traveling over the railroads. It is interesting to note whether the President was upon the side of the railroads or upon the side of the people. Just a while before the Interstate Commerce Commission was expected to hand down its decision in regard to this proposed raise of freight rates the President called a number of newspaper reporters about him and authorized the following interview, which was printed by the press of the country on the 1st day of June, 1915:

President Wilson indicated to-day that he would not be dissatisfied if the Interstate Commerce Commission allowed the railroads the 5 per cent freight-rate increase they are seeking. Mr. Wilson left no doubt in the minds of those who talked to him that he was in favor of the increase.

The Interstate Commerce Commission decided in accordance with the President's wishes and granted the increase. He soon reappointed the commissioner who cast the deciding vote. Apparently the habit of the President and the Democratic Party in breaking their platform pledges to the American people has become chronic.

#### REDUCTION OF OFFICES PLEDGE BROKEN.

The Democrats said in their Baltimore platform—

We demand a reduction in the number of useless offices, the salaries of which drain the substance of the people.

Yet in the face of that pledge the Democrats have created, in less than four years, 30,000 new offices and places at an annual cost of over \$36,000,000.

They have increased the annual salaries of the old offices over \$4,000,000 every year.

#### ANOTHER BROKEN PLANK.

I quote the following from the Democratic platform adopted at Baltimore:

The constitutional rights of American citizens should protect them on our borders and go with them throughout the world, and every American citizen residing or having property in any foreign country is entitled to and must be given the full protection of the United States Government, both for himself and his property.

That platform pledge has been shamefully ignored and superseded by "watchful waiting." This administration has not had the merit to go to war nor the courage to stay out of it. Its hatred for Germany and partisanship for England and her allies belies its loud professions of neutrality.

The Democrats declared in their platform that—

American citizens residing or having property in any foreign country are entitled to and must be given the full protection of the United States Government.

Yet in the face of this solemn platform pledge the President of the United States, the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, has "watchfully waited," has backed and filled, has hesitated and halted, while Mexico and Mexicans have spat upon our flag, trampled it in the dust, and flung this truthful taunt in the face of red-blooded Americans: "We have outraged your women; we have murdered your children; we have burned your property; we have insulted the flag of your country. Tell us, is there anything we can do to you that will make you stand up and fight like men."

The President's policy in Mexico has not only broken the platform pledge of his party, but has brought a blush of shame and humiliation to every true American, be he native or foreign born.

THE CIVIL-SERVICE PLANK, TOO, HAS BEEN BROKEN.

The Democratic platform adopted at Baltimore, made famous by the number of its broken promises, contained this plank:

The law pertaining to the civil service should be honestly and rightly enforced, to the end that merit and ability shall be the standard of appointment and promotion rather than service rendered to a political party.

Notwithstanding that party declaration and platform pledge, civil service, under this administration, has been utterly debauched in order to find places for "deserving Democrats." The civil-service laws were set aside in the passage of the Underwood Tariff Act, and there were exempted from the civil-service regulations more than 600 agents, deputy collectors, and other income-tax employees. Appointees under new laws like the proposed rural credits are not to be taken from civil service.

One thousand one hundred and forty-five deputy collectors of internal revenue and 176 deputy United States marshals were authorized to be appointed and removed without reference to the civil-service act in the very first general deficiency bill passed by the Wilson administration.

The civil-service laws were violated by the Democrats in the acts of December 17, 1914; December 26, 1914; July 16, 1914; January 28, 1915; March 4, 1913; August 1, 1915. Also in the Federal reserve banking law, the rural-credits law, and other laws passed by this administration.

The 45,000 fourth-class postmasters in this country have virtually been put under the spoils system. Thirty thousand new offices have been created for the faithful. The President by Executive order has waived the civil-service rules 253 times since he has been in office. The spoils system has run riot. Civil-service laws and their pledges to uphold them have been tossed to the winds by the Democrats.

DEMOCRATIC ECONOMY.

But there were two planks in the Democratic platform of 1912 that stood out preeminently above all the others in importance—the ones on which the Democrats most relied for success. One of these reads as follows:

We denounce the profligate waste of the money wrung from the people by oppressive taxation through the lavish appropriations by recent Republican Congresses.

They said that the Republicans were just taxing the people to death; that they had run the annual appropriations up to a billion dollars; and that when they, the Democrats, were placed in power they proposed to have an economical administration, and one of retrenchment and reform. They said that the Republican appropriations were wastefully extravagant. They demanded economy, simplicity, retrenchment, and reform. They said they would abolish all the useless offices that were a drain upon the people's substance and would cut down the salaries of Government officials. They have, as I have said, created 30,000 new offices and have increased the salaries of offices by the millions of dollars. They said that merit and ability should be the standard of appointment to office; that the merit system should be impartially and rigidly upheld, but I have just shown how that pledge was violated. They said they would not spend as much money if they had charge of the Government's affairs as the Republicans had been spending. The first time, however, they got control of the affairs of the country they spent in one year \$63,000,000 more of the people's money than had ever been expended by any Republican Congress that has ever been convened in the city of Washington or elsewhere. We turned over to them a total balance of \$149,335,710 in the general fund of the Treasury on the 3d of March, 1913. They have spent that. They have spent every cent of money they could rake and scrape from every source of taxation. Notwithstanding this there was a deficiency of \$17,575,216.85 on the 29th day of April, 1916. They have invented new ways of taxing the people.

They invented the income-tax system. They figured out that they would collect from the people about \$80,000,000 annually from that source. They are now collecting many millions more than that. Then they turned around and invented some more new methods of wringing money from the people, whom they pledged themselves to save and to serve. They saddled on us a war tax, calculated to bring into the Treasury of the United States about \$100,000,000 a year. They tax us at the telephone booth and the telegraph office. There never has been such a stamp-licking time in the history of the country. They figured out that there would be a good many notes and a good many mortgages and but very little money passing around under their administration, so they put a stamp tax on notes and mortgages, but did not put any on checks. They knew there would not be very many of them. And so, with all these various forms of taxations, new ones must still be invented. They are puzzling

their brains over that now. The Democrats have broken their pledge of economy. This is admitted by all men, denied by nobody.

But the one plank in the Democratic platform of three years ago concerning which the Democrats had most to say was their tariff plank. While the Democrats lambasted the Republicans for the reckless expenditure of the people's money, and while they said many mean things along that line, the most of the abuse that they heaped upon us was concerning the tariff question. They told the people that they were being robbed through the instrumentality of a tariff law that the Republicans had put upon the statute books. They said that the poor man, the laboring man, was staggering under the weight of it and the burden of it. They said that poor men and women all over this land and country were being robbed of the fruits of their labor through the "robber tariff"; that they were pouring their money into the coffers of the rich, especially into the coffers of the rich "tariff barons." They said that the high cost of living was all due to this "robber tariff"; that the Republicans were wedded to and had foisted it upon the many for the benefit of the few. They said that the Republican Party was in bed with the great monopolies of this land and country and was in league with the flesh and the devil.

They said to the laboring man, "Look at this 25 cents you have to pay for a pound of bacon. It was all brought about by the robber protective tariff." They said, "Look at the high cost of the hat on your head and the shoes on your feet, due to this robber protective tariff, fostered and nurtured by the Republican Party." They said, "If you will just put us in power we will put an end to all this. We will revise these tariff laws. We will give you free trade or a tariff for revenue only. We will annihilate the trust and the monopoly. We will reduce the cost of living. We will put the poor man and the laboring man in possession of his rights. We will see to it that as long as we are in power he shall have plenty of work to do at big wages. He shall not have to pay half as much for the necessities of life as he has been forced to pay under the Republican protective-tariff administration. We are not only going to revise these tariff laws but we are going to do it in such a way as will not injure any 'legitimate industry.' Prosperity will be increased, the trusts destroyed, the high cost of living removed from the backs of labor. The 'crown of thorns' shall be for the laboring man no more." That is what you Democrats said to us, gentlemen; and you now know that not a single one of your promises have been complied with. You said you would revise the tariff down to a revenue or free-trade basis without doing hurt or harm to any "legitimate industry." You did revise the tariff, but not without doing irreparable harm and injury to the legitimate industries of this land and country. You did revise the tariff, but instead of increasing the prosperity of the country, prosperity fled our realms, and is only now returning because of the war in Europe coupled with the immediate prospect of another Republican administration. You did revise the tariff, but instead of reducing the high cost of living it has been getting higher all the time. The average price of the necessities of life are now 17 per cent more than when you took charge of the affairs of this Government. You enacted your Democratic tariff law in October, 1913. You did away with Republican protection. You were going to enact a tariff law, you said, for revenue only. You said that it was neither your purpose nor your desire to protect any American industry or any American workingman. You said that you had only one idea in view and that was to raise revenue, and a sufficient amount of it to run this Government when its affairs were economically administered; so you passed the Underwood tariff law with that avowed purpose, but it did not raise the needed revenue.

You said the consumer pays the tariff tax. You said take this tariff off of imported goods and they can and will be sold a good deal cheaper than we are getting them in this country. You have preached for years, for example, that free hides means cheaper shoes; free wool, cheaper clothes and cheaper hats. That looks pretty well in theory, but it fails to work out in practice. You said during the 1912 campaign that shoes were entirely too high, and they have been mighty high. You said, "We are going to put hides on the free list and reduce the cost of shoes to the consumer." So you put hides on the free list and the price of shoes have gone up from that day to this. We have lost the revenue. The importer of shoes has kept the price of his shoes at or near the price of shoes produced in this country.

The price of shoes has not been lowered to the consumer. The importer has pocketed the cash while we have lost the revenue.

You said the Republicans had placed a big tariff on sugar and that the tariff on it kept the price of sugar unreasonably high. You said that the poor man who sweetened his coffee with sugar had to pay a double price for the privilege on account of the Republican tariff laws. You said you would put it on the free list and that everybody would get cheap sugar. So in the Underwood law you reduced the tariff on sugar 25 per cent in October, 1913, when the Underwood law became effective and scheduled it to go altogether on the free list in May, 1916. But instead of bringing cheap sugar to the consumer the price of the sweet thing has been soaring toward heaven from that day down to this, or rather to the day when sugar was again put back on the dutiable list. You reversed yourselves and put it back on the dutiable list where the Republicans had placed it. While sugar was on the free list the consumer paid more for it than he had ever done before. The importer pocketed the money. We lost the revenue. We got \$50,000,000 a year in revenue by reason of the tariff duty the Republicans laid on sugar. That \$50,000,000 annually was used in helping to defray the expenses of the Government. When the Democrats put sugar on the free list we lost the \$50,000,000 annually in revenue. It had to be supplied in some other way. It was supplied through the passage of an income-tax law and a war-tax law when this country was at peace with all the world. In the first 10 months of the operation of the Underwood tariff law and before the war in Europe began, 5,000,000 laboring men had been thrown out of employment by reason of it. The railroads alone laid off 120,000 men and cut down expenses \$138,000,000 from July 1, 1914, to July 1, 1915. Uninterfered with by the European war, it had brought the country to the verge of ruin and to the homes of many want and starvation.

The Democrats say that the Underwood law is all right, and would be producing ample revenues to run the Government but for the European war. The value of importations coming monthly to our shores—the greatest in the history of the country—and the little revenue collected thereon, however, refutes this charge. We sold during the first year of the war \$404,000,000 worth more of our products abroad than we sold the year before the war began. We bought \$219,000,000 worth less. The Democrats propose to leave the Underwood tariff law on the statute books, which now admits free of duty about 70 per cent of the goods of foreign countries; and around the tariff issue this fall will be waged one of the fiercest political battles that this country has witnessed in many a day. The Republicans know or feel that they know that when the war in Europe is over and the men now engaged in it return to useful occupations and avenues of productiveness, anxious to retrieve their lost fortunes, this country will be flooded with such an immense quantity of cheaply produced goods as will close down our mines, mills, and factories, and turn millions of our laboring men out of employment, unless the Republicans come back into power and place upon the statute books an adequate protective-tariff law. The Democrats will, no doubt, make many fair promises to the American people; but how can they be trusted in face of the fact that they have violated all of the pledges contained in their last national platform? What will future pledges from such a party be worth? I can not see how fair-minded men can indorse the doings of the Democratic Party or put any faith in any promise its leaders may make.

I am through with my argument, but in order to show conclusively that the President has turned down the chief legislative demand of the 2,000,000 members of the American Federation of Labor, which so enthusiastically supported him four years ago under the apparently mistaken notion that he was their friend and sympathized with them in their efforts to better their conditions, I am appending clippings from recent issues of the official weekly publication of the American Federation of Labor, 100,000 of which go throughout the length and breadth of this land to its local officials and members.

In this as well as other demands of the workingmen, the working people, organized and unorganized, will have to look to the Republican Party for a realization of their expectations and just demands. The Republican Party has always stood for protection, while the Democratic Party has advocated through its present leaders the "open door" and free trade. The Republican Party is for protection against foreign invasion. It stands for true preparedness. It is for protection against foreign pauper-made goods and for protection against the foreign pauper cheap labor itself. It has so declared and will so stand.

The following articles are clipped from the American Federation of Labor Weekly News Letter, printed Saturday, April 8, 1916:

HOUSE PASSES BURNETT IMMIGRATION RESTRICTION BILL—307 TO 87.

WASHINGTON, April 8.

By a vote of 307 to 87 the House passed the Burnett immigration bill, with the literacy test, on Thursday, March 30. Prior to this vote, Con-

gressman SABATH moved to recommit the bill "with instructions" to strike out the literacy test. This was defeated on a roll call vote, 284 to 107.

Opponents of the measure presented no new arguments, while the position of its advocates was strengthened by conditions in Europe because of the war. Congressman MANN, the minority leader—who voted for the Sabath amendment, but later voted for the bill—indorsed this position. He said: "And unless those countries (European) by their own legislation can prevent their citizens coming here, we are liable to have a flood of immigration such as no country in the world ever experienced before. I am not willing to take the chances on it."

Advocates of restriction referred to the increasing sentiment in favor of greater effectiveness in every field of activity. They insisted that democracy can not be developed to its highest possible point while we encourage the admission of illiterates who destroy living standards of American labor and who refuse to become a part of our national life.

The literacy test provides that immigrants over 16 years of age must read at least 30 words in some language or dialect, including Hebrew or Yiddish, chosen by the immigrant. Exceptions to this test are made in the case of an immigrant's father or grandfather over 55 years of age; his wife, his mother, his grandmother, or his unmarried or widowed daughter.

Exception to the literacy test is also made where an immigrant flees from religious or political persecution. The latter exception includes "persons convicted, or who admit the commission, or who teach and advocate the commission, of an offense purely political." Under this provision the old-world revolutionist who advocates force to overthrow his government, or who admits the use of force for that purpose, will be admitted to this country regardless of educational qualifications.

The question of immigration restriction by a literacy test has been favorably voted on by almost every Congress since 1896. On three occasions the proposal has been vetoed—by Presidents Cleveland, Taft, and Wilson. In 1897 the House passed the bill over President Cleveland's veto, 193 to 37. This was 37 votes more than the necessary two-thirds vote. The Senate failed to act, owing to a rush of business and Congress adjourning a few hours after the House vote.

In 1913 the Senate passed the bill over President Taft's veto, 72 to 18, but the veto was sustained in the House by a few votes. On February 4, 1915, the House sustained President Wilson's veto, 261 to 136. If any 4 of the 136 that voted to sustain the President had voted with the majority a two-thirds vote would have been secured and the bill passed.

The last vote in favor of immigration restriction—307 to 87, recorded March 30 last—indicates the increasing demand by the people for this legislation.

The bill is now in the Senate. Its passage by that body is conceded if its advocates can overcome the small minority that will take advantage of the rules of the Senate to keep the bill from being voted on.

Trade-unionists and other friends of this legislation are urged to write their two United States Senators and insist that the Burnett immigration bill be voted on at this session of Congress.

#### VOTE ON RESTRICTION IN HOUSE ANALYZED.

WASHINGTON, April 8.

An analysis of the House vote on immigration restriction, March 30, indicates an increasing demand for this legislation.

Out of a possible 434 votes in the House, only 87 were cast against the bill, 36 were recorded "not voting," and 3 "present." Of these 39 only 13 were paired against the passage of the bill. There was not a single vote against the bill from the following 26 States: Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Kansas, Minnesota, Mississippi, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, and Wyoming.

Eighteen States were divided in their vote, but in none of these was a majority of the Congressmen against the bill.

In only four States—Connecticut, Michigan, New York, and Rhode Island—did a majority of the delegations vote against the bill on final passage. In these cases the vote was: Connecticut, 4 out of 5 against or were paired against; Michigan, 7 out of 13; New York, 27 out of 43; Rhode Island 3 out of 3.

Rhode Island was the only State whose entire delegation either voted or was paired against the bill, 2 voting "nay" and 1 being paired to vote "nay."

But one-fifth of the total membership of the House voted against the bill, which passed by nearly a 4 to 1 vote by Congressmen fresh from the people, just a year and two months after the President's veto of the same bill, January 28, 1915, when the Chief Executive stated that he doubted whether there was a popular demand for this legislation.

#### HOUSE ROLL CALL VOTE ON BURNETT IMMIGRATION RESTRICTION BILL. THE VOTE EXPLAINED.

Prior to the final vote on the immigration restriction bill Congressman SABATH moved to strike out the literacy test. This was defeated on a roll-call vote, 284 to 107.

The bill was then passed by the vote printed herein. The names in the "aye" columns, with a star (\*) at their left, indicate that these Members first voted to strike out the literacy test, and when the motion to strike out was defeated these Members voted for the bill on its final passage.

##### ALABAMA.

Aye: Abercrombie, Almon, Blackmon, Burnett, Gray, Hefflin, Hudleston, Oliver, and Stegall.  
Not voting: Dent.

##### ARIZONA.

Aye: Hayden.

##### ARKANSAS.

Aye: Caraway, Goodwin, Jacoway, Taylor, and Tillman.  
Not voting: Oldfield and Wingo.  
Wingo was paired in favor of the passage of the immigration bill with Cary, of Wisconsin, against.

##### CALIFORNIA.

Aye: Church, Curry, Elston, Hayes, Kent, Kettner, Nolan, Raker, Randall, and Stephens.  
Nay: Kahn.

##### COLORADO.

Aye: \*Keating, Taylor, and Timberlake.  
Not voting: Hilliard.

Hilliard was paired in favor of the passage of the immigration bill with Loud, of Michigan, against.

## CONNECTICUT.

Aye: Hill.  
Nay: Freeman, Glynn, and Oakey.  
Not voting: Tilson.

Tilson was paired against the passage of the immigration bill with Edwards, of Georgia, in favor of the passage of the immigration bill.

## DELAWARE.

Aye: Miller.

## FLORIDA.

Aye: Clark, Sears, Sparkman, and Wilson.

## GEORGIA.

Aye: Adamson, Belz, Crisp, Howard, Hughes, Lee, Park, Tribble, Vinson, and Wise.  
Not voting: Edwards and Walker.  
Edwards was paired in favor of the passage of the immigration bill with Tilson, of Connecticut, against.

## IDAHO.

Aye: McCracken and Smith.

## ILLINOIS.

Aye: Buchanan, Chipfield, Copley, Denison, Foss, Foster, Fuller, King, McKenzie, McKinley, \*Mann, Rainey, \*Rodenberg, Sterling, Tavenner, Wheeler, Williams, T. S., and Wilson.  
Nay: Britten, Cannon, Gallagher, McAndrews, McDermott, Madden, Sabbath, and Stoltz.  
Not voting: Williams, W. E.

## INDIANA.

Aye: Adair, Cline, Cox, \*Cullop, Dixon, \*Gray, Moores, Moss, \*Rauch, and \*Wood.  
Nay: Barnhart and Lieb.  
Not voting: Morrison.

## IOWA.

Aye: Dowell, Good, Green, Haugen, Hull, Kennedy, Ramseyer, Steele, and Sweet.  
Nay: Towner and Woods.

## KANSAS.

Aye: Anthony, Ayres, Campbell, Connelly, Doolittle, Helvering, Shouse, and \*Taggart.

## KENTUCKY.

Aye: Barkley, Cantrill, Fields, Helm, Johnson, Kincheloe, Langley, Powers, Rouse, and Thomas.  
Nay: Sherley.

## LOUISIANA.

Aye: Aswell, Lazaro, Morgan, and Wilson.  
Nay: Dupré, Estopinal, and Martin.  
Not voting: Watkins.

## MAINE.

Aye: Hinds and Peters.  
Not voting: Guernsey and McGillicuddy.  
McGillicuddy was paired against the passage of the immigration bill with Guernsey in favor.

## MARYLAND.

Aye: Linticum, \*Mudd, Price, and Talbott.  
Nay: Coady.  
Not voting: Lewis.  
Lewis was paired in favor of the passage of the immigration bill with Doremus, of Michigan, against.

## MASSACHUSETTS.

Aye: Gardner, Gillett, Olney, \*Rogers, and \*Treadway.  
Nay: Carter, Dallinger, Gallivan, Greene, Paige, Phelan, Roberts, Tague, Tinkham, Walsh, and Winslow.

## MICHIGAN.

Aye: Hamilton, Kelley, McLaughlin, Mapes, Scott, and Smith.  
Nay: Beakes, Cramton, Fordney, James, and Nichols.  
Not voting: Doremus and Loud.  
Doremus was paired against the passage of the immigration bill with Lewis, of Maryland, in favor.  
Loud was paired against the passage of the immigration bill with Hilliard, of Colorado, in favor.

## MINNESOTA.

Aye: Anderson, Davis, Ellsworth, Lindbergh, Miller, Schall, \*Smith, Steenerson, Van Dyke, and Volstead.

## MISSISSIPPI.

Aye: Candler, Collier, Harrison, Humphreys, Quin, Sisson, Stephens, and Venable.

## MISSOURI.

Aye: Alexander, \*Borland, Decker, Dickinson, Hamlin, Hensley, Lloyd, Rubey, Rucker, and Russell.  
Not voting: Booher, Dyer, Igoe, Meeker, and Shackelford.  
Booher answered "present."  
Igoe answered "present."  
Dyer was paired in favor of the passage of the immigration bill with Igoe against.  
Meeker was paired in favor of the passage of the immigration bill with Booher against.  
Champ Clark—Speaker—not recorded.

## MONTANA.

Aye: Evans.  
Not voting: Stout.

## NEBRASKA.

Aye: Kinkaid, Reavis, Shallenberger, \*Sloan, and Stephens.  
Nay: Lobeck.

## NEVADA.

Aye: Roberts.

## NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Aye: Sulloway and Wason.

## NEW JERSEY.

Aye: Browning, Capstick, Drukker, Gray, Hutchinson, Lehlbach, and Parker.  
Nay: Bacharach and Eagan.  
Not voting: Hamill, Hart, and Scully.

Hamill was paired against the passage of the immigration bill with Young of Texas in favor.

Hart was paired in favor of the passage of the immigration bill with Graham, of Pennsylvania, against.

Scully was paired against the passage of the immigration bill with Rowland, of Pennsylvania, in favor.

Aye: Hernandez.

## NEW MEXICO.

## NEW YORK.

Aye: Charles, Danforth, Dempsey, Dunn, Hamilton, Hicks, Husted, Magee, Mott, Parker, Pratt, Snell, Snyder, and Ward.  
Nay: Bennet, Bruckner, Caldwell, Carew, Chandler, Conry, Dale, Dooling, Driscoll, Farley, Fitzgerald, Flynn, Gould, Griffin, Haskell, Hulbert, Loft, London, Maher, Oglesby, Patten, Riordan, Rowe, Sanford, Slegel, Smith, and Swift.  
Not voting: Fairchild and Platt.

## NORTH CAROLINA.

Aye: Britt, Doughton, Godwin, Hood, Kitchin, Page, Pou, Small, Stedman, and Webb.

## NORTH DAKOTA.

Aye: Helgesen and Young.  
Nay: Norton.

## OHIO.

Aye: Allen, Ashbrook, Brumbaugh, Cooper, Emerson, Fess, Gard, Hollingsworth, Kearns, Key, Longworth, McCulloch, Matthews, Mooney, Overmeyer, Ricketts, Russell, Switzer, and Williams.  
Nay: Crosser, Gordon, and Sherwood.

## OKLAHOMA.

Aye: Carter, Davenport, Ferris, Hastings, McClintic, Morgan, Murray, and Thompson.

## OREGON.

Aye: Hawley, McArthur, and Sinnott.

## PENNSYLVANIA.

Aye: \*Basley, Beales, Butler, Coleman, Costello, Crago, Farr, Focht, Garland, Heaton, Hopwood, Kelster, Kless, Kreider, Lafean, Leshar, Miller, North, Porter, Scott, Steele, Temple, and Watson.  
Nay: Barchfield, Casey, Liebel, Moore, Morin, and Vore.  
Not voting: Darrow, Dewalt, Edmonds, Graham, Griest, McFadden, and Rowland.  
Graham was paired against the passage of the immigration bill with Hart, of New Jersey, in favor.  
Griest was paired in favor of the passage of the immigration bill with Edmonds against.  
Rowland was paired in favor of the passage of the immigration bill with Scully, of New Jersey, against.

## RHODE ISLAND.

Nay: Kennedy and O'Shaunessy.  
Not voting: Stiness.  
Stiness was paired against the passage of the immigration bill with Henry, of Texas, in favor.

## SOUTH CAROLINA.

Aye: Aiken, Byrnes, Finley, Lever, Nicholls, Ragsdale, and Whaley.

## SOUTH DAKOTA.

Aye: Dillon, Gandy, and Johnson.

## TENNESSEE.

Aye: Austin, Byrns, Houston, Hull, McKellar, Moon, Padgett, Selis, and Sims.  
Not voting: Garrett.

## TEXAS.

Aye: Black, Callaway, Davis, Dies, Eagle, Garner, Gregg, McLemore, Rayburn, Slayden, Smith, Stephens, and Summers.  
Nay: Burgess, Buchanan, and Hardy.  
Not voting: Henry and Young.  
Henry was paired in favor of the passage of the immigration bill with Stiness, of Rhode Island, against.  
Young was paired in favor of the passage of the immigration bill with Hamill, of New Jersey, against.

## UTAH.

Aye: Mays.  
Nay: Howell.

## VERMONT.

Aye: Dale and Greene.

## VIRGINIA.

Aye: Carlin, Flood, Glass, Hay, Holland, Jones, Montague, Slemp, and Watson.  
Not voting: Saunders.

## WASHINGTON.

Aye: Dill, Hadley, Humphrey, Johnson, and La Follette.

## WEST VIRGINIA.

Cooper, Littlepage, Moss, Neely, and \*Sutherland.

## WISCONSIN.

Aye: Browne, \*Cooper, \*Esch, Frear, Lenroot, and Nelson.  
Nay: Burke, Konop, Reilly, and Stafford.  
Not voting: Cary.  
Cary was paired against the passage of the immigration bill with Wingo, of Arkansas, in favor.

## WYOMING.

Aye: Mondell.

## POLITICAL AND RELIGIOUS REFUGEES ARE NOT BARRED.

The Burnett immigration-restriction bill makes clear provision for the continued admission of political and religious refugees to this country.

Opponents of the bill evade discussing the main purpose of this legislation—to maintain American living standards of workers by debarring illiterates.

As it is unwise to combat this principle, the trusts and other cheap-labor advocates insist that the act would change America's traditions and policy toward those who are forced to leave the Old World because of political or religious beliefs.

The following sections of the bill, however, completely refute these claims:

"That the following classes of persons shall be exempt from the operation of the illiteracy test, to wit: All aliens who shall prove to the satisfaction of the proper immigration officer or to the Secretary of Labor that they are seeking admission to the United States to avoid religious persecution in the country of their last permanent residence, whether such persecution be evidenced by overt acts or by laws or by governmental regulations that discriminate against the alien or the race to which he belongs because of his religious faith.

"Nothing in this act shall exclude, if otherwise admissible, persons convicted, or who admit the commission, or who teach or advocate the commission, of an offense purely political."

Congressman BURNETT, author of the bill, and chairman of the House Committee on Immigration, has repeatedly stated that the friends of immigration restriction would not support legislation that would debar these refugees.

Other advocates of restriction have taken a similar position, which is in line with the innumerable humanitarian declarations of the American Federation of Labor, and which was pointed out by Congressman MEEKER, of Missouri, who made this answer to the claim of anti-restrictionists:

"You speak of the political refugee. If the language is not distinct and plain on that one issue, then I can not understand how it is to be written. The revolutionist, your Kosciuszko, and all those men to whom reference has been made, could enter this country under this provision. This country will always remain the home of the religious and the political refugee, but we would just as well begin now to face that other problem of imported ignorance."

**INSIST THAT THE IMMIGRATION BILL BE PASSED AT THIS SESSION—URGE YOUR TWO SENATORS AT WASHINGTON TO FAVOR IMMEDIATE ACTION ON THIS MEASURE—RESTRICTION WILL PROTECT AMERICAN WORKERS' LIVING STANDARDS—INSIST THAT THIS BILL BE PASSED BEFORE CONGRESS ADJOURNS—OPponents OF IMMIGRATION BILL DID NOT DIVIDE ON PARTY LINES.**

Opposition to the Burnett immigration bill, which passed the House March 30 by a vote of 307 to 87, was of a nonpartisan character.

On the Democratic side Congressmen SABATH, of Illinois, and GALLIVAN, of Massachusetts, were leaders in defending the cause of cheap-labor advocates. In one of Mr. GALLIVAN'S fervent pleas he declared that "a literacy test will bar from our land its most vital necessity—strong, vigorous, simple, God-fearing peasants."

Mr. SABATH insisted that "reports which have been circulated declaring there is an imperative need for immigration legislation are unfounded and unjustifiable."

Congressman LONDON, Socialist, opposed the bill. Over one-half of the Friday, March 24, speech of this attorney was devoted to an arraignment of the trade-union movement. In a tone that sounded like a spokesman for the National Association of Manufacturers, he declared that:

"The trouble with the average representative of organized labor is that he is incapable of that broader vision which sees above and beyond the narrow needs of the moment. That is the misfortune of the trade-union movement. What lack of intelligence! The politician is afraid to tell them that they are stupid."

In answer to a question Mr. LONDON said he assumed employees in Youngstown steel mills were unorganized, and then made this reference to the trade-union movement:

"But if they were not organized, it was the fault of the narrowness of the trade-union movement that does not know how to reach the masses."

Mr. LONDON is evidently unacquainted with the spy systems of large corporations, with the constant agitation by the American Federation of Labor to organize the unskilled, and with the number of unionists who have been slugged by corporation thugs to prevent organization. He said:

"The union should greet the immigrant as a brother. The union man should teach him unionism. Instead of that, the labor leader looks upon every immigrant as an enemy."

Despite this attorney's claim that he represents the workers, he made it clear that he would be the sole judge of what was best fitted for them. In his second reference to the alleged stupidity of workers, he said:

"I have no faith in the friend of labor who encourages every stupid demand of the worker, checking at the same time every real aspiration of the working class for a greater share in life's joys."

On the Republican side, Congressmen JOSEPH CANNON of Illinois, BENNET of New York, and MOORE of Pennsylvania were among the leading opponents of restriction.

In referring to the literacy test, Mr. MOORE said:

"It casts down utterly the toiler who struggles patiently and laboriously under the burdens imposed upon him by the strong and the heartless."

Mr. CANNON is president of the National Liberal Immigration League, which was exposed last year by President Gompers, who showed that this league was financed by steamship companies, steel, mine, and coal companies, and other large employers of cheap labor. The documents made public by President Gompers proved that this alleged philanthropic organization was the vehicle by which cheap-labor advocates opposed immigration restriction. It was also shown that the league financed delegations of various nationalities to Washington, and that the delegates were not selected by the organizations they alleged to represent.

Congressman W. S. BENNET, another active exponent of restriction, is vice president of the National Liberal Immigration League. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February and March, this year, Mr. BENNET acknowledged he was attorney for steamship companies; that he defended contract labor violators; and that he opposed increasing, from \$50,000 to \$100,000, the appropriation for Secretary of Labor Wilson to enforce the contract labor law.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 25, 1916, Mr. BENNET is quoted:

"While I was out of the House, amongst my clients were some steamship companies, and I studied it (immigration restriction) some more."

Mr. BENNET was a member of the United States immigration commission that investigated this question for nearly four years. He was the only member of the commission that dissented from a literacy test and other restrictions favored by his colleagues on the commission.

As an attorney he is most versatile, acting not only as pleader for the steamship companies but for contract-labor-law violators. In the March 25 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD he is quoted:

"The Department of Justice collects thousands of dollars from violators of the contract-labor law. While I was out of Congress on a temporary vacation, I represented a gentleman who had to walk up to the captain's office and pay \$6,000 in one of these cases."

TRUSTS ARE PROTECTED FROM FOREIGN PRODUCTS, BUT DEMAND AN UNLIMITED FLOW OF CHEAP LABOR, WHICH DESTROYS AMERICAN WAGES AND IDEALS.

[By Frank Morrison, Secretary of the American Federation of Labor.]

"A high tariff against European cheap-labor products is insisted upon by American trusts, but these trusts are the chief opponents of immigration restriction intended to protect American workers," said Frank Morrison, secretary of the American Federation of Labor, at a recent hearing on this legislation before the House Committee on Immigration. The American Federation of Labor official declared that American manhood can not compete with the living standards of eastern Europe and Asia, and that it "is unwise to expect them to resist the tidal waves of Slavs and oriental onslaught." He further said:

"The proposition to prohibit immigration to the United States of able-bodied men and women because they can not read has a sympathetic viewpoint, where individuals are considered; but, notwithstanding such a viewpoint, the American Federation of Labor, which represents the organized workers of the country, and which is the only method or organization or agency which can with any justification or reason represent the unorganized workers, has repeatedly declared by resolutions in conventions 'that the literacy test is the most practical means of restricting the present immigration of cheap labor whose competition is so ruinous to the workers already here, whether native or foreign.'

"A great deal has been said and published in an endeavor to create the impression that it is necessary to induce immigration to come to this country for the purpose of securing agricultural workers. There is no question in my mind but that such agitation has for its purpose the enticing of immigrants to our country to supply the United States Steel Corporation, the great manufacturing concerns, coal companies, packing houses, and railroads with men willing to work at a cheaper wage than those who are born here.

"The opponents to this test make the argument that common laborers would belong to the class that could not pass the literacy test, and that this country is very much in need of that particular kind of labor.

"The great industrial companies of this country have more men to-day than they can employ, but they want two men for every job. They know that unemployed men must work to live and their necessities will force them to accept any wage set by the companies. Hence the workers' wages are literally held below a living wage by the hunger, misery, and distress of the unemployed.

"The organized wageworkers have declared in favor of restriction of immigration to maintain unlowered the American standard of life. Those who oppose restriction are representatives of companies and associations composed of employers of labor whose dominant interest is the dollar, and associations that depend for their existence upon contributions from the employing class.

"They feel that a reduction of immigration will result in a higher wage for their workers which will disturb the profits and dividends from products manufactured by them, or perhaps they have been informed that if the steamship companies do not receive \$60,000,000 a year for transporting aliens they will raise their freight rates.

"This reason will account in a great measure for the opposition of societies of various nationalities composed wholly or partly of business men and the attorneys of business men. Restrictions may interfere with their profits.

"We oppose any attempt to lower the standards of American life. We want to raise them, and we are opposed to the exploitation of millions of aliens with its attending evils to swell the profits of the steamship companies, even if it adds to the resources of those companies \$60,000,000 a year, even if it enables the United States Steel Trust to pay dividends and interest on \$400,000,000 of stocks and bonds, which never cost that company 1 cent.

"I wish to call your attention to the fact that industry is protected by a tariff, but labor is not; that the products of labor are protected, but we have a free flow of labor coming to our shores all the time; that manufacturers have protection against products manufactured by cheap labor in foreign countries, but labor has not protection against the importation of cheap labor.

The opponents of this measure say that if the products of labor are protected, then labor itself must be benefited, because the manufacturer can sell the products at a much higher price than can be obtained in other countries and will be in a position to pay higher wages to his employees. The protected manufacturer does receive a higher price than the products can be sold for in other countries; and the second contention—that they are thus made able to pay higher wages to their employees—is also true, but the fact is they do not pay higher wages. They pay lower wages.

We find that the most highly protected industries, particularly the industries that are now controlled by trusts, such as the Steel Trust, Rubber Trust, Sugar Trust, packing houses, and textile industry, pay to their employees the lowest wage in the country, and some of them less than a living wage for a family. A high tariff has nothing to do with the wages in these industries.

We hold that limitation of immigration to our country will compel social and industrial reform in the countries from which the immigrants flow. The fact that these countries have an outlet for a great number of their people means that there is an outlet from the oppressive conditions in these countries. For that reason those countries delay social and industrial reforms. As a consequence industrial and social misery is perpetual in those countries, because their citizens are induced to come to this country.

The wage earners believe in an effective regulation of immigration, because they desire to retain the American standard of living. The standard of wages for both skilled and unskilled labor in this country is the result of many years' effort by organized labor. When an immigrant accepts work at less than the standard wage, he not only takes the place of a man working at a higher rate, but he assists in forcing downward the prevailing rate of wages in that industry, which result carries with it a corresponding reduction in the physical, moral, and intellectual standard of American life.

In support of my statement that the American worker can not compete with this induced immigration and support a family on the wages paid, I refer you to the investigation of the Bethlehem Steel Works made by a committee of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ, representing over 16,000,000 people, and the investigation made by Commissioner Neill, of the Department of Labor, as to wages and conditions in the steel industry.

The committee of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ, commenting on the wage scale at Bethlehem, said:

"This is a wage scale that leaves no option to the common laborers but the boarding-house method of living with many men to the room. When a man has a family with him, they take in lodgers, or often the

woman goes to work. It is reported that immigrant parents send their children back to the old country to be reared while the mother goes to work. On such a wage basis American standards are impossible."

The literacy test is an expedient which should be adopted now, and time and experience will demonstrate what further legislation will be necessary in the interest and for the safety of the American people, for the improvement of American citizenship and homes, and for the perpetuation of the American Republic.

The American Federation of Labor, at its convention held last November in San Francisco, by unanimous action reiterated the decisions of previous conventions urging the speedy enactment into law of the immigration bill containing the literacy test.

No other single proposed addition to our immigration laws has received the indorsement accorded to the literacy test.

#### WHY THE TRADE-UNION MOVEMENT URGES IMMIGRATION RESTRICTION. [By President Gompers in American Federationist.]

As a people we have barely begun to appreciate the value of those qualities which make for real progress, the necessity to insist and persist in formulating sound policies to redound to the interests of the people of our Nation. Indeed for years we have delayed in even formulating a national policy that would protect us against such elements and conditions which act as a barrier to the development of American character and national unity. We have excused this delay on the ground that we were a young Nation; that we had vast public lands and national resources that must be developed, and that we could afford to open our doors to a practically unrestricted immigration in order to increase our population.

But conditions have changed. We are no longer a young Nation. We have wasted much of our national heritage and the frontier has practically disappeared. Recent events that have tested national institutions and men's faith to the uttermost, proved conclusively that we can not hope to be the ideal which America represents, we can not maintain a place of influence in the affairs of the world if we do not plan to carry out those purposes. Haphazard development may do well enough for the ordinary activities from day to day, but will not endure the tests of a great crisis or the slower test of time.

To achieve the best that is possible for our Nation and for our citizens generally, we can not escape the duty devolving upon us of thinking out a national policy that will develop out of the many peoples within our boundaries a homogeneous Nation bound together by common ideals, common customs, common language, and a common culture.

America has not yet become a nation. It is still a conglomerated mass of various and diverse ethnic groups. Hordes of immigrants have crowded into our ports, and have, for the most part, settled in the nearest industrial center. In some cases they have in masses moved farther inland to industrial centers where the nature of the work required comparatively little skill. In many of these cases the coming of the immigrants was due to the activities of managers of industries, who arranged to secure the financial advantages by employing foreign workers who still retained the standards and prejudices of other countries. So we had in many industrial centers sections that are known as "Little Hungary," "Little Italy," etc. The inhabitants of these little nations transplant to American soil the institutions and the standards of their fatherlands. They gain nothing by coming. These communities speak a foreign language, read foreign papers, dress in accord with foreign customs, and bring up their families in accord with foreign standards. There is practically no sustained effort on the part of society or the Nation to assimilate these foreign groups and to make of them Americans. Nor is this condition confined only to the poorer immigrants. There are foreign communities in the resident districts of the large cities. These remain even more exclusively foreign because their wealth enables them to have foreign schools and foreign instruction for their children. Thus the foreign group and alien influence become rooted in the life of the community.

The workers of America have felt most keenly the pernicious results of the establishment of foreign standards of work, wages, and conduct in American industries and commerce. Foreign standards of wages do not permit American standards of life. Foreign labor has driven American workers out of many trades, callings, and communities, and the influence of these lower standards has permeated widely.

For years the organized-labor movement has called attention to these vicious tendencies which affect not only the workers but the whole Nation, for national unity is weakened when the Nation is honey-combed with "foreign groups" living a foreign life.

The labor movement has urged the adoption of a national policy that would enable us to select as future citizens of our country those who can be assimilated and made truly American. The American Federation of Labor has urged a literacy test, which shall be applied to all immigrants. Our Nation has accepted as a fundamental principle that education enables the girl and boy to attain better development and to have better control over their own personal ability and powers. It has been our national purpose to eliminate from our country all illiteracy. It is therefore in accord with this general plan that we should establish the same requirements for foreign-born persons who desire to come and live in our country. It has been urged that this is not a perfect standard. Of course, no standard is perfect, but the literacy test is the most effective and practical. It has been claimed that our greatest criminals are often educated persons. These are, however, only conspicuous failures of education to achieve its desired ideal. Educated criminality is not the fault of education, but is the inherent fault or defect in the nature or the physical make-up of the individual. If it is urged that education tends to criminality it would seem the wisest course to remain in ignorance, a fallacy so patent that its mere statement carries with it its own repudiation. Education can not remedy all the inherent faults of human nature, but it is the greatest instrumentality for human development and betterment.

It has been urged against the literacy test that this standard would make many suffer because they had been denied opportunities. That may be true, but it is equally true that our Nation can not work out all of the problems of all other nations. We can not undertake to educate all of those to whom other countries deny educational opportunities. Each nation must undertake and solve its own educational problems. The adoption of the literacy test by our own country would have a tendency to force nations to establish more general educational opportunities for all of their people. It is only a half truth to say that the literacy test would close the gates of opportunity to illiterate foreigners. As a matter of fact there is very little opportunity for these people in our industrial centers. Usually they have been brought over here either by steamship and railroad companies and other greedy corporations, by employers, or as a result of collusion between these

groups. They have been brought over here for the purpose of exploitation, and until they develop powers of resistance and determination to secure things for themselves they have little opportunity here. These same qualities would secure for them within their own countries many of the advantages that later come to them here.

The section of the Burnett immigration bill which establishes the literacy test provides for no unfair requirements. It says:

"All aliens over 16 years of age physically capable of reading who can not read the English language or some other language or dialect, including Hebrew or Yiddish: *Provided*, That any admissible alien, or any alien heretofore or hereafter legally admitted, or any citizen of the United States, may bring in or send for his father or grandfather over 55 years of age, his wife, his mother, his grandmother, or his unmarried or widowed daughter, if otherwise admissible, whether such relative can read or not, and such relative shall be permitted to enter. That for the purpose of ascertaining whether aliens can read the immigrant inspectors shall be furnished with slips of uniform size, prepared under the direction of the Secretary of Labor, each containing not less than 30 nor more than 40 words in ordinary use, printed in plainly legible type in some one of the various languages or dialects of immigrants. Each alien may designate the particular language or dialect in which he desires the examination to be made, and shall be required to read the words printed on the slip in such language or dialect."

An attempt has been made to create the impression that the literacy test will close America as a haven of refuge to political refugees and those persecuted because of religious faith. That this is wholly unwarranted in fact is evident from the following portion of the proposed act:

"That the following classes of persons shall be exempt from the operation of the illiteracy test, to wit: All aliens who shall prove to the satisfaction of the proper immigration officer or to the Secretary of Labor that they are seeking admission to the United States to avoid religious persecution in the country of their last permanent residence, whether such persecution be evidenced by overt acts or by laws or by governmental regulations that discriminate against the alien or the race to which he belongs because of his religious faith: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall exclude, if otherwise admissible, persons convicted or who admit the commission or who teach and advocate the commission of an offense purely political."

The proposed legislation does not represent a radical change in the policy of our Nation. It is an extension of our educational policy, and is in harmony with the conviction that has been growing recently that we, as a nation, must leave our haphazard methods of development behind and inaugurate a definite sustained national policy that shall promote our best development and shall coordinate and organize all of the resources of our country and plan for their best utilization.

Opposition to the literacy test and to any proposition to restrict immigration has come from steamship companies, steel corporations, coal operators, and other employers whose financial interests were associated with the maintenance of large numbers of workers forced by their helplessness to work for low wages. The activities of these interests have been given a cloak of respectability by many who, for sentimental reasons, were unwilling to indorse any form of restriction of immigration. But selfish interest or sentiment that is contrary to the fundamental principles of national welfare can not frustrate efforts to promote the best interests of our Nation.

The meaning of America lies in the ideal she represents. That ideal is liberty and opportunity. But beautiful as any ideal may be, it becomes of practical value when it has effectiveness in the daily lives of men and women.

Real liberty and opportunity mean a certain mental attitude toward life, certain standards of life and work, and possession of that which secures the enjoyment of opportunities.

America the ideal—the land of the free—exists only when her people are Americans in all things.

Ours has been a most perilous task—to weld together those from other lands who have sought our shores and to make of them homogeneous people—a Nation with common ideals, common standards of living, a national language, and an ideal national patriotism.

The building of a nation is not a thing of chance; it is the result of statesmanship, knowledge of tendencies, a discernment of cause and effect, ability to distinguish the good from the evil.

Too long our national policies have been determined by sentimental emotions, business profits, and political expediency. But there must come a change. These months of terrible warfare have compelled a testing of things that have passed over. "The world is afire"; and we must put our own house in order lest we, too, be caught unawares. We must search out each weakness and strengthen every danger point.

The workers of America make the demand that there shall be restriction of immigration to such as can be readily identified and assimilated with Americans and can become truly American.

#### RAILROAD EMPLOYEES AND FARMERS FAVOR IMMIGRATION RESTRICTION.

Railroad train service employees and the millions of organized farmers have repeatedly declared for immigration restriction, and their representatives are cooperating with the American Federation of Labor to secure the enactment into law of the Burnett immigration bill.

Last January, when the House Committee on Immigration held public hearings on this measure, the American Federation of Labor was represented by Secretary Frank Morrison; the railroad men by Val Fitzpatrick, vice president and national legislative representative of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, and the organized farmers by J. H. Kimble, national legislative representative of the Farmers' National Congress.

Val Fitzpatrick also spoke on behalf of these legislative colleagues: H. E. Wills, assistant grand chief engineer, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers; P. J. McNamara, vice president Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen; W. M. Clark, Order of Railway Conductors.

The railway employees' spokesman referred to a resolution passed on November 20, 1915, at a meeting of the chief executives of the four railway brotherhoods, when it was "unanimously agreed that we indorse the bill on this subject (immigration restriction) approved by the American Federation of Labor." Mr. Fitzpatrick told the committee that "our members have no guaranty that they are going to remain as engineers, firemen, and brakemen," and that the railroads actually dismiss between 30,000 and 40,000 train service men, and these workers are forced to enter other industries, where wages are often reduced because of the large number of illiterates. The speaker read numerous resolutions passed by the various railroad brotherhoods in favor of immigration restriction and the literacy test.

Speaking for the organized farmers, J. H. Kimble denied that agriculturalists favor unlimited immigration. He said:

"The farmers' organizations—and I am an actual farmer and live on a farm and make a living out of a farm—are opposed to any attempt to distribute the present immigration until the laws are stiffened up. . . . There is no demand among the farmers of the country for aliens unable to speak our language or to read their own. A glance at the last annual report of the Bureau of Immigration, which, by the way, gives many reasons for adopting the Burnett bill, shows that very few 'farmers' are coming to this country. Out of a total immigration last year of 434,244 aliens only 9,215 were 'farmers,' and only 29,247 could be classed as 'farm laborers.' Very few 'farmers' or 'farm laborers' come to this country. That is one important reason why distribution of immigrants is a failure. Another reason is that the farmers do not want and can not use the bulk of the kind that comes."

"UN-AMERICAN" IS FAMILIAR PLEA OF REFORM LEGISLATION OPPONENTS.  
[Editorial in the Unpopular Review, January, 1916.]

The assertion that the literacy test is un-American is one which has been urged against many measures of social progress, and which can be employed against any proposition which involves departing from traditional methods or policies—in other words, which recognizes that the world moves and conditions change. When policemen were first introduced into the cities of the United States, the innovation was bitterly opposed on the ground that it was un-American and interfered with the natural rights of the individual. The "penalty clause" by which the cooperative farmers' elevators of the Middle West maintain themselves has been attacked as un-American by those whom it affects unfavorably.

It would seem hardly necessary to consider arguments of this type were they not propounded with so much frequency and earnestness and accepted with so much sobriety. Especially it seems extraordinary that a measure which asks that the foreigner should have the same training for citizenship or residence that we require of our own children should be called un-American. When we spend over half a billion dollars annually on our public schools, and then compel children born in this country to take advantage of them, is it illogical—not to say un-American—to say to the adult foreigner that he should have so much of an education as is indicated by the ability to read?

But it is asserted that an educational test would be un-American, because it would exclude aliens on the basis of opportunity, not of character. Illiteracy, it is maintained, is not a test of ability but of early opportunity. But a test based on opportunity is not un-American. For our immigration law already contains a number of tests which rest, in part at least, on opportunity. Such are the tests excluding paupers, those likely to become public charges, persons with contagious diseases, etc. In fact, when the individual immigrant appears before the inspector little can be gained by trying to separate those of his characteristics which are due to native ability from those which are traceable to environment. The man must be judged as he is on the grounds of his fitness.

In pursuance of the "un-American" argument, however, it is further pointed out that illiteracy can not reasonably be considered a test of fitness for American life, because this Nation was founded by illiterates, and that it has nevertheless done pretty well. The trouble with this argument is that it is not true, and that if it were, it proves too much. It might be said with equal cogency that this Nation was founded by men who made their living by slave labor in the South and the slave and rum trade in the North, and that therefore these good old institutions should have been preserved. All such arguments ignore the fact that the world has progressed during the past three centuries and that illiteracy stands for very different things now from what it did in the days of the Pilgrim fathers or of the Revolutionary heroes.

Another argument which proves too much is that produced so triumphantly and with so great effect in some such words as these: "This measure would keep out a great many people who would be very useful citizens. If it had been in force in earlier years, it would have kept out the mother of Abraham Lincoln, who signed her name with a cross." Certainly the literacy test would keep out some who would be useful. So do many, if not most, of the tests now in force. The futility of such arguments may be illustrated by another reductio ad absurdum. "Booker T. Washington was one of the most useful citizens of the United States. His ancestors on one side were brought over as negro slaves. Therefore it was a mistake to abolish the slave trade."

Such are the arguments of the opponents of the literacy test. Aside from these, their efforts are devoted to countering the claims of the opposite side, which, as has been shown, can be done successfully only with respect to the strictly and temporarily economic aspects—the building up of quick fortunes by questionable and probably dangerous means. There are those who do not regard this as an argument against the literacy test, but for it.

The matter can be rightly understood only by taking the broadest possible view of the relations, not of this generation alone but of the generations to come. The natural destiny of the United States is to be the leader of the nations into the fullest development of the common people. Our duty is to set standards, not to distribute the natural advantages we possess. We can not render our highest service to mankind by hastily and inconsiderately yielding to the demands of a specious humanitarianism and dissipating to-day what should be the heritage of future generations.

#### ONLY PRACTICAL TEST OFFERED.

The Toledo Blade, in these few words sums up the agitation for and against the Burnett immigration-restriction bill:

"The literacy test for immigrant has never been advertised as perfect. In operation, it would turn back many aliens who might become worthy citizens. But no other test that promises to restrict immigration in a practical way has been suggested.

"The advocates of this measure are trying only to slow down the stream of foreigners who for so many years poured through our gates. The opponents of the test do not offer a substitute. And for a very good reason. They are not really troubled, as they profess to be, by an occasional healthy and intelligent, though illiterate, alien being refused admittance. Their concern is lest the supply of cheap labor be restricted."

#### CHICAGO TRIBUNE STATES CASE.

The Chicago Tribune is one of the very few large newspapers in this country that is fearless enough to state the forces for and against the Burnett immigration bill. In an editorial, March 30, 1916, this paper said:

"The literacy test has just one purpose; that is, to reduce immigration into this country.

"Opposition to the literacy test has just one purpose—to prevent any limitation of immigration into this country.

"Proponents of the literacy test believe that the time has come when we must slow up the inrush of foreign blood in order to allow the Nation to assimilate the multitude of strange races now within its borders and in order to limit the competition of pauper labor, which is more and more bearing upon American-born workmen.

"Opponents of the literacy test desire a broader labor market or they desire to open the benefits of America to foreigners, let the consequences to Americans be what they may.

"People favoring the literacy test wish to reduce immigration into America. People opposing it wish an unrestricted flow of foreigners, literate or illiterate."

In its issue of March 27, 1916, the Chicago Daily Tribune had the following as its first and leading editorial:

#### CLOSE THE GATES.

Peace may not bring a new influx of aliens to America. Emigration from Europe may be checked by laws of the countries in need of workers or by the employment of workers at home at high wages.

But even if this prove to be true and war taxes or bitter experience do not drive men and women from the Old World to our shores, the tide may set in from other regions, and these are precisely the sources from which the least assimilable elements are drawn.

The part of common sense and common caution for us is to close our gates for a time. All thinking Americans have become conscious in recent years that the process of Americanization is much slower and more superficial than we have flattered ourselves it was. The amount of foreign nationalism, of unassimilated immigration, is disquietingly if not alarmingly large. It is time to prevent our national composition from being further diluted. It is time to concentrate on an undisturbed process of American nationalism.

There are no signs that the civilized world is entering a period of internationalism. The probabilities are rather that we are to find in the form of new and perhaps larger alliances an intensive nationalism and a more formidable international competition. If this be true we can not afford to be full of domestic divisions and internal distractions, the only clay pot in the stream. We shall need a robust nationalism, a strong unity against the world.

And there is another reason for closing the gates. If we are to enter a period of prosperity, the fruit of our own energy, restraint, and pacific temper, we want that prosperity to be distributed among our own people, among those who have cast their lot with us and contributed to our welfare.

On the other hand, if we are to meet, as many believe, a serious reaction, we do not want to divide our means with millions of aliens. We want what we have for our own people.

The Tribune believes the absolute restriction of immigration would check the consequences of a reaction after the war and insure a widespread prosperity. It would protect our own wage earners from the competition of cheap labor, insure good wages and the American standard of living, and thereby stimulate the home market and bring about the broadest prosperity. If in addition to this measure of patriotism we enact a wise system of commercial laws and provide an adequate naval and military defense, the United States will be virtually invulnerable.

[American Federation of Labor Weekly News Letter, Washington, D. C., Apr. 15, 1916.]

CLERIC-ECONOMIST FAVORS IMMIGRATION BILL—SAYS OPPONENTS ARE SELFISH AND SENTIMENTAL.

WASHINGTON, April 15.

Rev. John A. Ryan, D. D., formerly of Minnesota, but now professor of economics, Catholic University, this city, has declared in favor of the Burnett immigration bill. If this legislation is adopted by Congress, he says, "We shall have sufficient legislation to improve the quality, provide for assimilation, and protect the standard of life that is required for decent living."

Rev. Ryan's statement, which includes a history of immigration legislation, has been published by the weekly press service of the social service commission, American Federation of Catholic Societies, and is in part as follows:

"The lowered standard of living is the main justification for restriction, and it is probably the reason behind the greater part of the agitation. Between two-thirds and four-fifths of the adult males of the country receive less than \$750 a year, and real wages have declined from 10 to 15 per cent since 1890. The great majority of the new immigrants go into the unskilled industries, thereby overstocking the market for that kind of labor and bringing down wages. They do not become farmers, as so considerably occurred with the old immigration. The supply of unskilled labor should be reduced. The immigration commission was unanimous on this point.

"Among methods of restriction suggested are: The requirement of a contract enabling the immigrant to command living wages, the restriction of the arrivals from any country to a certain per cent of the average emigration from that country during the preceding period of 10 years, the division of the immigration countries in groups and the granting of the privilege of sending immigrants to only one group in one year, and the literacy test. The first three are difficult of administration, while the last was recommended by eight of the nine members of the Immigration Commission as the best single method of restriction. It would exclude about one-third.

"The opposition to restriction is sentimental or superficial or selfish. The sentimentalists want America to be kept a haven for the oppressed; but charity begins at home, and we want to keep it a genuine haven, instead of developing a proletariat, and we want to keep it an example of genuine democracy and of a better distribution of wealth than exists in Europe. Thus we can serve humanity better than by enabling a comparatively small proportion of the oppressed of Europe to better their condition very slightly.

"The superficial objectors find fault with the literacy test because it does not guarantee character, something that it was not meant to do. It is primarily a method of affecting quantity, not quality. Others denounce it as the outcome of bigotry, but this factor is relatively unimportant in the movement; besides, the device ought to be judged on its merits. It is regrettable that Catholics will not consider more the economic argument for restriction. Others object that the country needs to be developed. If that means that a large group will be worse off than before, the objection is baseless. All the rough work generally done by unskilled foreigners would be done by Americans if they were

paid sufficient wages. The immigration commission declared there is a constant oversupply of unskilled labor.

"The selfish persons are those who wish to increase production and profits through cheap labor at less than living wages. They would prefer Chinese and Japanese laborers if they could get them. They do not deserve serious consideration."

[American Federation of Labor Weekly News Letter, May 6, 1916.]  
LITERACY OPPOSITIONS CONTINUE ALARM CRY.

TOLEDO, OHIO, April 29.

Under the caption "Still harping on the literacy test," the Evening Blade expresses these editorial views on the Burnett immigration bill now pending in the Senate:

"A number of persons in excellent vocal condition continue to be exercised over the literacy test of the immigration bill. The faults and flaws they find in it are simply amazing. If an earnest-minded citizen confined his reading to these criticisms he would become convinced that this test must be eliminated or the Republic will perish.

"The Immigration Commission, which first made a study of ways to restrict the human flood from Europe, voted 8 to 1 for the literacy test, because it was the only practical method suggested to it. One proposal was that the emigration from any one country should in a single year be confined to a certain percentage of the 10-year average emigration of the country. Another proposal was that immigration be controlled as to groups. In any one year, only a single group should have the privilege of entering the country. There was still another idea, that a contract be required guaranteeing the immigrant's ability to earn a living wage. Plainly, some of the restrictions could not be applied. The commission had to accept the literacy test as the one thing that could be administered day after day without doing grave injustice, conflicting with laws and treaties, and raising the business of examining immigrants to the dimensions of flourishing munitions plants.

"Once the immigration bill is passed and becomes operative, we will hear little more about the shortcomings and oppressions of the literacy test. The agitation has been conducted mostly by people who saw in this test a threatened shortage of cheap labor, an increase in living standards which would make a low standard of wages no longer possible."

[From the Cleveland Press, Cleveland, Ohio, May 16, 1916.]

#### IMMIGRATION.

This newspaper stands for the further restriction of immigration. Hence we favor the bill now in Congress providing for a literacy test. We have many and important reasons for including this policy in our declaration of principles. We favor restriction, in the first place, for the sake of the immigrant himself who is brought in most cases from a life of lowly simplicity in his native land to a life of deadly isolation, exploitation, and degradation in this country.

Millions of these people are herded to-day in smoke and soot-swept settlements and insanitary slums where, shunned, lonesome, and abused, they learn nothing whatever of the land of their so-called adoption—learn rather to hate it because of the miseries they are compelled to suffer by those who exploit them. It was once America's proud boast that this country was the haven of the poor and oppressed. The evidence is clear and conclusive that the peasant who is poor and oppressed in Europe is still further impoverished and oppressed when, having fled, he finds himself in this haven of his dreams.

We hold that this Nation has not assimilated the thirteen millions odd of immigrants who have landed on our shores since the opening of this century, and that it is high time now to call a halt upon further immigration until we shall have taken this great mass of humanity to our hearts, cheered them with our interest, educated them to our national ideals and made them Americans who will love, and die if need be, for the Nation which has really lifted them from poverty and freed them from oppression. We insist that this process of valid absorption is one of the prime necessities in the making of a new and united American Nation.

We, too, believe, with organized labor, that the practically unrestricted immigration of the past 15 years has been unfair to the working people of this country. The competition of a million new arrivals every year, in addition to the natural native increase of hands that work, was too great.

The entire advantage was with capital—often heartless, ruthless capital. The almost complete cessation of immigration since the beginning of the war has been a double-edged revelation to the American workman and to those thoughtful citizens who have viewed with anxiety the increasingly serious labor problem in our land. Unemployment has passed. Wages have increased. Working people are more prosperous, their families more comfortable. And, mark this: Although immigration was suspended and the working population was decreased by the half million who returned to Europe to fight, production increased beyond all records, as shown by the official figures of our exports and domestic consumption. Does this not prove that well-paid, regularly employed labor, unhampered by competition flowing from abroad, is a greater producer of national wealth than dissatisfied labor, working half time and suffering from undue competition?

Have we not also the proof before us that a population of 100,000,000 can provide in the natural human increase all the labor needed for the work to be done?

Thus restriction of immigration promises better citizens of our foreign-born, more prosperous, and more contented citizens in our great working classes, better homes, a stronger people in body and mind, greater production of wealth, all of which will combine to cement us into a Nation strong for health and country and willing and quick to defend both when the occasion demands.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I will state to the gentleman from Tennessee that I would prefer to speak a little later, after I have heard further debate, to get a better conception of the amendment.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. SULLOWAY].

Mr. SULLOWAY. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me there have been conversions here during this discussion more sudden than St. Paul's by far. I want to say to the Members of this House

that there is but one navy yard in the United States that has 40 feet of water at all times, and that there has never been a penny expended for dredging at that yard and there never will need to be. I refer to the one at Portsmouth, N. H. The yards named here to be equipped for the purpose of building battle-ships are all subject to dredging, and this bill carries an appropriation of \$327,000 for that purpose for the next fiscal year.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SULLOWAY. Certainly.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. My friend is mistaken in respect to the Bremerton yard. We have no dredging there. We have 60 feet of water.

Mr. SULLOWAY. That is the Puget Sound yard?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes.

Mr. SULLOWAY. If the gentleman will look at the bill, he will find that there is an appropriation of \$15,000 or \$25,000, I forget which, to continue dredging there.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. That is the approach to the dock.

Mr. SULLOWAY. I do not know what it is or what excuse there is for it, but I am taking the bill as it is before us to-day. If the approaches to the dock have but 24 feet of water, as Admiral Stanford stated on page 23 of the hearings, that is the controlling depth, no matter what depth at the dock, but 17 feet less than at Portsmouth. That is true also of every navy yard except the Portsmouth yard, and the appropriations for dredging have mounted to millions upon millions. Admiral Stanford, constructor of yards and docks, has said it would be necessary to continue dredging at all these yards, as they have done in the past. Portsmouth is admitted to be the best yard under our flag and in the United States. There are 40 feet of water there at low tide. A captain can take his craft up that channel without tugging, without pilots, by night or by day. There is no other yard that has that depth of water. On page 27 of the hearings gentlemen will find the different depths of water in each of these yards, and I will put the data in the RECORD. There is not another one that comes within 5 feet of it in depth. There is to-day a dock there of precisely the same size as the one at Boston. They were twins. Gov. McCall and myself were sort of accouching angels at their birth. They were born at the same time and in the same bill. In each of those docks was sufficient room at the time they were authorized to hold any ship constructed or contemplated. It is a remarkable yard. Above it a short distance, not half a mile, is what is known as Great Bay, and within that bay there are thousands and thousands of acres of water from 60 to 100 feet deep.

The navies of the world could swing at anchor and there would not be any such danger of collision as happens in most all of the other yards by ships coming from the sea or going out to it, because it would be at the end of navigation. It is above and beyond the docks. Take, for instance, a yard like Mare Island, with 22 or 23 feet of water, where they are dredging all of the time, with large appropriations for that purpose, and I am not talking against that yard with a view to undoing it. I am stating it as a matter of fact in order that gentlemen of the House may know what they are doing when they locate shipbuilding plants in yards like that, where they have to be dredged perpetually, and then refuse to give to a yard at Portsmouth the same privilege, where dredging will never be needed. The channel is worn and the dock is cut and chiseled out of the solid granite.

Why is the Portsmouth yard excluded from the list of yards on the Atlantic coast by the proposed amendment of the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs? Shot in here like a flash of lightning from a clear sky, authorizing the Secretary of the Navy in his discretion to equip certain yards to construct capital ships; never considered by the committee, and by means of the most vicious and infernal gag rule ever presented to a legislative body I am limited to a few minutes to oppose it or to urge that the Portsmouth yard be included in the list.

The answer is patent. No Secretary of the Navy—not even the Hon. George von L. Meyer—would dare refuse to put the Portsmouth yard first on the list, by reason of its superior natural advantages over all other yards. This gag-rule, snapshot legislation will end on March 4, 1917, thank God. And the people will join with Dr. Watts in singing:

Believing, we rejoice to see the curse depart.

[Applause.]

We are in greater need of larger docks than of battleships. Early in this session I introduced a bill that went to the Committee on Naval Affairs, authorizing the construction of a dock at the Portsmouth yard, and I now have an amendment to this bill filed at the Clerk's desk that can never be reached under this gag rule, which prohibits in its working the consideration



of amendments other than those proposed by the 21 members of the Committee on Naval Affairs. More than 400 Members of the House are absolutely denied hearing on matters of great importance to their constituents and, but for this rule, would be able to have the right to be heard in their behalf.

My amendment reads as follows:

On page 20, line 16, after the figures "\$3,000," insert "dry dock—limit of cost not exceeding \$3,500,000—in all, \$3,503,000."

Permit me to quote Rear Admiral H. R. Stanford, Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, in his testimony before the Committee on Naval Affairs, where he gives the depth of water at the several yards and the necessity for big docks—the man who for years has been at the head of said bureau.

The Mare Island yard furnishes a sample illustration of the expense of dredging and the results obtained in muddy-bottom straits, rivers, and channels. On page 48 Admiral Stanford said that yard was located in the early fifties, and at that time there was 40 or 50 feet of water in the straits. On page 30 it appears that \$20,000,000 have been expended on that yard; that not one of the battleships built in the last eight years can get in. And on page 27 it appears that the controlling depth now is but 22 feet, with a continual expenditure of money to the amount of \$20,000,000, and the loss of from 18 to 28 feet in depth of water in the straits. And this bill provides \$50,000 for dikes and dredging for the next fiscal year at that yard.

The dock at Charleston, S. C., is still more fortunate. This bill provides \$187,000 for dredging and opening a channel to that dock where the controlling depth of water is 22 feet.

On page 95 Admiral Stanford said:

At this stage of our naval development the construction of additional docks and battleship piers is as essential as the building of the ships. I think our need for large dry docks and deep-water piers equipment for hauling heavy weights is most urgent, both south and north of Hatteras.

Question by Mr. KELLEY:

Would not an expenditure of \$15,000,000 in dry docks, piers, wall extension in our various naval stations do more in promoting the efficiency of the fleet than the addition of a single battleship?

The Admiral's answer was:

It's hardly a fair question to put to me.

Page 96:

I did say that my personal view is that the need for big dry docks is most urgent of the Navy ashore.

On page 90 the Admiral said:

During the past few years the appropriations for yards and docks improvements have been greatly reduced and curtailed, so that there is a very great need for more docks.

On page 90 Admiral Stanford said:

In 1913 there was expended, approximately, for yards and docks \$9,000,000. During the past year something over \$7,000,000.

On page 91:

It is safe to say that appropriations for yards and docks, for several years to come, will be from \$7,500,000 to \$10,000,000 to develop the additional dry docks that are needed.

On page 97:

I think for the last three or four years, ever since the construction of our superdreadnaughts, we have needed these additional docks.

On page 50:

We have but three dry docks that will admit the 13 ships built, building, or authorized, and the program if carried out will give us 29 of these capital ships and only four docks that will hold them. The department recognizes the need of more big docks to be built at other yards.

On page 41:

The General Board has recommended that we should have 40 feet of water at all the principal yards.

On pages 90 and 91:

Dredging will be required from time to time in every yard we have, excepting Portsmouth and Puget Sound.

On page 99:

There is dependable deep water at the Portsmouth yard, as I stated two or three days ago. The reason I did not refer to that yard particularly is because it is not fitted with a dock large enough to dock a superdreadnaught.

No harbor on the Atlantic coast possesses the depth of water, the natural advantages, the wonderful channel, that never requires dredging, that is so free from sand, silt, and mud, up which a battleship or a dreadnaught can wend its way in high tide and low tide, as the one at Portsmouth, N. H. Worn out of solid rock, with a width practically equal to any channel on the Atlantic coast, with a bottom as smooth as a floor, this great waterway has a controlling depth of 40 feet, sufficient to sail any vessel afloat or under construction, without waiting for favorable conditions or depending upon Omnipotence to provide sufficient waters through the instrumentality of the tides to get a great ship to its dock.

From the birth of this Republic to the present moment Portsmouth has been famous as a shipbuilding center. But it is not on the glorious past of this famous old seaboard city that I would dwell, but upon its great possibilities at this time, when we, as well as all of the people of the earth, are confronted with great questions of proper and adequate preparedness, and when we are called upon to take account of stock, to look over our advantages and our opportunities for national safety and national security. The protection of home and the protection of our liberties and our Government are solemn duties that we must meet, not with hysteria but with calmness, sanity, and judgment. Proper protection is the greatest element of national safety.

No navy yard in the country is so admirably situated as the one at Portsmouth, N. H. Not only does it have the deepest waterway, 40 feet at controlling depth, but is the most defensible harbor on the Atlantic coast. Situated 10 miles at sea from Portsmouth, absolutely commanding the harbor, are the Isles of Shoals, a series of islands which could be fortified and which not only would command Portsmouth Harbor, but also the coast for miles, both north and south. At Portsmouth the opportunity for development is greater than in any other yard in this country. Available land can be bought at prices per acre that in some of the great cities where navy yards are located would be sold by the foot at fabulous prices.

The opportunity for additional dry docks is unsurpassed anywhere for the reason that the natural advantages of the soil make it a natural location for these great resting places for our ships. The great dry dock constructed some years ago, which at that time would take the largest ship of our Navy, would have contained a ship before a single bit of masonry was placed in it. The great basin for this dock was cut out of the solid rock. There has never been a dump cart full of mud or sand washed into it or its approaches from the ocean since it was constructed. It never requires dredging to get ships in, and when a dock is once completed here, outside of the natural wear and tear, there would never be any artificial repairs necessary by the working of the elements that have to be met. Nature provided everything essential at Portsmouth for the greatest naval station in the world. Climatically it possesses advantages unexcelled by any place where a navy yard or a naval station is located in this country.

From a labor standpoint it means much to the thousands of men employed in the way of cheap rents and a desirable place to live. It has tremendous advantages in this respect over the yards in the great cities. There are opportunities there for men to own their homes at a modest price and within the reach of their pay envelope. This means contented workmen, the keeping of skilled labor, for whenever a workman accumulates enough to build him a home he settles down there usually to spend his days. As a great economic proposition, both to the Government and to the employees, Portsmouth offers wonderful advantages, which any private business concern in the country would seize upon as a great asset.

While cities and places where other naval yards are clamoring year after year for appropriations for dredging to keep the channels of their harbors open so that present-day shipping may dock in safety Portsmouth has deep enough water to safely float our big ships at any hour of the night or day. Every navigation expert who appeared before the House Naval Committee admitted on questioning that Portsmouth had an abundance of water. It was freely stated that this was the only harbor on the Atlantic coast where water conditions are perfect, and, with the single exception of Puget Sound, the only place on either coast.

Much of the expert testimony before the Naval Committee favored new and additional docking facilities, and it was frankly admitted that there would be practically no dry-dock facilities for our big ships of the future when we get them constructed. It is not in line with wisdom or good judgment to construct great and expensive dreadnaughts with no place to repair and dock them, neither is it a wise business policy to expend money for great dry docks in places where the water is not of sufficient depth to get a great vessel of the future into it when it is constructed.

There is no question about Portsmouth, for the water is there now. It is not a gamble or an experiment, but a reality. The cold facts are there, and they are indisputable. Portsmouth has suffered in the past, I regret to say, because it lacked some of the social advantages of Boston, New York, and Norfolk. Unfair and untrue criticisms of the yard have been made by men who placed the pink tea above efficiency; but in spite of this the yard, which 20 years ago, when I came to Congress, was about ready to be abandoned, has been improved, developed, and brought to

a standard that now compels it to be recognized as one of the great yards of the country.

Sentiment, favoritism, and the popularity of its location have not entered into its present high standing. It has come to the front in spite of official handicapping and backbiting, and purely upon its merits and because of its unquestioned natural advantages. Notwithstanding talk of its abandonment from certain sources in times past, it has continued to grow and develop, and will continue to grow and develop until it ranks second to none in this country.

This yard has been designated as a submarine base by the present administration, which was the very least that could be done. The workmen at that yard are to-day constructing undersea craft, but that is only a small part of the work that should be done there. With land already owned by the Government, with much more that is available, the work of the yard must and will be enlarged to meet the natural requirements and the demands of the times. This Congress may not see fit to rise to the occasion and place in the greatest and deepest waterway on the Atlantic coast a great dry dock to meet all the requirements of the future but there are other Congresses coming which will not be so blind to the wonderful opportunities of Portsmouth, and circumstances and demands of the future will absolutely require the greater development of this natural naval base, making it sufficient to meet any emergency and to be properly equipped for any line of naval construction.

Another novel feature of the Portsmouth Harbor is Great Bay, a large body of water up the river from the navy yard, which is of sufficient size and depth, having 100 feet of water in many places, to anchor the navies of the world. This could be made available with a comparatively reasonable expense and at a cost not in excess of many recent river and harbor improvements in various sections of the country. With the development of Great Bay, a naval base and anchorage could be secured that would be far superior to the one at Hampton Roads and other places, because it would be away from the main channel of traffic and there would be absolutely no danger of collisions and accidents by vessels passing to and from the ocean.

Portsmouth has been the scene of the visits of many of the large ships of our Navy of the past, and there are no records of them going aground, as has often happened in the case of some of the other harbors where navy yards are located. Vessels have to come to anchorage at the yard after coming up the harbor under their own steam and without assistance of tugs. The removal of Hendersons Point some years ago took away the only difficulty to navigation that existed and made Portsmouth Harbor and the navy yard dry dock safe and easy of access, a harbor that never freezes in winter and which possesses at all times ample and abundant water to ship any vessel that floats.

Admiral Stanford, Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, in the hearings before the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House said:

There is dependable deep water at the Portsmouth yard. There is difficulty of getting into the New York yard at times. At some times it will happen that you have to lay outside the San Francisco Harbor before entering on account of sea and fog. There is also difficulty in getting over the bar at times at San Francisco. The Philadelphia Navy Yard is 90 miles from the Capes, and there is a portion of the river between these two points which under certain tidal conditions would barely pass our largest vessels. At the Norfolk yard dredging is required in the river in front of the yard and also a widening of the channel is required. It is my impression that Charleston, S. C., can only be entered under favorable conditions. There is good water leading up to the Boston yard.

Speaking further on this same subject, Admiral Stanford said:

At the Portsmouth yard the controlling depth of the water is 40 feet, the controlling width 500 feet, and the range of the tide 7.8 feet. At Boston the controlling depth is 35 feet, the width of the channel 540 feet, and the tidal change is 9.6. At New York the controlling depth is 31 feet, the controlling width of channel is 450 feet, and the mean rise and fall of the tide is 4.2 feet. At Philadelphia the controlling depth is 30 feet, the controlling width from the yard to the sea is 600 feet, and the tidal change is 5.9 feet. At Norfolk the controlling depth is 35 feet, the controlling width is 450 feet, and the mean rise and fall of the tide is 2.8. At Charleston, S. C., the controlling depth is 22 feet, the width of channel is 300 feet, and the mean rise and fall of the tide is 5.2.

This goes to show that of all harbors on the Atlantic coast used for naval purposes Portsmouth has the greatest depth of water. Admiral Stanford also stated that periodical dredging was absolutely necessary at Boston, New York, and Norfolk. This is something that is never necessary at Portsmouth.

To give the country some idea of the cost of dredging in the approaches to the navy yards of this country, let me quote from the present bill. This measure we are now here considering carries \$337,000 for the coming fiscal year. It is divided up as follows: Navy yard, Boston, dredging, \$10,000; navy yard, New York, to continue dredging, \$50,000; navy yard, Philadelphia, to continue dredging, \$25,000; navy yard, Charleston, S. C., to continue dredging, \$12,000; dredging Cooper River, approach

to navy yard, Charleston, S. C., \$175,000; navy yard, Mare Island, Cal., maintenance of dikes and dredging, \$50,000; navy yard, Puget Sound, Wash., to continue dredging, \$15,000. Continually sums aggregating millions have been appropriated during the past decade to keep these harbors of the navy yards of this country open to navigation, on account of the constant filling of the channels with mud, sand, and silt, and for the purpose of getting a deeper waterway. But at Portsmouth it has never been necessary to make these constant appropriations. The depth of the water has been there from time immemorial and will remain as long as the world exists.

Admiral Stanford, in the hearings before the Naval Affairs Committee, pointed out the great need for docks. He stated in his testimony that during the past few years there had been a great curtailment in the amount of appropriations for this purpose. He said:

My personal view is that more dry docks are most urgent. Ever since we began the construction of the superdreadnaughts we have needed these additional docks.

The Admiral was asked by Representative BUTLER of Pennsylvania, a member of the committee, this question: "Would we not be in a bad mess if we should have war now for lack of docking facilities?" "I think so; yes," replied the Admiral.

Admiral Stanford made the astounding admission before the Naval Committee that we have but three dry docks on both the Atlantic and the Pacific coasts that will admit the 13 ships constructed, under construction, or authorized; and if the present program is carried out, it will give us 29 of these capital ships and only three dry docks in the United States navy yards which will hold them. Two of these are located on the Atlantic coast—one at Norfolk, one at New York—the other being at Bremerton, on the Pacific coast. None of these docks are large enough to hold the fast cruisers that are contemplated under the provisions of this bill.

With these indisputable facts in view, with this country embarking upon a program to place its Navy on a footing that will guarantee us national security and national safety, with a view to developing a proper coast defense that will insure the peace and happiness of our people, I appeal to the good judgment and the common sense of this House to place some of these great improvements and means of national defense where nature has given us the greatest advantages and the deepest harbor anywhere on the coast of our great country. In this time of a crying demand for additional docks, the place to put them is where, when they are completed, ships can be brought to them in safety, where the Almighty has already constructed the channel, and where sufficient water exists to-day, without the use of a dredge, to float in safety the mightiest ship within the conception of man. This place is at Portsmouth, in the district which I have the honor to represent.

Let no one think in anything I have said I have thought to belittle any of our navy yards. Far from it; for I am in favor of developing all of them. But in future construction I believe it to be a patriotic duty to build and improve them where nature has ordained they should be. [Applause.]

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I dislike to voice a discordant note in this family arrangement of providing for all of the yards from Portsmouth on the Atlantic to New Orleans on the Gulf and from Puget Sound on the north down to the other extreme. I think we are going very fast, indeed, when we authorize, even in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy, the equipment of yards confessedly unsuited for building programs, such as those at New Orleans, Charleston, and other places, under the guise of naval necessity. This bill is fast becoming a public-building bill rather than a naval bill. Yesterday you voted in favor of an ultimate \$20,000,000 Government armor-plate project, when there are sufficient existing plants to furnish armor at cost, and with the completion of this 20,000-ton armor-plate plant the result will be that it will drive the private concerns out of business, because there will not be enough armor contracted for to warrant their continuing in existence. You also have in this bill a provision for the establishment of a plant for the manufacture of projectiles, and now under the guise of naval necessity, which, if carried out, will involve this Government to the extent of millions and millions of dollars—not six millions or seven millions, but hundreds of millions of dollars—it is proposed to equip these yards for shipbuilding purposes, this to be done at so-called navy yards which Secretaries of the Navy in times past have condemned as unfit for navy-yard purposes. Where is this trend, this wild rage of Democratic extravagance, going to end? The bill which was brought in here involving two hundred and

sixty-odd millions will leave us ultimately carrying millions beyond that.

But it takes something more than mere buildings to make a proper shipbuilding yard. The Government can order the buildings, but it will take time.

A shipyard that was constituted to repair ships has not the necessary foundries, has not the machine shops, and above all else has not the necessary organization of men that will be required to make it an efficient shipbuilding concern. There is no consideration in this family arrangement of the Government interests. There is no hope of defeating it when you bring in here an omnibus public building bill.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. For a short question.

Mr. CRAMTON. Does the gentleman mean to insinuate that there can be such a thing as "pork" in preparedness?

Mr. STAFFORD. Far be it for me to insinuate something that is so patent. So, Mr. Chairman, you are taking away from the Secretary of the Navy the right to determine where these ships in case of necessity can be properly built. Those who wish to get an advantage for yards in their districts by having them created into a large shipbuilding plant are objecting to an obvious business proposal offered by the gentleman from California to equip the New York Yard and the Mare Island Yard, which to-day are the only two yards in the country that have the necessary equipment and the necessary organization to build these capital ships. They are objecting to that because they fear that it will be trenching on their own private preserves, to get, what—not "pork" but "pie." Such a policy can not be too severely criticized when under the guise of naval preparation you are trying to take away from private shipbuilding yards the building of ships that can be more economically and more expeditiously built than in Government yards lacking the material for large shipbuilding purposes. If we are ever going to have a merchant marine, the private yards should be encouraged with construction of naval vessels so long as their prices are fair and right.

We are going wild in our haste to make a showing. Without any investigation as to the fitness of these yards you are directing their conversion into shipbuilding plants upon the ipse dixit of local representatives. When once navy yards are equipped, the hue and cry from local interests will demand their employment regardless of cost or need.

The proposed policy is Government ownership run wild with only combination of local interests to support it. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VARE].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VARE].

Mr. VARE. I ask that the Clerk read the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT].

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the amendment.

The Clerk read the amendment, as follows:

Page 100, following the amendment inserted after line 9, insert the following:

"In the event the Secretary of the Navy is unable to secure from the shipbuilders contracts for the expeditious construction of the ships herein authorized at a fair and reasonable price, the sum of \$6,000,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated to enable the Secretary of the Navy to equip the navy yards at Puget Sound, Philadelphia, Norfolk, Boston, Portsmouth, Charleston, and New Orleans, with suitable and necessary machinery, implements, building ways, and equipment for the construction of such of the ships herein authorized as may be assigned to such yard for construction."

Mr. VARE. Mr. Chairman, I would much prefer that the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] had provided \$6,000,000 without any condition; but, however, I find as it is it is a step in the right direction, namely, to give the Secretary of the Navy the discretion to further equip the yards of the country which he regards as efficient.

During the discussion a few moments ago the question arose as to which were the superior, the governmental or private shipbuilding plants. That recalled to my mind an incident that occurred on the floor of this House two years ago. There had been bids invited by the Secretary of the Navy from the various private shipbuilding yards for a transport, since called the *Henderson*, which is being constructed at the Philadelphia Navy Yard. Bids were received from these private shipbuilding yards of the country, and the lowest private shipbuilding bid was from the Newport News Shipbuilding Co., which bid was \$1,725,000.

The Secretary of the Navy thought that the bids were excessive. He then invited Government yards to send in estimates. The Philadelphia Navy Yard furnished the lowest estimate, and that estimate was \$1,405,000, as against \$1,725,000. It was said at the time by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES], who represents the district in which the Newport News Shipbuilding Co. is located, that that company's bid was backed up by a bond. On the other hand, I said that this was a business proposition, and I had such confidence in the ability of the estimating board of the Philadelphia Navy Yard that I would be willing to back up the estimate of the Philadelphia Navy Yard by my personal bond. There was a difference of \$319,930 between those two propositions.

Mr. LOUD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VARE. With pleasure.

Mr. LOUD. Did the Philadelphia bid include insurance, overhead charges, depreciation, and all other incidentals that attach to a private yard?

Mr. VARE. I will come to that in a moment. I report to this Congress to-day that this transport will be launched this month, and that instead of saving more than \$200,000, which I then predicted, it will save \$400,000 beyond all overhead charges and insurance. [Applause.]

And so it is that I welcome the proposition that the chairman of the committee makes, that the yards of the country be placed upon a competitive basis, and I am quite sure that the great mass of laboring people of Philadelphia will do likewise. I would prefer there be no conditions prescribed in the amendment. I want to say to the Members of the House that I am not one of those who believe in governmental ownership. I do, however, believe that these Government plants ought to be so well equipped as not only to be efficient in order to determine what is a reasonable price in battleship construction, but they ought to be well equipped at all times to meet all emergencies. [Applause.]

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CURRY].

Mr. CURRY. Mr. Chairman, if the ships provided for in this bill are to be constructed within the time limit, they will have to be constructed in the Government navy yards. You will not receive a bid from a private yard for the construction of one of these ships. At the present time every private yard in the United States has already contracts for the construction of all the ships they can build within the next three years. At the present time there are 368 ships being constructed and construction ordered at these private yards. More than 300 of them are large ships for use in the overseas trade. It will take at least three years to construct those ships, and under the circumstances the battle cruisers and the other ships provided for in this bill, and ships that will be provided for at the next session of Congress, will have to be constructed in the navy yards of the United States. But two of those navy yards at the present time are equipped to construct a battleship, the one at New York and the one at Mare Island. Now, I hope that the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee, as amended by the gentleman from California, my colleague, Mr. NOLAN, will be adopted. That will provide \$7,000,000 to be used in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy for the equipment of all the navy yards in the United States. Mare Island and New York will need more equipment than they have if they are assigned other ships to build than are assigned to them to-day, and it is right and proper that part of this money should be used in the further equipment of those two yards. I am glad there is a disposition in this House to equip the navy yard at Bremerton. There ought to be two first-class yards on the Pacific coast, fully equipped to do the work of the Navy.

Our friend from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] has year after year and year after year tried to impress upon this House the absolute necessity for equipping the Bremerton Yard. All that has been done for that yard has been done by the Congress through his efforts. If Bremerton is equipped every Member of this House knows it will be due to the efforts of Mr. HUMPHREY, who has worked hard and persistently for the adequate equipment of that yard. He has appeared before the Committee on Naval Affairs and has told you on the floor of the House what ought to be done for Bremerton and for Mare Island, the two yards on the Pacific coast. I feel certain that the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee as amended by my colleague will be accepted by the gentleman from Tennessee and adopted by the House, and that the \$7,000,000 will be provided for the absolutely necessary equipment of the navy yards if this building program is put through.

I wish to call the attention of the committee to the fact that Mare Island has an organization that is unexcelled in efficiency. She always turns out first-class work within the estimate and

time limit and has never been compelled to ask for a deficiency on any job that has been assigned to her.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, did the gentleman consume all his time?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman consumed four minutes.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. How much time has that side remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. Four minutes remaining.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield four minutes of that time to the gentleman from California [Mr. STEPHENS].

Mr. STEPHENS of California. Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to the fact that construction in Government navy yards is sometimes cheaper than in private yards, and as an illustration of that, the bid of the Mare Island Navy Yard for the battleship *California* was \$245,000 less than the bid of any private yard, and that bid, although \$245,000 less than any private yard, included \$500,000 with which to extend the building ways in Mare Island Navy Yard for the building of that and other capital ships. In addition to that it included the furnishing of a number of items for the *California* which private yards excluded from their bids. And the Mare Island Navy Yard, on the Pacific coast, has never yet exceeded its estimates nor the time in which it said it would construct a ship. The Mare Island Navy Yard has proven its character and capability.

Mr. Chairman, at least four of the Government navy yards on the Atlantic coast, as well as the Puget Sound and Mare Island Navy Yards, on the Pacific, should be equipped for largest construction, and especially so when the private yards are unable to meet the requirements of the Government. If ever this Nation engages in naval warfare on the Pacific Ocean we shall need both navy yards there for both repair and construction. Mare Island Yard is now being equipped for the construction of capital ships and the Puget Sound Yard should be similarly equipped at the earliest day possible. I think the amendment proposed is a perfectly proper one and should be adopted. [Applause.]

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the chairman of the committee occupy some of his time.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HOLLAND].

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say that I am heartily in favor of this amendment. Under present conditions I believe any scheme of preparedness is absolutely useless which does not, in addition to authorizing battleships, provide the several yards with the facilities necessary for building them.

I ask unanimous consent for permission to extend my remarks in the Record.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am well acquainted with the navy yard at Bremerton, know its highly favored location and the present state of its equipment. I know also of the comparative ease with which it can be further equipped for the complete construction of first-class ships. I hope that soon some of the vessels authorized last year, and others now being authorized for the Navy, may be constructed in that yard.

Under the provisions of the amendment about to be voted on, I believe that ships will soon be on the ways at Bremerton. The needs of this yard have been well presented to the committee during its hearings by my colleague Representative HUMPHREY, in whose district the yards lie, and by all of the Members of the delegation from the State of Washington. The people of Bremerton, too, have been active and alive to the matter. They are to be complimented on having sent to Washington my old friend and acquaintance, Mr. J. E. Barnes, with a mass of facts which are not to be controverted. The people of Bremerton do not ask for favors for their yard; they ask that its capacity be utilized. I believe the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] will solve the situation. I shall not take the time of the committee further.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. NOLAN].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment here which I wish to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 24, strike out all of lines 14 to 25, inclusive, and, on page 25, strike out all of lines 1 to 7, inclusive. Insert in lieu of the matter stricken out the following:

"Beginning at a point marked by a concrete monument at the southeast corner of the land acquired by the United States from the John Li estate through condemnation proceedings, which point has the coordinates 230.1 feet south and 87.2 feet west from 'Ford No. 5' (Ford No. 5 being marked by a galvanized pipe in a concrete monument stamped 'U. S. 1911,' established by the United States district engineer office, and having coordinates 8,570.99 feet south and 10,087.64 feet west from the Ewa Territorial triangulation station); thence north 23° 12' east 177 feet, more or less; thence north 16° 0' east 66 feet, more or less, to a point on the shore line at high-water mark; thence southerly along high-water mark to a point marked by a concrete monument that is, with reference to the point of beginning, south 51° 0' east 70 feet, more or less, the southwesterly boundary of the said tract being formed by the line joining said last-mentioned point on the high-water line with the point of beginning."

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, this is to correct the description of a piece of land. The War Department first furnished the boundaries, and they were inaccurate. They have since notified the Secretary of the Navy of the correct boundaries, as set out in this amendment. It is to exchange the two tracts of land between the two departments. The Navy Department has a small tract of land that the War Department had use for, and the War Department had another small tract that the Navy Department had use for, and it is just authorizing the departments to exchange the use.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee offers a further amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. PADGETT: Page 76, after line 19, insert as a new paragraph:

"The sum of \$340,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated for a test of the Neff system of propulsion in such submarine as the Secretary of the Navy may designate for the purpose. Provided, That should the system prove unsuitable for use in submarines one-half the cost of the equipment shall be borne by the Government and one-half by the owners of the Neff system, and that if any part of the system is considered desirable for retention its value, previously agreed upon, shall be deducted from the cost of the equipment in determining the cost of the experiment to be borne by each party to the contract."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to make this statement. I have a letter from the Secretary of the Navy that is dated March 10 that I will ask the Clerk to read in a moment.

This matter was considered before the Committee on Naval Affairs, and a number of naval officers testified in regard to it; and I believe that every officer who testified stated that there were three military objections to the proposed engine, which, in their opinion, were almost insuperable. That is the way they expressed it. They expressed themselves very strongly against it.

The effort is to secure an oil internal-combustion engine to operate, submerged, by the use of compressed air. It would be very desirable indeed to secure that if possible. There are many objections and shortcomings to the battery system that we have in our submarines, both in the lead battery that is installed in our submarines and also to the Edison battery, from which we had an explosion, as you will remember, a short time ago in the New York yard, when five men, I believe, were killed, and eight or nine were injured. If it is possible to secure an engine that will operate by combustion of oil to propel the submarines when submerged, it would be a very desirable thing and a very great addition to the usefulness of the submarines. But the naval officers stated to the committee that when the engine was operating submerged, the air used in the combustion of the oil being discharged into the air would produce a wake of air bubbles that would disclose the presence and the trace of the submarine. They gave it as their opinion that that would be a very great objection, and if there was no way of overcoming that it would destroy the usefulness of the engine, because the wake, disclosing the track of the submarine, would destroy the utility of the submarine by making its whereabouts known. The owners of this system insist that the air is discharged in such a way and in such a position with reference to the propeller blades that it is churned up so in the water that it will not produce a wake. That, however, has never been demonstrated, and there is that conflict of claims.

Another claim is that in the discharge from the combustion, when submerged, there is more or less oil that goes out with the

refuse into the water, which will rise to the surface and produce an oil wake, and that would disclose the track and the whereabouts of the submarine. That by the owners is disputed, and they stated it would not.

There is still a third military objection that the naval men submitted, and that was that the operation of the engine would produce so much noise when submerged that the under-water communications—the telephones—would pick up the noise at a distance of several miles and disclose the location or the whereabouts of the submarine.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit one question?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. COX. That is very interesting. Does the gentleman know how Germany has overcome that, or any of those objections?

Mr. PADGETT. We have never heard that she has overcome it.

Mr. COX. Why, then, don't they discover the presence and whereabouts of German submarines that are all around England?

Mr. PADGETT. The German submarines are moving down and up, and they are operating in very small waters, and they come in and out of their bases. We know of no way that a submarine is operated except by storage batteries. We are trying to get a system of propulsion under water that will dispense with the batteries, and it would be a wonderful achievement if it could be accomplished.

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. LOUD. Is it not a fact that the Government has already contracted for two or three installations of the Deisel internal combustion engine on some of our submarines, one of them being the very boat that had the accident some time ago?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know as to that.

Mr. LOUD. I was informed by the representative of the electric company that sold them that they had placed an order for those boats.

Mr. PADGETT. They had them for surface operation. We use the internal combustion engine or the Deisel engine; we have them on all the boats.

Mr. LOUD. Exactly.

Mr. PADGETT. But they do not operate submerged. They operate on the surface, and while in operation on the surface they charge, when the boat either runs very slowly or stands still; with the oil engine, operating on the surface, they generate electricity that stores the batteries, but the moment that the boat submerges the engines stop. They do not operate under water, and all submerged operation is by electricity from the storage batteries.

Mr. LOUD. I gathered from what the gentleman said before that they had not used those engines. I was quite sure that they had.

Mr. PADGETT. Oh, no. All our submarines are operated on the surface by the Deisel combustion engine.

Mr. WM. ELZA WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. WM. ELZA WILLIAMS. What is the engine operated with that operates on the surface?

Mr. PADGETT. Oil.

Mr. WM. ELZA WILLIAMS. That is the one that is proposed to be used when submerged?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. WM. ELZA WILLIAMS. Does not the gentleman believe, from the experience of the German submarines in this war, that they have a submarine far superior to anything that we have?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know. Over there, from what we can get, it seems they advertise their successes. We over here advertise our failures. We do not know anything about their failures or shortcomings.

Mr. WM. ELZA WILLIAMS. But we do know that their successes almost involved the United States in trouble with Germany.

Mr. PADGETT. Well, I do not care to discuss that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I will ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. PADGETT. When the matter was before the committee, in consideration of the testimony that was given by the naval officers, which I have stated to the committee here to-

day, the Naval Committee concluded not to recommend this appropriation for experimental purposes upon one of the boats. Since then a number of Members of the House have spoken to me about it. They have heard about it. Mr. Neff has submitted to me a large amount of data on the subject from the department and naval officers which I thought I had here on the table, but it seems it has been removed; but on account of the great desirability and urgent need of some means of propulsion under water, different from storage batteries and which would be more efficient, I thought I would lay the matter before the House.

The complaint has been made sometimes that we do not experiment enough. I do not think there is any very substantial basis for the criticism, because there is a great deal of experimentation done, and we appropriate for experimentation; but I thought I would lay this matter before the House with a statement of the facts and let the House determine whether or not we would make this appropriation.

The statement is made that there are certain parts of this machinery embraced in this appropriation of \$340,000 that could be used whether the experiments were successful or not. Allowing for this salvage, it is estimated that it would reduce the loss to something like \$100,000 or \$150,000 if the experiments in underwater combustion were a failure; and the proposal is that the company shall bear one-half of the loss and the Government one-half. That would involve the expenditure of somewhere from \$50,000 to \$75,000 on the part of the Government.

Now, with this statement I lay the matter before the House for its consideration and determination as to whether or not under the circumstances the House feels justified in making this appropriation, and in having this experiment made, to see whether or not it is possible to have this thing developed to a successful stage.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MADDEN. Is not this a most extraordinary proposition to bring before the House?

Mr. PADGETT. It is out of the usual; yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Is there any justification for a man who pretends to have a machine that he is endeavoring to put upon the market asking to have the Government pay the cost of developing it?

Mr. PADGETT. I think there are cases where the Government has developed—

Mr. MADDEN. They do it in guns, but not in engines.

Mr. PADGETT. In certain things; and if the experiment promises success, the great desirability of the end to be attained would more than justify the expenditure. The question that I hesitated about was that all of the naval officers who testified before our committee were of the opinion that the military objections which were stated were insuperable, and in the committee I was at first averse to recommending it, and the committee left it out and did not recommend it.

Mr. MADDEN. What does the department say about it?

Mr. PADGETT. The Secretary of the Navy has recommended that the experiment be made. I will ask permission to have his letter read, so that we may have it before us and in the RECORD.

Mr. MADDEN. Just a moment, before the letter is read. What will it cost?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. PADGETT. I ask unanimous consent for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that his time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. What does this man who controls the engine propose to charge the Government if the experiments are successful?

Mr. PADGETT. He proposes to charge the Government a profit not exceeding 25 per cent on the cost of manufacture.

Mr. MADDEN. What is the cost of manufacture?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know. He said he would enter into an agreement with the Government that the profit should not exceed 25 per cent of the cost.

Mr. MADDEN. Then, we are buying a pig in a poke if we enter into this thing. Yesterday the House went on record against even buying armor plate from institutions that were already in existence, at a fixed price, or at a price to be fixed by the Secretary of the Navy. Yet, here we come to-day with a proposition that nobody knows anything about, and that a man who has a patent upon an engine is endeavoring to force upon the Government, without anybody knowing anything whatever

about it, and those who pretend to know—the officers of the Navy—talking against it.

Mr. PADGETT. I am not submitting any question with reference to a contract, or the purchase of anything. The only question involved here is the question of experiment as to whether or not the experiments were worth a trial, to see whether or not we can develop this engine. As far as I am personally concerned, I stated before the committee that I was unwilling to include it in the report or to recommend it, and the committee so acted. I am bringing it here and making this full statement without in any way involving the committee and without even my personal recommendation. I am simply laying it before the House, in order that they may have all the facts and determine for themselves whether or not they want to make this experiment.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. TILSON. In the opinion of the gentleman, would these experiments go on if the Government did not take hold of the project? Will this gentleman drop his experimenting and let it go by the board if the Government does not take it up?

Mr. PADGETT. I am not prepared to answer that. I have heard that it is owned by some individuals of very limited means. I will just state—it is a statement of private matters—that the other day I got a letter from some gentleman either in Iowa or Illinois, I am not sure which, stating that he had taken some stock in this matter, and that they were calling on him to advance some more money, and that he had hardly any money, and asking me for my opinion. I told him that I had no recommendations to make, that the committee had failed to recommend it, and that I did not know whether Congress was going to do anything or not, and that he must act on his own judgment, that I could not give him any advice.

Mr. KINKAID. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. PADGETT. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. KINKAID. Can the gentleman inform the committee what is the estimated cost of making the experiments?

Mr. PADGETT. The amount asked for is \$340,000. It was estimated, however, as the matter was stated to me, that certain parts of the machinery, the engines, and so forth, are common to all of the submarines, and that with that salvage taken out it would reduce the loss, if it was a failure, to about \$100,000 or \$150,000, which, if divided between the owners and the Government, would make the loss of the Government somewhere between \$50,000 and \$75,000.

Mr. GARDNER. Is the gentleman from Tennessee going to vote for his own amendment?

Mr. PADGETT. I am willing to vote for it.

Mr. GARDNER. Are the members of the committee generally going to vote for it?

Mr. PADGETT. I think not, no, sir; and I am not advocating it as a member of the committee. I am not submitting it as a member of the committee. I am simply laying it before the House with this statement of facts, so that the House may have the facts.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. PADGETT. I ask that my time be extended long enough to have a letter from the Secretary of the Navy read.

Mr. MADDEN. I will withhold the point of order until that is done.

The Clerk read as follows:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,  
Washington, March 10, 1916.

SIR: There is transmitted herewith a copy of a letter from Mr. Abner R. Neff regarding the Neff system of propulsion for submarines for which he submitted a proposal to the department September 30, 1915, for its installation in a submarine.

There has been considerable correspondence from time to time between the department and Mr. Neff and his predecessors, the L—A Submarine Boat Co., looking to the installation of such a system in a submarine, and more than a year ago the department offered to place a submarine at the disposal of this company for the purpose, the proposition then being substantially that the Neff Co. would install their system at their expense, and that if it proved satisfactory it would be purchased at a figure to be mutually agreed upon in advance of installation.

In the present case Mr. Neff has not submitted a definite proposition covering responsibility for the efficient operation of his system, although his proposal of September 30, 1915, was made under the same conditions as applied to bidders on submarines as a whole; that is, it covered the guaranties for surface and for submerged speed and for defects that might develop in any part of the system.

There are, however, features of the system which might render its use highly objectionable from a military standpoint and, therefore, make it unsuitable for use in a submarine. These features are not covered in the form of contract on which Mr. Neff bid, nor is any mention of them made in his later correspondence. They refer to the possibility of the presence of the submarine being disclosed by the air bubbles or the oil "slick" from the exhaust of her engines when submerged and also by the noise of her engines.

While the probability is that these conditions would exist, the problem is one which can be definitely determined only by experiment, and as it is extremely desirable to get rid of storage batteries, if a satisfactory substitute can be found, it is believed that there is sufficient merit in the scheme to justify a trial of it. While recognizing that there are objections to the system which may render it unsuitable, the Bureau of Construction and Repair and Steam Engineering nevertheless recommend that it be tested in order definitely to determine its merits. It is, therefore, recommended that an appropriation be made for the purpose somewhat along the following lines:

"That \$340,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated for a test of the Neff system of propulsion in such submarine as the Secretary of the Navy may designate for the purpose: *Provided*, That, should the system prove unsuitable for use in submarines, one-half the cost of the equipment shall be borne by the Government and one-half by the owners of the Neff system, and that if any part of the system is considered desirable for retention its value, previously agreed upon, shall be deducted from the cost of the equipment in determining the cost of the experiment to be borne by each party to the contract."

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPHUS DANIELS.

Hon. L. P. PADGETT, Member of Congress,  
Chairman Committee on Naval Affairs,  
House of Representatives.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman from Tennessee, or any other naval expert in the House, a question. I read in the morning paper a statement which, I think, said that a British submarine had been out 46 days without touching port. Of course, I do not believe everything I hear or read, but is that possible?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know what is possible, but it is not common.

Mr. MANN. I know that it is not common, but I wanted to know whether it was possible.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I think it would be possible for a submarine to stay out that length of time without touching port, if she had supplies brought to her by other vessels, and that is being done.

Mr. MANN. This statement indicated that that was not done, and I wanted to know if it was possible for a submarine to stay out longer than 10 days without touching port or receiving supplies.

Mr. PADGETT. I think 7 or 8 days is about the limit of what we call our coast-defense submarine.

Mr. MANN. What is the power in these submarines?

Mr. PADGETT. It is an oil-burning engine running on the surface and storage batteries, electric batteries, when submerged.

Mr. MANN. How long can they run submerged?

Mr. PADGETT. About 70 miles, if they run at a very slow speed. They can stay under about 14 or 15 hours when running 4 or 5 knots an hour. But if they run 14 or 15 knots an hour they can stay under only an hour or two.

Mr. MANN. Then they have to rise to the surface and charge the batteries.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. MANN. How much oil do they carry?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know, they have a cruising radius of about 400 or 600 miles.

Mr. MANN. What is the relative comparative power produced by oil whether it be used directly or for the storage of electricity?

Mr. PADGETT. \*I do not know how much oil is consumed in generating electricity where the boat is standing still, but I would think it would be much less than where she is running. Where they are running nothing but the engine and not carrying the weight and resistance of the boat and just running the engines and developing electricity it must be much less.

Mr. MANN. That is not exactly what I wanted to get at. I wanted to know what is the loss of power in converting oil into electricity.

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know.

Mr. MANN. That is the first question I would ask if I was investigating submarines as to power.

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know the relative power of electricity generated by burning the oil bears to the direct power of the oil operating in the oil engine direct.

Mr. MANN. It may be that some of the other wise experts can answer my question.

Mr. PADGETT. I would be justified in saying this, that in our battleships we use oil for generating electricity for the purpose of running the motor that drives the shaft in the battleship, and in that way get more power than they do by coal burning.

Mr. MANN. That is like a man raising himself by pulling on his boot straps.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is not germane, that it is a violation of all the ethics of the House, bringing in something that nobody knows anything about, and it is new legislation.

Mr. PADGETT. I think, Mr. Chairman, it is subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 21, line 16, after the figures "\$500,000," insert "to provide structural shop and shop facilities in place of those recently destroyed by fire (limit of cost not to exceed \$1,050,000), \$450,000."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that amendment. I would like to ask the gentleman what it is for?

Mr. PADGETT. It is for a shop at the Norfolk yard on account of one that was burned since the committee reported the bill. It is recommended by the Secretary of the Navy. They had a fire down there and this is to build a new shop.

Mr. MANN. What was the value of the shop destroyed by fire?

Mr. PADGETT. It was nothing like so good as the one proposed to be built here.

Mr. MANN. Was it worth half a million dollars?

Mr. PADGETT. The limit of cost here is \$1,050,000.

Mr. MANN. Fifty thousand dollars to replace the old shop and one million for additions.

Mr. HOLLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. The purpose is to save as much of the old machinery as possible. It is hard to say what the old shop was worth.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. What was the old shop used for?

Mr. HOLLAND. It was a ship-fitters' shop. I would like to say that it was a shop that had been added to from time to time, and it is practically impossible to tell exactly what it was worth. A part of the machinery was exceedingly valuable.

I wish to say that the shop facilities for promptly and expeditiously handling the repair work assigned to the Norfolk Navy Yard are inadequate, as is conclusively shown by the statements of the following naval experts and officials:

First. Secretary Daniels, in a letter dated February 15, 1915, and which can be found on page 2843 of the hearings, said:

Many of the shops at the Norfolk Navy Yard are antiquated and incapable of satisfactory remodeling.

Second. A naval board, composed of Admiral Edwards and others, in a report made to the Secretary of the Navy in 1914, made the following statement:

The Norfolk Navy Yard, being one of the oldest yards in the country, contains many old buildings of a design and construction which, judged from modern industrial needs, are neither adaptable for storehouses nor for manufacturing purposes. While undoubtedly of excellent construction for the period in which designed and have served the purpose for which built, some are now showing signs of weakness, and the life of many of them can not be greatly prolonged. It would undoubtedly promote economy and efficiency to give consideration to the question of erecting new buildings in preference to attempting any important improvement or extension of buildings which were designed for conditions which no longer exist.

Third. Admiral Stanford, on page 193 of his hearing before the Committee on Naval Affairs, said:

The Norfolk yard to-day is one of the principal Navy bases of this country, but is equipped almost exclusively with buildings which were constructed years and years ago and which were designed for work upon wooden vessels of the old Navy. The yard is not equipped at this time, in my judgment, with buildings which enable that yard to most efficiently and economically perform the work which is exacted of it, and as a business proposition it is going to be necessary to provide for modern and ample shop buildings at an early date, and if you can do it at once it would be a good thing.

Fourth. Assistant Secretary of the Navy Roosevelt, on page 3472 of his hearing before the Naval Affairs Committee, declared:

The general situation is that the Navy has, in the various navy yards, a lot of buildings that go back to the earliest day of the Government. They were buildings that were built for wooden-ship construction, sail lofts, mold lofts, etc., purely for wooden ships with very little iron, and where the furnaces, if there were any, or the forges, if there were any, were all very primitive in character, and were in the open air. We have had to use those buildings as the Navy developed, at first into an iron Navy and next into a steel Navy, for purposes for which they were not meant, and the result has been that at the older yards the conditions in some shops are distinctly bad. The conditions at Norfolk are probably worse than at any other place.

Fifth. Naval Constructor R. M. Watt, who, until a short time ago, was Chief of the Bureau of Construction and Repair, and is now industrial manager at the Norfolk Yard, in a letter to the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, on page 3615 of the hearings, wrote, in part, as follows:

Of all the yards in the country the Norfolk Yard is the most antiquated. It has fewer modern improvements and facilities than any other yard belonging to the Government. The reason of this is that appropriations have not been made for new and modern shops and other necessary facilities which go along with it. According to the

publication of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, "Public Works of the Navy, July 1, 1912," and the appropriations which have been made for the different yards since July 1, 1911, make a total value of offices, storehouses, and shops for the different yards as follows:

Portsmouth, N. H.	\$2,555,000
Boston, Mass.	2,668,000
New York, N. Y.	3,587,000
Philadelphia, Pa.	1,975,000
Washington, D. C.	3,513,000
Norfolk, Va.	1,500,000
Charleston, S. C.	1,459,000
Mare Island, Cal.	2,728,000
Puget Sound, Wash.	1,512,000

You will see from this valuation that the offices, storehouses, and shops at the Norfolk Navy Yard have a less value than of any other yard in the country, with the exception of Charleston, S. C., but the worst of it is that this valuation is placed on old and antiquated and out-of-date shops, which makes the situation very much worse than the figures show it to be.

These statements conclusively show not only the need for new and better shop buildings at Norfolk, but that the facilities there for doing work are worse than at any other station.

Some provision should be made at once for new shop facilities, and for the reasons briefly stated as follows:

First. The old buildings can not be moved or be so remodeled as to make them suitable for modern industrial purposes. They need not be torn down, but, as testified to by Admiral Stanford, they can be utilized for storage purposes and will provide storage facilities which are now very much needed. (See p. 209.) It would be real economy to use them for this purpose, the only purpose for which they are now adapted.

Second. Just treatment to its employees imperatively demands that this yard shall be modernized and improved without delay. Present conditions in these old buildings, most of which were erected before the Civil War, are almost intolerable. They are not properly ventilated; are not adequately heated; are without proper light and also without suitable and sanitary wash rooms and toilets; and are otherwise lacking in the facilities which are essential for the protection of the health and comfort of the men employed therein. Such conditions would not be allowed in any private establishment, and ought not to be permitted in any Government yard. Such buildings are not adapted for present-day industrial uses, and it is impossible for the men, who are compelled to use them, to accomplish the work which might otherwise be expected of them. Until these conditions are changed the men can not render their best service and can not efficiently and economically perform the work which is required of them. This occasions a direct loss to the Government. It would be effecting a real economy to remedy such a condition.

Third. It is unfair to this yard not to provide these new shop facilities at once. Work at the yard is largely secured by competitive bidding, and fair competitive bidding can not be had unless the yards are equally well equipped for the work. It is unfair to this yard to compel it to compete for work with better equipped yards. It is unfair to expect from it the same degree of efficiency and the same good results as from yards with modern buildings and modern conveniences. It is unfair to so neglect such an important station that it can not perform the work which might otherwise be exacted of it. It would be real economy to so equip it that you could secure genuine rivalry and sharp competition between this and other yards and between this and private yards. The policy now being followed is wrong and would eventually bring about the partial abandonment of this station, except for its advantages and its strategical location.

Fourth. It is unfair to the fleet not to make immediate provision for these improvements. By reason of its geographical location and its accessibility at all seasons of the year, this yard has been and must continue to be the great repair and supply station of the Navy. In time of peace it is visited by a larger number of ships and vessels than any other yard. Vessels in distress invariably seek it, and it can be reached when the channels to some of the other yards are closed by ice or by storm or are otherwise inaccessible. In time of war it must, by reason of its location near Hampton Roads and Chesapeake Bay, be the yard of the greatest military activity. If our ships are kept ready for service they must be periodically docked and overhauled. Disabled ships, whether such disability is occasioned by accident or constant use, must be repaired. The maintenance of the fleet in an efficient condition must depend upon the ability of the yards to promptly render it necessary docking and repair service. This service is absolutely essential, and the lack of it might at any time result in greater loss to the Government than the cost of these needed improvements. It is possible for it to result in the defeat of the fleet.

And yet this yard, the great repair station of the Navy, is now without the shop facilities so necessary to enable it to

render in the most economical and most expeditious manner this very essential service. It is unfair to the Navy to keep it in such condition. Such an important repair station should be so developed and equipped as to make it capable of promptly and efficiently meeting any demands which might reasonably be made upon it.

Fifth. The facilities for work at the yard have been rendered still more inadequate since the destruction by fire on May 18 of the ship-fitters' shop, the most important shop of all ship-repair stations. This one shop employed 400 men, and the urgency of their work is best shown by the fact that it was being done in three shifts of eight hours a day. These men are now temporarily housed and employed, but they are badly handicapped in their work. Steps should immediately be taken to provide new shops. If not provided, this yard, conceded to be of the greatest importance for the maintenance of the fleet, can not render the service which must be required of it.

It is useless to provide for the construction of additional ships unless at the same time you make some provision at the several yards for the pressing facilities which the very maintenance of the fleet imperatively demands. This is equally as important, and its neglect is not in the interest of economy nor in the interest of the Navy. Ships are useless unless kept ready for service, and the yard must do the work necessary to keep them ready.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, in this connection I would like to have read a letter of the Secretary of the Navy with reference to this.

Mr. HOLLAND. And I would like to say, so far as the cost of the building is concerned, that it is the amount recommended by the Secretary of the Navy; but if the committee believes that the amount is too large and that the amendment ought to be amended, then let the committee do it, but do not fail to provide at this yard a facility that is absolutely essential to enable it to do necessary work—not only the work which has heretofore been exacted of it but the work which may hereafter be required of it.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I suppose this amendment may have been prepared by the Secretary of the Navy. I see that when originally prepared it provided for an appropriation of \$450, but before it was offered it was changed in pencil so as to provide an appropriation of \$450,000. I think, however, that a little matter like that on the naval bill amounts to nothing.

Mr. PADGETT. That was typewritten, not by the Secretary of the Navy, but the clerk of my committee added corrections to it to correct the shortcomings of the typewriter.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the letter referred to by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The Clerk read as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,  
Washington May 22, 1916.

MY DEAR MR. PADGETT: The Norfolk Navy Yard reports that a fire at that yard on May 18, 1916, completely destroyed the yard's ship fitters' shop. The loss of this building will prove a serious handicap to repair work now on hand there and will also delay the completion of destroyer No. 70, although all possible arrangements within my power have been made for temporary expedients to care for the emergency.

I have already brought to your attention, in my letter to you of March 25, 1916, the inadequacy of the shop facilities at the Norfolk Navy Yard for promptly and expeditiously handling the repair work assigned to that yard. If this were so before the destruction of the shop for ship fitting, the most important shop of a ship-repair yard, you will at once realize how much embarrassment will result at this yard in the future unless steps are immediately taken to improve the conditions.

In this letter of March 25 I urged an appropriation for the construction of structural or ship-fitters' shops, and in recognition of the conditions at Norfolk, a few months ago ordered the Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks to make an inspection of the Norfolk Navy Yard with the view to informing me as to the urgent and immediate requirements for improving the facilities there. Shortly after his return I directed him to confer with the Chief of Naval Operations and the Chief of the Bureau of Construction and Repair with the view to their submitting to me a joint recommendation, and I am forwarding herewith a copy of a report made by them in accordance with my directions.

I would refer you to paragraph 5 of this report, giving the items recommended by them to be included in the present appropriation act. I understand that the first item, a dry dock, is already included in the preliminary draft made by your committee of the appropriation bill. In view of the destruction of the ship-fitters' shop by fire, I earnestly recommend and urge that a special appropriation be secured for:

"A structural shop (cost not to exceed \$1,050,000), \$450,000 to be immediately available, of which \$50,000 shall be available for salvage of tools and to insure the continuance of structural work until the new shop is completed."

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPHUS DANIELS.

Hon. L. P. PADGETT,

Chairman Committee on Naval Affairs,  
House of Representatives.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HOLLAND] stated a moment ago that this appropriation was to provide the shop and replace the machinery. Is he correct about that?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is my information—that it is largely for that purpose. I have been furnished no detailed figures.

Mr. MANN. It seems to me that we ought to have some one on the floor, even on an item so small as \$1,050,000, who knows something about it, who knows what it is for. Of course, I know that in a lot of these things we do not pay very much attention to such small sums of money, but I would like to ask the chairman of the committee whether this is for the shop—that is, to replace the shop, to replace the machinery, or is it for both?

Mr. PADGETT. It is both.

Mr. MANN. The letter of the Secretary of the Navy asked for \$1,050,000, to replace the shop, as I just heard it read. I do not know whether the gentleman has read it or not; but if he has not, what would be the situation under this amendment—

Mr. PADGETT. My information is that it embraced the shop and the fitting out of shop.

Mr. HOLLAND. That is my information.

Mr. MANN. But that is not what the letter reads, as I heard it read from the desk, though I may be mistaken about that. If that be not the case, what is the situation? This is an amendment to provide a structural shop and shop facilities. I take it that shop facilities in this case means the machinery, and so forth.

Mr. PADGETT. That is what I understand.

Mr. MANN. To replace those recently destroyed by fire, limit of cost not to exceed \$1,050,000. Under the rules of the House and under the practice of Congress, where you have a limit of cost fixed, whenever that limit of cost is reached and you desire to add anything to it, you must have legislation, or it is subject to a point of order. Under this amendment, having expended \$1,050,000, if they desired to add a 20-cent tool down there they could not make an appropriation for it without its being subject to a point of order. There ought never to be a limit of cost fixed upon tools, machinery, at navy yards or anywhere else. There never has been before. I quote from the letter of the Secretary which has just been read:

I earnestly recommend and urge that a special appropriation be secured for:

A structural shop—cost not to exceed \$1,050,000.

If that means machinery, then I do not understand the English language.

Mr. PADGETT. The amendment that is offered provides for the shop and the shop facilities, which takes in the machinery that would fit out the shop.

Mr. MANN. Yes; but you put a limit of cost upon the shop and the machinery.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. MANN. And that limit of cost is legislation.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. MANN. And you can not exceed it hereafter.

Mr. PADGETT. Of course hereafter we would have to depend upon Congress in dealing with the question, as it was presented then, and the limit of cost as occasion arises is often extended.

Mr. MANN. I do not know that I shall be here, but if I am, and an appropriation is sought to provide additional machinery down there, please remember that it will be subject to the point of order.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I had a talk with the Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, and unless I misunderstood him the purpose is not only to provide for the shop but also to provide the machinery.

Mr. MANN. How much is the shop to cost, and how much of the appropriation is for machinery?

Mr. HOLLAND. I could not advise the gentleman as to the exact figures.

Mr. MANN. When you make an estimate of \$1,050,000—I wonder they did not make it \$1,049,999—certainly somebody must have gotten the figures up on those two propositions, and we are entitled to have the information.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have not the figures; they have not been furnished me.

Mr. PADGETT. Here is a letter referred to there, signed by Admiral Benson, Chief of the Bureau of Operations; Admiral Taylor, Chief of the Bureau of Construction and Repair; and Admiral Harris, Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, who made an investigation, and they report for \$1,000,000 for the shop and \$50,000 is added to that, and in the letter which the gentleman had there he will notice that the Secretary in the estimate which he drafted, stated that \$50,000 was for the salvage of the old machinery.

Mr. MANN. I see that plainly enough. That is not for machinery; that is for salvage of the old machinery. That is not



to supply machinery for the shop; and under the gentleman's amendment—

Mr. PADGETT. I understand.

Mr. MANN. You can not put in any new machinery in that shop. You can build a shop and have a roof over it, but you can not do anything in it.

Mr. PADGETT. We are authorizing a shop with machinery to cost \$1,050,000, not providing for so expensive a shop as they recommended.

Mr. MANN. Oh, no; you do not know what you are doing. That is the trouble about it.

Mr. PADGETT. Shop and machinery.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I agree entirely with the gentleman from Illinois it would be wise to know the relative proportions of the cost of machinery and the shop. I would like to ask the chairman if he can tell us what was the original cost of the machinery and the shop?

Mr. PADGETT. I stated I could not. That was put in many, many years ago—some of it before the Civil War—and it has come along down with repairs and additions and scrapping and new machinery, and I could not give the gentleman any idea what it was. I will ask unanimous consent that this amendment be passed over until to-morrow, and in the meantime I will get detailed information along the line of the gentleman's request.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that this amendment be passed over until to-morrow morning. Is there objection?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, in order to close the matter up now, does the gentleman recall whether an appropriation has yet been made for the burned machine shop at the Philadelphia Navy Yard?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know. We have made so many appropriations for the Philadelphia Navy Yard, I do not know whether that has been made or not.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I rather expected the gentleman to say that. The fact that the Norfolk Navy Yard has about \$792,000—practically \$800,000—in this bill and the Philadelphia Navy Yard \$538,000 answers the gentleman as to that.

Mr. PADGETT. I will state to the gentleman that the Secretary of the Navy recommended very earnestly a dry dock at Norfolk, and did not recommend one at Philadelphia, and the gentleman's committee put in one for Philadelphia at three and a half million dollars without the recommendation of the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. We appreciate that, for it was due.

Mr. PADGETT. So it does not lie in the mouth of the gentleman to be captious about the committee.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. May I ask the gentleman again whether the request for the reconstruction of the burned machine shop at the Philadelphia Navy Yard has yet been complied with?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know; there has not been any request for several years.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It was burned several years ago.

Mr. PADGETT. There has been no request from the department nor from a Member of Congress for several years.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. This was before the committee at one time. May I ask the gentleman whether any request by the department was made for a floating crane at the Philadelphia Navy Yard?

Mr. PADGETT. Not this year—either by the department or the gentleman himself.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I wish to submit to the gentleman that a bill was introduced by my colleague [Mr. VARE] and has been before the committee asking for a floating crane, which is a matter of great necessity, since you are obliged to hire one once in a while at the Philadelphia Navy Yard—

Mr. PADGETT. The matter has not been impressed upon the committee by either the department or the gentleman.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the chairman of the committee take the general committee into his confidence and tell the committee in how many instances they have departed from the recommendations of the General Board or the Secretary of the Navy and favored some special pet project of a local district?

Mr. PADGETT. We did not favor any special project of a local district. The committee two years ago recommended one at Philadelphia, which went out on a point of order, and—

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not mean a dry dock, but generally speaking.

Mr. PADGETT. Generally speaking, I can not give the gentleman any details.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, as we are not considering this bill in the regular order but by special rule, I think it is only due to the committee that the gentleman should indicate how many instances there were when the committee went beyond the recommendations of the department.

Mr. PADGETT. Sometimes we put in more and sometimes less.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I submit an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 26, page 37, add the following:

"And provided further, That any retired officer, while on active duty, shall receive the pay and allowances of the grade, not above that of lieutenant commander, that he would have attained in due course of promotion if he had remained on the active list for a period beyond the date of his retirement equal to the total amount of time during which he has been detailed on active duty since his retirement."

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. MANN. Where does that come in?

Mr. BORLAND. At the bottom of page 37.

Mr. Chairman, if the chairman of the committee wants to reserve the point of order I will make a little statement of the amendment first before touching on the point of order. My understanding is that this particular provision occurs in exactly these words, except the change of title, lieutenant commander to major, in the Army bill. It is exactly the language that was carried in the Army bill with reference to Army officers who are detailed for active duty. As I understand the purpose and the practical effect of it is to give the Government the advantage of the work of these retired officers in cases where it can be done and on conditions that are fair to the retired officer. Now, to illustrate that, because an illustration brings it more closely home to my conception and does, I think, to other nonprofessional men—there is a young man of my acquaintance in the Navy, I do not know exactly what his rank is, but it can not be very high, who had his hearing impaired by a gun discharged in the line of duty. He is a splendid, active young man. My impression is that he was appointed from Arkansas, went through the Naval Academy, is a trained naval constructor, and a very efficient man, and he was retired because in the line of his duty his hearing was impaired by this gun discharge. He is in line with a good deal of work, especially with the enlargement of the Navy. In fact, he is detailed for that purpose right now. But the effect of the present law is, as I understand, no matter how long he has been detailed for that work—and I think he ought to be detailed to it as long as he is able to perform competent work in that branch of the service—his retirement grade does not change as the grade of a man in the active service does. He may become more skilled and more efficient, but he has been retired at a very low grade as a young officer in the Army.

Now, that matter has been corrected by the Military Committee by a specific provision in the military bill which provides that the officers under the grade of major, if they are detailed from the retired list to the active list for duties they are able to perform, advance in grade as though they were on the active list. This is a proposed application of the same principles of the Navy, using the rank of lieutenant commander instead of the rank of major. In other words, a man has to be low down on the list before this can affect him at all, and he never can get above the rank of lieutenant commander.

Now, it does seem to me there are cases similar to the one that I have pointed out, where a man's hearing is affected, or perhaps some other defect incurred in the line of duty. A great deal can be done with the technical knowledge with which the Government has educated him to the advantage of the service. Instead of his lying a dead weight upon the retired list of the Army and continuing to draw his pay and do nothing more, he should be given active duty. If he has the technical knowledge that ought to be used, he should be permitted to use it. I have not any other information about it, but I have no doubt it will appeal to the fairness of the members of the Naval Committee, it being exactly the proposition the Military Committee put on their bill.

Does the gentleman from Tennessee insist on his point of order?

Mr. PADGETT. It is subject to a point of order, but I want to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. PADGETT. Is this the identical provision that is contained in the Army reorganization bill passed at the present Congress?

Mr. BORLAND. I understand it is identical, word for word, with the provision, except that the Army bill uses the word "major" as the rank above which they can not go, while this uses the words "lieutenant commander."

Mr. PADGETT. And this puts the two services upon the same basis?

Mr. BORLAND. Precisely. The Advocate General has put his approval upon this wording.

Mr. PADGETT. I will not insist upon the point of order, but let the House vote on the merits of it.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object. This provides for a promotion upon the retired list. It may be that the rule has been repealed in the Army, but I do not know that. I had no opportunity, however, to prevent that, but I have one to prevent it here; and I am going to make the prevention, and I will make the point of order.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman reserve it?

Mr. BUTLER. I certainly will if the gentleman wants to make a statement.

Mr. BORLAND. I call attention to the fact that in no case can the commander receive the pay or allowance above the rank or grade of lieutenant commander.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. If this proposition is a fair one for a junior officer who has been retired for disability, why is it not fair for a lieutenant commander? If a commander has been retired for disability and can perform some active service, why cut the line and say that it is fair for the man below and not fair for the man above?

Mr. BORLAND. I think the distinction was made on this account. I will say that this young man I describe was a comparatively young man, barely over 30 years of age. He had his hearing affected by a gun discharge. He had only just come out of the Naval Academy and just received his technical education.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. In what grade was he retired?

Mr. BORLAND. I do not know.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. That of junior lieutenant, or what?

Mr. BORLAND. I do not know. I could not say.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. If he was 30 years old he was probably a junior lieutenant. Now, let me ask the gentleman a question. If he is on active duty he is getting the full pay, is he not?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes; if he is on active duty he is getting full pay; but if he stays on active duty 20 or 30 years he would still be getting what? As I understand it, he would still be getting the active pay of a junior lieutenant.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Is not that better pay than if he were not at work?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes; but I do not see why, if he is doing the work, he should not have the active service counted in his favor.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. The objection is to bringing these retired men in and taking all the snore stations—getting all the soft berths.

Mr. BORLAND. There may be a scramble among officers for promotions; but we are considering the payment of bills for the retired officers. We are not considering it from the standpoint of the officer who wants a promotion in the service, but from the standpoint that we are paying for these men anyway, and should not we at least have some benefit from their service?

Mr. BUTLER. I do not agree about the scramble for office. I am opposed to men on the retired list being placed on active duty.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. The gentleman misunderstands the situation entirely. This law has not the slightest effect on the promotion of a man on the active list.

Mr. BORLAND. That is the gentleman's own statement.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. No; I did not say that. I said this would shut out the line officer when he comes on shore from having a proper duty, and the effect would be to keep him at sea indefinitely, because there is no place on shore

where he would get relief from sea duty by reason of all the places being filled up with men on the retired list doing active duty.

Mr. BORLAND. That assumes that there is not more work to be done on shore than could be done by the retired officers. I am not sure that we should not use the retired officers in that way, anyway. But I do not think either one of these assumptions is absolutely incontestable.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. GARDNER. Does the gentleman know whether the effect of the passage or adoption of this amendment would be to displace any officer who was in the line of promotion? In other words, would an officer under the gentleman's amendment be an active officer of his grade?

Mr. BORLAND. I understand that this could not possibly interfere with the promotion of an officer in the active service.

Mr. PADGETT. This is on the retired list, and there are no extra numbers on the retired list.

Mr. BORLAND. It simply says that the man who is on the retired list and is assigned to active duty shall have—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. I object.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition in my own right.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] is recognized.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the chairman of the committee, in connection with this amendment, a question. As I understand it, there is no question of promotion involved except on the retired list?

Mr. PADGETT. That is right.

Mr. GARDNER. Very well. Now, if you say that a man shall have the same promotion as he would have had if he had served that length of time longer on the active list, how do you determine in what grade he is to be promoted?

Mr. PADGETT. Simply by the man in front of him and the man who is behind him at the time he went out. This, as I stated, gives promotion on the retired list. It is subject to a point of order, but I was willing that the matter should be debated. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] made his point of order.

Mr. BUTLER. I reserved the point of order. I withheld it so that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] might have an opportunity to make a statement.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I do not think it is subject to a point of order. It is offered at a place which provides for the pay and accounts of the officers and men of the Navy, and it contains a good many of these provisos. The one immediately preceding it is in the rating of storekeepers in the artificers' branch. There are a number of similar designations there. I do not know upon what theory the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] is making the point of order, unless it is not germane. I do not think that is tenable. I think it is germane to that particular paragraph, and certainly to the bill itself.

The CHAIRMAN. The particular portion of the bill to which the amendment is offered provides for the compensation and rating of enlisted men in active service. The amendment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] provides for the compensation of retired officers when assigned to active duty. In the opinion of the Chair it is not germane to the provision of the bill to which it is offered, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I reoffer the amendment at page 66.

Mr. MANN. I reserve a point of order on it, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BORLAND. At page 66, line 10, I reoffer the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri reoffers the amendment, and the Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. BORLAND: On page 66, line 10, insert: "And provided further, That any retired officer while on active duty shall receive the pay and allowances of the grade, not above that of lieutenant commander, that he would have attained in due course of promotion if he had remained on the active list for a period beyond the date of his retirement equal to the total amount of time during which he has been detailed on active duty since his retirement."

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. MANN. I make the point of order.

Mr. BORLAND. The Chair will observe that the paragraph applies to a great many retired officers, and provides "That the aforesaid officers shall be carried as additional numbers in the grade to which they may be appointed under this act," so that it includes exactly provisions of this character. It seems to me the point of order is not well taken.

The CHAIRMAN. The provision of the bill to which the amendment is offered authorizes the President to appoint on the active list certain officers of the Navy now on the retired list, and provides that they shall, when appointed, be carried as additional numbers. Under the law retired officers may be assigned to duty on the active list, and receive the compensation of the grade they had reached when retired. The gentleman from Missouri proposes that when assigned to the active list they shall receive the compensation of the grade to which they would have been promoted had they remained in active service without retirement. The Chair does not believe that amendment is germane to the provision of the bill authorizing the President to appoint on the active list certain designated officers now on the retired list. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. TOWNER. I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TOWNER: Page 102, line 15, after the word "plant," strike out the period, insert a colon, and the words and figures following, to wit: "Provided further, That if in securing contracts for any of the increases authorized by this act the Secretary of the Navy shall be unable to make contracts within six months from the passage of this act, which shall provide for the completion and delivery to the Government of battle cruisers within 24 months, of scout cruisers within 18 months, and of destroyers and submarines within 1 year from the date of such contracts, within the limits of cost herein provided, the Secretary shall forthwith report such fact to Congress, with a full statement of reasons assigned and conditions existing, together with an estimate of the cost for the enlargement of Government plants to provide for the building therein of all such increases of the Navy herein authorized for which contracts can not be secured for completion within the limits of the time herein specified."

Mr. STAFFORD. I reserve a point of order.

Mr. MANN. A parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MANN. This is an amendment offered to the proviso on page 102. If this amendment should be agreed to, would it still be in order to move to strike out the proviso as amended or is it necessary to make that motion now or before the amendment is agreed to? Of course, this is to perfect the text, I take it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of the opinion that the pending amendment is of a distinctly substantive nature.

Mr. MANN. I am not raising the point of order. That is raised elsewhere. In the form in which the amendment was offered it was offered as an amendment to perfect the text.

Mr. TOWNER. The question is whether or not the motion to strike out the proviso in the bill could be made independently or whether necessarily such a motion would include this proviso.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman to debate the amendment, and will reserve his decision on the question raised.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BROWNE] desires to make a motion to strike out the proviso and to have that motion pending.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROWNE: After the word "emergency," in line 2, page 102, strike out the following:

"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 Government 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."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that amendment will be in order after the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] is disposed of.

Mr. MANN. I suggest to the gentleman from Wisconsin that he modify his amendment so as to propose to strike out the proviso, beginning with line 2, on page 102, so that it will be to strike out the proviso as amended, if it shall be amended.

Mr. BROWNE. I assent to that suggestion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment. The gentleman can submit that amendment subsequently.

Mr. BROWNE. I ask that the Clerk modify it according to that.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, does the mere fact that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa—which seems to be totally unrelated to the proviso—is offered following the proviso, make it an amendment to the proviso?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa moved to strike out the period and insert a colon, and his amendment seems to be an amendment to the proviso.

Mr. GARDNER. I raise the point of order, if it is not too late, that it is not germane to the proviso that it seeks to amend.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is pending.

Mr. GARDNER. Why does not the gentleman offer it as a separate paragraph? That will remove the confusion. Obviously the paragraph would have to be completed before you could move to strike it out, and surely the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] has no desire to modify the proviso by his amendment, which is totally unrelated.

The CHAIRMAN. The portion of the paragraph proposed to be stricken out can be stricken out regardless of the action of the committee on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa, and would be in order even if the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa was agreed to.

Mr. MANN. But the way the amendment was offered by the gentleman from Iowa was to strike out the period in line 15 and insert a colon, and then so forth.

Mr. GARDNER. If the Chair will hear me, if the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] is adopted, and then the question reverts to the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin and that is adopted also, not only is the proviso stricken out which the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BROWNE] seeks to strike out, but also the proviso offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin will be stricken out, under the parliamentary situation which the Chair has declared to exist.

[Mr. TOWNER addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point or order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] that it is legislation, that it changes existing law, and is not germane; and further, the House has already voted on the proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is clearly legislation, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, upon the pending amendment to strike out the proviso on page 102, I understand that a specified time is desired for debate. I want to be liberal with gentlemen about it. What time is desired?

Mr. BROWNE. Mr. Chairman, I would like for myself 15 or 20 minutes.

Mr. BUTLER. I do not know of anyone else who desires to be heard on this side.

Mr. MANN. We have some other amendments which we desire to get a chance to offer, and the time is somewhat restricted now.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the pending amendment to strike out the proviso on page 102 and all amendments thereto close in 40 minutes, 20 minutes of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] and 20 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 40 minutes, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] and one-half by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING]. Is there objection?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I wish to observe at this time that the majority and the minority side of the committee having concluded their amendments some 15 minutes ago, and only 1 hour remaining before adjournment this afternoon, and possibly only 3 hours to-morrow, the gentleman is very liberal in the time allotted for this amendment.

Mr. PADGETT. Oh, the House generally began offering amendments much longer ago than 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I wish to state that at 12 o'clock the gentleman stated that there were two more amendments from his side of the committee, and I think on this side of the House it was stated there would be two more amendments. Three hours have been used in the discussion of committee amendments since

then. Now, when the main body of the House wishes to offer amendments, the gentleman proposes to give 40 minutes to one amendment, with but 1 hour remaining of the day's time.

Mr. PADGETT. I am only expressing the wishes of both sides of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object—

The CHAIRMAN. Debate is not in order. The committee takes more time in trying to come to an agreement than in discussing propositions. Is there objection?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania objects.

Mr. BROWNE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to proceed for 20 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWNE. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I propose seeks to strike out a provision in this bill which is similar to the bill familiar to a great many here known as the Tavenner bill, which provides that the stop watch or any time-measuring device shall not be used. It also prohibits the premium or bonus system. We are using the time study and the premium systems in several of the departments of the Government, and these systems are giving the best of satisfaction, and the heads of these departments are anxious to retain them. We have both of these systems in use in the Post Office Department and in the Ordnance Department. The question here is whether it is a wise time now to place in this large appropriation bill a provision which may interfere seriously with the administration of the Navy Department. I wish to call attention to just what the stop watch is used for. A great many people look upon the use of the stop watch as an instrument of torture to the laboring man, while, as a matter of fact, the stop watch is used to-day by thousands of manufacturers. It is not used simply to be held over an employee, but it is used more particularly as a time-measuring device, a laboratory instrument, to determine how long it will take to accomplish a certain task. To determine the cost of any article that is manufactured there are three elements that must be determined. First, there is labor, then material, and third, the overhead or managing charges. And the greatest of these three items is the labor that enters into every manufactured article. Now, the greatest scientific experts on efficiency hold that the only way to find out what an article costs is in some way to find out how much labor and how long it takes that labor to accomplish that task, and as a result they take a skilled employee and see how long it takes him to accomplish that task, and they make this time study by the use of a watch. They make many of these experiments to determine the quickest and best way to accomplish the work.

Now, take the Watertown Arsenal, where both the time study and premium system have been established since 1909 by Gen. Crozier. A great many objected to it when it was being established. Some thought it would result in throwing out a large number of laboring men, putting them on the scrap heap, as they expressed it; but what was the result? No man there lost his job on account of it, but they constantly shifted men about until they got men who were adapted to each particular job, and as a result there has been a tremendous saving made, and I will read you some of the testimony of Gen. Crozier later in regard to it.

Mr. KEATING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNE. I want to make my statement first. If the use of a stop watch and the premium system, or any time-measuring device, is a bad thing, then we want to abolish it. We want to abolish it not only in the Navy Department but also in the Military Department and the Post Office Department and other departments; and so, if we vote to retain the provision I seek to strike out, we logically will have to insert a similar provision in the next appropriation bill that comes up—the fortification bill. They are attempting at this time to insert a provision of that kind in the Post Office bill, and the question will come up squarely whether this Government, which is embarking to-day on so many new activities, is going to follow the private manufacturing institutions and adopt efficient methods, or whether it is going to remain at a standstill and prohibit those methods.

Now, take the premium system, which goes along with the time-study system. The premium or bonus system are practically the same thing—technically they are different, but they

are used in the testimony of these experts as being synonymous. They take a man in a shop and set him at a job, and they find out how long it will take him to do that job. They try to get as efficient a man as they can. They then add to the time it takes him to complete the task additional time, sometimes 60 per cent, so they will not set an excessively small time, and fix that as the time an ordinary man can do the job. Then they say to the men who are working on similar jobs, "If you can do more than that task in the required time you will get a premium." As a result, that man has an incentive to do the best he can, and as a result of that practice in the Watertown Arsenal every man who is working under the premium system gets on an average over \$10 a month premium. He gets, in the first place, the full day's wage, which is the going wage paid in private institutions of that kind, and in addition he gets a premium, and that premium in the Watertown Arsenal averages over \$10 a month.

Now, just see what the Government employees in the navy yards and the arsenals are getting. In the first place, this Government gives an eight-hour day, and I am heartily in favor of that. Next, it says to each employee, "You are entitled to 15 full holidays with full pay." Next it says, "You are entitled during the year to seven legal holidays with full pay." Next, the Government gives each employee during the summer months 13 half-holidays—13 Saturday afternoons off. In all this makes 28½ days that the Government employees in the Navy Department, the War Department, and the Post Office Department get with full pay. That amounts to 10 per cent of the working days of the year that every Government employee working in these departments has to himself, with full pay for every day.

So I say that this Government is not treating its employees badly, but is treating them generously, and that is why they like to work for the Government. Now, what do the heads of these great departments that have this efficiency system—the time study and the premium system—say about it? Secretary of War Baker has written a letter to the Speaker of this House testifying in the very highest terms of the way that system has worked in the War Department, and says it would work great injury to the Government to prohibit the use of these efficiency methods. Postmaster General Burleson and the First, Second, Third, and Fourth Assistant Postmasters General, all of them, are unanimous in saying that prohibiting the use of a time study and premium system is going to disorganize their great departments. Now, our Post Office Department competes with the express companies in the parcel post. Our Navy Department, in its shipyards, is going to compete with private institutions, and they want to use the same efficiency methods which their competitors use. Now, there is another thing to which I desire to call attention, and that is about a year ago the President of the United States, cooperating with the Secretary of the Navy, appointed an Advisory Board to the Navy. He sent out to 11 of the great scientific societies in the United States and asked each to select a man from its society to act as an advisory board in the matter of preparing the national defense. Each society selected one of its members by referendum, and they elected Thomas A. Edison as the chairman of the Advisory Board, and in addition to that others were appointed, which made in all 23 to advise the Navy Department. What do these great scientists and experts, men who are disinterested, say of this legislation? I have the opinion of a number of them, and everyone that has expressed himself has emphatically protested against the Tavenner bill, which is incorporated in this naval bill, and I wish just simply to read for a moment from some of these great men upon that subject.

Here is what Thomas A. Edison says:

In my opinion, the bill introduced by Congressman TAVENNER is based on fallacy. It is an attempt to prevent efficiency and would be disastrous to labor and to the public.

The worst enemy of all workers is an inefficiently managed shop.

Here is another of these men, Lawrence Addicks, of Chrome, N. J., a member of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers, a graduate of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and consulting engineer for Phelps, Dodge & Co. He is as strongly against this proposition as is Mr. Edison.

Another man who takes the same position is Elmer A. Sperry, of New York City, member of American Society of Mechanical Engineers; is a graduate of Cornell, class of 1876; designer of electric appliances; and noted inventor (designer of gyroscopic stabilizer for ships and aeroplanes).

Another is A. M. Hunt, of New York City; member of American Society of Mechanical Engineers; is a graduate of Naval Academy of 1879; is consulting engineer and experienced in the development of hydroelectric, steam, and gas plants.

Still another is Alfred Craven, of New York City; member of American Society of Mechanical Engineers; is a graduate of

Naval Academy of 1876; is chief engineer of the Public Service Commission of New York City; and was formerly division engineer in charge of the construction work on the Croton aqueduct and reservoirs.

Another is Frank J. Sprague, of New York City; member of American Society of Mechanical Engineers; is a graduate of Naval Academy of 1888; now is consulting engineer for the Sprague, Otis, and General Electric Companies. He was the founder of the Sprague Electric Railway Motor Co., and was concerned in establishing the first electric trolley system in the United States.

Another is W. R. Whitney, of Schenectady, N. Y.; member of American Society of Mechanical Engineers; is a graduate of Massachusetts Institute of Technology of 1890; is at present director of the research laboratory of the General Electric Co.; has been the moving spirit in the perfecting of metallic electric-lamp filaments and the development of wrought tungsten.

All of these men believe that the Tavenner bill would be disastrous to efficiency and would injure the laborer himself.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. BROWNE. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Has the gentleman the opinion there of Mr. Louis D. Brandeis, recently nominated for the Supreme Court by the President?

Mr. BROWNE. Yes, I have; and Mr. Brandeis favors the time study and premium system and believes that they are necessary to any efficiency methods. I will quote from Brandeis later. Here is the opinion of John F. Wallace. He was formerly chief engineer of the Panama Canal. He resides in New York. He says:

I would say that the Tavenner bill is so obviously to the disadvantage not only of the United States Government, but also to all employers of labor as well as to labor itself that it is difficult to conceive of its finding favor with our Senators and Representatives. The prosperity of the American Nation, outside of the personalities of its broad and progressive citizens, has been due to the introduction of labor-saving machinery and the substitution of brains for manual labor in all classes of human industry, and it should be apparent to employees in the mass as much as to employers that increased efficiency in production has not only bettered the condition of workmen, but also increased the available profits out of which compensation of labor is paid.

Elmer L. Corthell, doctor of science, president American Society of Civil Engineers, says:

It is my decided personal opinion from careful study of industrial conditions in this and other countries, covering many years, that the result of the proposed Tavenner bill will lead fast to industrial and commercial disaster. Every effort should be made to remove rather than increase the burden on our industries. This bill, if enacted into law, will lead to irreparable injury and loss to the industry, commerce, and particularly the foreign trade of this country.

And I could go on with the testimony of all these other men. My friend from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] asked me about Mr. Brandeis. I have Mr. Brandeis's statement, and I will read it. When Louis D. Brandeis appeared before the Interstate Commerce Commission a few years ago he made the statement to them that the railroad companies of the United States were losing \$1,000,000 a day because they were not efficient, and the railroad companies and the Interstate Commerce Commission both asked him to prove it, and he brought his great efficiency experts before them, and he was days and days introducing evidence, making out his case. He submitted a brief on the subject that will convince anyone who will read it that a time study is necessary to efficient management. Everyone knows that if any man in this country is in favor of labor, a champion of organized labor, it is Louis D. Brandeis. And what does he say?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to the gentleman from Colorado?

Mr. BROWNE. Yes.

Mr. KEATING. Does the gentleman know of any railroad in the world that has adopted a stop watch?

Mr. BROWNE. I do not know of any.

Mr. KEATING. You do not know of any railroad that has taken the opportunity to save \$1,000,000 a day?

Mr. BROWNE. There are hundreds of thousands of men working to-day under the stop-watch and time system that are absolutely contented, and I could stand here and read from now until to-morrow night from the testimony that I have, not only from manufacturers all over the United States that are making use of the time-study and premium system but also the employees working under such system who are heartily in favor of the same. And I have failed to find a single instance where the employees wanted to abolish the system.

#### SCIENTIFIC MANAGEMENT DEMANDS TIME STUDY.

The results obtained through scientific management depend further on a careful study of each operation with a view to determining, in the first place, what time should normally be taken in performing the operation, and, secondly, whether it can be performed in a better manner than as hitherto practiced. The whole realm of science is brought to the aid of the humblest workman.

Scientific management recognizes also that due appreciation of the actual results of effort must be based upon actual knowledge, and such knowledge is an essential condition to the best performance. The current record of the accomplishment of each individual, of each machine, and of all materials is an indispensable factor in scientific management. Without such a record the tyranny of the foreman, and all the discord which attends it, is inevitable. Without such a record, justice to employer and employee is impossible. Without such a record, waste can not be eliminated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. BROWNE. Mr. Chairman, I ask to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWNE. These interruptions have taken a great deal of my time.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to have some understanding that those who are opposed to the motion shall have an equal amount of time.

Mr. BROWNE. Mr. Brandeis says further:

#### FINANCIAL GAINS.

Under scientific management the employee is enabled to earn without greater strain upon his vitality from 25 to 60 per cent more than under the old system.

The larger wages are made possible by larger production; but this gain in production is not attained by speeding up. It comes largely from removing the obstacles to production which annoy and exhaust the workman, obstacles for which he is, or should not be, made responsible.

Mr. Brandeis commends in the strongest manner possible in his brief, both as to time study and the premium system, and Louis D. Brandeis is against the piece system. Organized labor is against the piece system. Yet this bill does not condemn the piece system, but the time system; time study of any kind. It condemns the premium system; and yet organized labor, so far as ever I have known, has never made any public statement where it has condemned the use of the time system or the premium system outside of Government work.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNE. Yes.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I would like to ask the gentleman whether he knows if Mr. Brandeis or Mr. Wallace or any other scientific man that he has cited ever worked under a stop-watch system or knows anything about it?

Mr. BROWNE. They have made a great study of it.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I do not believe they know anything about it.

Mr. BROWNE. Well, the laboring man is not always the best judge of what is best for him. We know that in days gone by the labor men fought every labor-saving device. We know that the Government Printing Office was the last great printing office in the United States that put in linotype machines, because the men in the Government Printing Office thought it was going to hurt them. But it did not hurt them, and never has; but, on the contrary, they were benefited by such inventions.

Now, my friends who are in favor of the Tavenner bill argue that scientific management is subject to abuse. It is. Every system is subject to abuse. If you have the flat day's work system and you have an unscrupulous employer, he may ask a man to do a day and a half's work in a day. All a man has to do is simply to stop working for such employer.

An employer that wants to treat his men badly can do it under one system as easily as another. It is policy and good business sense to treat laboring men fairly and squarely. Now, under this system it has not impaired the health of any employee. I have Gen. Crozier's statement upon that and I have the statement of the Secretary of War on that. He has ascertained that fact very carefully. They say it will overstimulate a man if you give him a premium. Just look at that a moment. If a premium was going to overstimulate a man if that man was working for himself, he would have the same incentive to overwork as he would if working for a premium. A man may sometimes overstimulate himself because he is working for a premium, but such men are exceptions, and laws are not made for the exceptions. Men are not created with equal capacity. A man that can do twice the work of another man ought to get pay for it. I say that a man ought to have the advantage of his talents, of his energy, and of his ability. And this time system and this premium system give him this.

Take, for instance, a paper mill. A paper machine costs \$75,000. It is an important thing in that paper mill to have a man working at that machine that can work it most efficiently. Some men may not be adapted to certain work. They may put such a man at some other machine and he may do well at his new work. So they get the square man in the square place, and the result is we have greater efficiency, a greater output. I have testimony here that it would take me hours to read, showing how much the output is increased and how much more the laboring men are getting under it. And although I have not any accurate information about it, I believe that they are using the time study and premium system in a majority of the up-to-date manufacturing plants in the United States, and the evidence shows that where they have this time system, it shows this fact, that in those plants where they have scientific management they have decreased the hours of labor and increased the output, and at the same time they have increased the wages of labor.

Mr. KEATING. Was not the testimony before our committee with regard to the boot and shoe industry as an example, that less than 15 per cent of the boot and shoe manufactories of this country had the stop-watch system?

Mr. BROWNE. I think that is correct. And some lines have it completely. A large proportion of the automobile works have it.

Mr. KEATING. In the young men's clothing business the testimony showed that there was just one concern in the entire United States. Was not that true? It was so testified before our committee.

Mr. GORDON. You are mistaken about it.

Mr. KEATING. I am not mistaken about it.

Mr. BROWNE. Take the clothing industry. A man testified here, a Mr. Fiess. He showed how he had reduced the hours of labor to seven hours a day. He had increased the pay of the employees and increased his output. Just stop and think a minute. We are going into a great many undertakings in this naval bill. We are going to manufacture armor plate, and great emergencies may arise when we will need to use all efficiency methods known to increase and hasten our output, and should it be the policy of our Government at this time to say that we shall not use a system that is almost universally used by the private employers of the United States just because you can find employers who, maybe, are abusing the system? I can go to plants where they have the common day-work plan, where they have an unscrupulous employer who is abusing his laborers. I do not believe that the heads of great Government departments will abuse a system of this kind.

Gen. Crozier, Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance, states that in the various arsenals over which he has charge there are 6,194 employees. These employees work eight hours per day, and each employee has a 15 days' leave of absence each year with full pay, and receives the same wages as are paid for similar work in private works and in addition many receive premiums or bonuses.

Gen. Crozier testified before the Labor Committee that if the Tavenner bill became a law it would have the effect of abolishing all time study and premium work in the Watertown Arsenal, and in his opinion the labor cost would be doubled.

The following questions were asked Gen. Crozier when he testified, and answered by him as follows:

"Mr. DENISON. As a result of this system, have you had a chance to observe whether or not there is a decrease in the vitality of the employees, and whether it has an injurious effect upon the laborers themselves?"

"Gen. CROZIER. It has not in the least. As I stated a moment ago, the records show that the percentage of accidents among the premium workers is less than among the day workers.

"Q. Does the application of the system result in eliminating the men or shifting them?—A. We have a great deal of shifting of the men. We have never discharged any man as a direct result of the system. We have never discharged a man because he could not come up to the system. (Hearings, p. 169.)

"Q. General, what is your judgment, speaking with reference to these men, as to whether or not this system will result in decreasing their vitality and health?—A. I do not see the slightest reason why it should. You must remember that the effort which is made is only to ascertain what the workmen can do reasonably, or can be reasonably expected to do. In that respect it constitutes a safeguard, because without the system in any effort to establish tasks I do not see that we can do anything but resort to the pacemaker. If you have an employed pacemaker, he may be an exceptional man, and he would furnish the only standard you would have to go by in forming your expectation as to what a man should do. Even under this legislation this kind of a process would not be forbidden.

"Q. Let me ask this question: Do you think that the enactment of this law, if it should be enacted, would result in any embarrassment to the Government or in any decrease in its ability to meet the situation in case we should become involved in a war?"

"Gen. CROZIER. I think it would have a great influence on it, because in that case we would have, in the first place, no accurate knowledge of what a day's work should be, what the output of the workman should be, or what we should require him to do, or what we should tell him to do to get a day's work.

"Q. Do you think you could get a factory to a high state of efficiency without the stop-watch system?—A. I think we could not reach a high state of efficiency without it. I do not believe I could have

gotten the Watertown Arsenal up to its present state of efficiency without using the stop watch or some other equivalent time-measuring device.

"Gen. CROZIER. When the amendment carrying similar legislation to that which is now proposed was added to the Army bill last year in order to let the employees see what the effect would be, I gave it by order the same effect it would have if it became a law. I thereupon received a petition signed by several hundred employees of the Frankford Arsenal, where the premium payments were made, asking that my action be withdrawn. A part of the petition is as follows:

PETITION OF EMPLOYEES.

"FRANKFORD ARSENAL, January 28, 1915.

"CHIEF OF ORDNANCE, UNITED STATES ARMY:

"I believe that this system (referring to the premium system) has been eminently successful because, according to published reports, the manufacture of small-arms ammunition at the Frankford Arsenal presents a decided economy when compared with costs of the same ammunition procured from private manufacturers. Many of us, based upon the premium system of competition, have obligated ourselves to purchase homes, and if the premium rates are abolished, it means the loss of our homes to us.

"It is very probable that branch of Congress which passed this legislation had in view the interests of the employees, but we beg to differ on this very point. While the legislation prohibits rewarding us for our increased efforts which we give the Government, it does not prohibit an officer or foreman from requiring us to work just as hard as we are now working and for very much less compensation.

"The power of your authority, and that of your officers and your foremen to make us work harder, has not been lessened by this legislation, but you have been deprived of the opportunity of paying us for such increased work as you may give to us.

"We therefore ask you to submit this petition to the Secretary of War, with the recommendation that he transmit it to Congress for consideration and, we hope, favorable action.

"Signed by several hundred workmen." (Hearings, p. 163.)

About March 8 premium payments were restored at the Frankford Arsenal. Maj. Shinkle, who was in charge of the cartridge branch of the arsenal, wrote to Gen. Crozier as follows:

"DEAR GENERAL: When your restoration of premium payments was announced in the cartridge factory there was a complete change in the whole atmosphere of the building. Pessimism gave way to optimism, dissatisfaction to complete contentment.

"There never was a better illustration of the fact that the premium system, when administered in the interests of the employees, is one of the greatest stimulants for the moral, physical, and financial well-being of the employees, etc. (Hearings, p. 185.)

GIVING THE MAN A CHANCE, GIVING HIM INSPIRATION, MAKES A MAN OUT OF HIM INSTEAD OF A MACHINE.

"The social gain of the workman from scientific management is greater even than the financial. He secures the development and rise in self-respect, the satisfaction that his work, which in almost every line of human activity, accompanies great accomplishment by the individual. Eagerness and interest take the place of indifference, both because the workman is called upon to do the highest work of which he is capable and also because in doing this better work he secures appropriate and substantial recognition and reward.

BRANDEIS FAVORS BONUS SYSTEM.

"The money reward for the individual workman's high accomplishment is ordinarily and probably most effectively distributed by means of a bonus system. The bonus system under scientific management has proved itself to be perhaps the most appropriate method of securing to labor its proper reward and perpetuating full cooperation between employer and employee.

SCIENTIFIC MANAGEMENT HELPS CONSUMER.

"Experience in trade has shown that except where there is a close unregulated monopoly the public always secures some part of the benefit gained by reduced cost of production. The reduced selling price comes ordinarily, not as a voluntary concession, but because the demand of the consumer for lower prices proves irresistible in competitive or publicly regulated business."

SCIENTIFIC MANAGEMENT AND LABOR UNIONS.

Mr. Brandeis believes in and has been as great a friend of organized labor as any man of this generation. He says in his brief:

"The claim has been made that scientific management and labor unions are inconsistent; that the organization of labor present insuperable obstacles to the introduction of scientific management in railroads and other industries where unionism is potent. This claim, we believe, is wholly unfounded in fact.

"Collective bargaining is alike an important factor under scientific management as under the old system.

"Unionism does not prevent the introduction of scientific management. It is true that unions, in some trades, have bitterly opposed the introduction of the piece rate or the bonus system without scientific management, just as other unions have opposed the day rate system without scientific management. And very intelligent labor leaders have from time to time objected, and objected properly, to ruthless methods of speeding up; but, as shown above, speeding up is not scientific management.

"It will always require tact and patience to introduce radically new methods, whether the persons to be effected are organized or unorganized workers."

SCIENTIFIC MANAGEMENT APPLICABLE TO ALL BUSINESS.

"Experience has already demonstrated that the principles of scientific management are generally in their application, and can be introduced into practically all businesses, and all departments of any business. They have been successfully applied in private competitive business, like machine shops and factories, steelworks and paper mills, cotton mills and shoe shops, in bleacheries and dye works, in printing and book binding, in lithographing establishments, in the manufacture of typewriters and optical instruments, in construction and engineering work."

Mr. Brandeis produced evidence of the success of scientific management in many different industries, and offered to continue further, when Commissioner Prouty of the Interstate Commerce Commission said:

"Mr. Brandeis, you can hardly add anything to your case by calling the representatives of some other industry and showing these same principles have been applied there. It is perfectly evident that if they

have been applied in one case, they can be applied in another analogous case."

Dr. H. S. Person, director of the Amos Tuck School of Administration and Finances 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 effect of scientific management upon the workmen. 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."

"Wages 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 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."

Tabor Manufacturing Co., Philadelphia, Pa.: Records examined by Mr. Godfrey, now president of Drexel Institute, show 73 per cent increase 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 to 50 per cent; hours reduced from 10 to 9; increase in output, 20 to 75 per cent; cost reduced 10 to 25 per cent; quality of product improved.

Lewiston Bleachery & 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 Manufacturing Co., Syracuse, N. Y., by Mr. G. D. Babcock, product 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, Aukan & Co., Lebanon, Pa., by Mr. D. J. Walsh, jr.: Labor turnover reduced; sanitary conditions improved; increase of wages of 25 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 to twenty-five 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 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 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 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.

Waverly Press, Baltimore, Md., by Edward B. Passano, president: Increase in production 33 per cent; operatives earning 33 to 50 per cent more; apparently satisfied and in good health.

Clothing Shops, Cleveland, Ohio, by Richard A. Feiss, general manager: Happiness improved; health of workers improved, as shown specifically by average of absentees 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 William N. 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.

[Col. Wheeler, p. 74.]

REDUCTION IN COST OF LABOR AND MATERIALS DURING DEVELOPMENT OF SCIENTIFIC MANAGEMENT.

During the development of the new scientific management at the Watertown Arsenal, the cost, not only of labor but also of material, in

making sets of parts for the alteration of 12-inch mortar carriages (for short guns) was gradually reduced, "so that we have this result, that the direct labor cost per set was reduced from \$480 to \$275 per set. The shop expense cost was reduced from \$335 to \$332 per set, and the material cost was reduced from \$785 to \$362 per set."

[Col. Wheeler, p. 93.]

DECREASE IN COST OF GEARS UNDER PREMIUM SYSTEM.

Referring to a case where a man was required to cut teeth in 17 steel gears: "As a result of the time study on this work, this man was told that the work ought to be done in 71 minutes, and that if it was done in 71 minutes he would get a premium of 33 per cent. \* \* \* Adding 66 per cent to that time made the time 120 minutes per gear within which he could earn a premium, his saving in time being shared by the arsenal. This man completed the 17 gears in 1,356 minutes, whereas his total allowance was 2,040 minutes, and he earned a premium of approximately 25 per cent. In executing this work under this system he reduced the cost of each gear from \$2.41 to \$1.06, or a saving per gear of \$1.35."

[Gen. Crozier, p. 935.]

EMPLOYEES INCREASED EARNINGS AT PIECEWORK OVER DAY RATE, ARSENAL.

At the arsenal in June, 1911, one miller whose day rate was \$2 averaged at piecework \$3 a day; that is, his percentage of increase averaged 50 over and above his day rate.

Eighteen millers whose day rate was \$1.75 each averaged at piecework \$2.63 each; that is, their percentage of increase was 50.28.

Four millers whose day rate was \$1.50 each averaged at piecework \$2.02 each, their percentage of increase being 34.66.

Two millers whose day rate was \$1.25 each averaged at piecework \$2.23 each, their percentage of increase being 78.40.

In a group of 25 millers the increased earnings at piecework over their day work averaged from 34.66 to 78.40 per cent.

Fifteen millers whose day rate was \$2.50 each averaged at piecework \$3.09 each, their percentage of increase being 23.60.

Two profilers whose day rate was \$2.75 each averaged at piecework \$3.12 each, their percentage of increase being 13.45.

Twelve profilers whose day rate was \$2.50 each averaged at piecework \$3.09 each, their increase being 23.60 per cent.

Two profilers whose day rate was \$2.25 each averaged at piecework \$2.63 each, their percentage of increase being 16.88.

Another trade, polishers. One polisher whose day rate was \$3.25 averaged at piecework \$3.60, an increase of 10.76 per cent.

Eighteen polishers whose day rate was \$3 each averaged at piecework \$3.59 each, their increase being 19.66 per cent.

Eighteen polishers whose day rate was \$3 averaged at piecework \$3.55, their increase being 18.33 per cent.

The object of that is simply to show, as stated at the time to the witness, that the rates are such that men, by the extra effort intended to accompany piecework, may make this percentage over and above their day rates.

[Gen. Crozier, p. 1198.]

MACHINISTS UNDER NEW SYSTEM ARE REDUCING COST TO A NOTABLE EXTENT—EXAMPLES GIVEN.

With reference to the length of time that is required for making studs by the use of the stop watch, it is now reported from the Watertown Arsenal that the use of the stop watch in setting the time for the turret lathe work has practically ceased, and that the same condition is being approached in reference to the engine lathes—that very few time studies indeed have been made since the 1st of November in the foundry—although I think there are now working in the foundry, and have been for a month or two past, pretty nearly 75 per cent of the molders under the new system, and have given them compensation under that system. In the machine shop they have been working something like 20 per cent of the machinists under the new system. These men have been doing very well. They have reduced the cost of things. They have kept on reducing the cost of things to a notable extent.

[Gen. Crozier, p. 1204.]

EXAMPLE OF FLOOR JOB IN FOUNDRY—REDUCTION OF OVER 41 PER CENT.

Now, I wish to give an example of a little different kind. Mr. O'Leary asked me about a bench job, so I gave him an example about a bench job. Now, here is an example of a floor job in the foundry, the molding of the elevating arms for a 6-inch disappearing gun carriage. The elevating arm is an affair shaped something like this [indicating]. It is intended to raise and lower the breech of the gun. It is pivoted at its lower end about an arbor and its upper end embraces the trunnions of a band which is placed on the gun near its breech, so that by raising and lowering this arm the breech of the gun is raised and lowered. It is about 6 or 7 feet long, and the spread is perhaps 20 inches up at the top.

That, of course, was a larger job than the one I mentioned a moment ago, and the cost of it under the day-work method was \$42.35. After a time study had been made of it the cost was reduced to \$24.87, making a saving of \$17.48; which was 41 and something over per cent of the original cost. The saving represented a sum of \$9.94 a day to the Government. The man's pay was increased from \$3.52 to \$5.02, which was an increase of 42 per cent.

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,

Washington, D. C., May 18, 1916.

HON. EDWARD E. BROWNE,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BROWNE: With reference to your letter of April 28, asking for my views in regard to H. R. 8665, entitled "A bill to regulate the method of directing the work of Government employees," you are informed that it is my opinion that the enactment of the above-mentioned bill into law would be prejudicial to the best interests of the Post Office Department and Postal Service. I inclose herewith copies of memoranda submitted by several of my assistants covering the subject in detail.

Very sincerely, yours,

OTTO PRAGER,

Acting Postmaster General.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,

FIRST ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL,

Washington, May 10, 1916.

CHIEF CLERK,

Post Office Department:

It is my opinion that the attached bill (H. R. 8665) should be opposed by the department. It is reactionary in character and, if enacted, would prove a bar to the adoption, in the administration of the service at large as well as in the department, of methods and practices which

are recognized as sound and proper by all progressive and intelligent business executives.

It may be true that the methods and practices against which the bill is directed, if wrongly applied or left to the discretion of inexperienced supervisory officers, might work hardship and injustice on employees, but this is no justification for condemning and proscribing the general scheme and the principles on which it rests.

"Scientific management" rests upon the theory that intelligent and effective supervision of labor is possible only when the supervisory officer possesses definite knowledge of the time which ought to be consumed by a reasonably efficient man, under reasonably efficient conditions, in the performance of a given task. It recognizes, naturally, the variations in capacity that will be found among different workmen. It merely fixes standard times as a result of actual tests under ordinary conditions and presupposes that different employees may fail to attain the standard, may attain the standard, or may exceed the standard, depending upon their ability and the conditions surrounding the particular job. Under scientific management, where properly and intelligently applied, there are usually two standards—(1) the standard of performance which may reasonably be expected of an efficient employee under efficient conditions, and (2) a standard of performance below which no employee may fall without jeopardizing his salary or position, subject, of course, to exception when the inefficiency is due to conditions over which the employee has no control, such as defective machines, tools, etc., or, in the case of the Post Office Service, defective distribution cases, bad light or ventilation, poor space arrangements, etc.

Scientific management not only enables the employer to eliminate the totally inefficient, but enables him to ascertain definitely the employees who are below the standard of efficiency so that he may endeavor to develop them and also to determine the question of adaptability with respect to different employees.

So far as the Post Office Service of this bureau is concerned, there has been no complete application of all of the principles of scientific management, although it is believed that the tendency should be toward the adoption and application of such principles. We have, however, endeavored to apply, in a restricted way, several of the principles and practices—for example, the efficiency rating system promulgated by general circular in November, 1908. This system was the original step in the direction of scientific efficiency ratings but is now obsolete, and the department has had under consideration for several years the question of improving it. Without some standard of performance and method of ascertaining the performance of different clerks and carriers, even the present crude efficiency rating system could not be applied to our service. The time element is most important, and whether a stop watch is used or not, it is necessary to ascertain the time required by a clerk or carrier to handle the mail distributed to him or to perform other duties to which he is assigned. The broad language of the Tavenner bill proscribing the use of a stop watch or "other time-measuring device" appears to prohibit any method of calculating the time taken by the clerk or carrier to perform his work.

In the City Delivery Service we have adopted recently certain standards of work. For example, our system of determining the reasonableness of office time of carriers consists of a comparison of the time required by the carrier actually to perform his work and the time which he ought to have required based upon standards of 16 letters and 6 papers per minute for two-trip carriers and time allowances for miscellaneous duties. Although the comparison is arrived at as a result of a deductive method, it is, nevertheless, a "time-measuring device." With respect to the street work of carriers, the time element is important again, and the average performance of the carrier, for purposes of comparison, is set up against the actual time consumed by the carrier when accompanied by a foreman or roundsman. The foreman frequently uses not only his ordinary watch and a pedometer but frequently, I believe, equips himself with a stop watch as well as a counting device to determine the number of stops, etc., the carrier may make and the time he consumes per stop. These practices in the City Delivery Service, although somewhat crude as compared with the methods and practices employed in modern industrial plants, are of the nature of scientific management and they, as well as improved methods of their kind, are necessary if we are to arrive at anything like good efficiency in the City Delivery Service.

It is believed, moreover, that the tendency should be toward the adoption of a device or method which will more exactly determine the time consumed by both clerks and carriers in the performance of the different kinds of work assigned to them. Standards of work have not been so generally applied in the case of post-office clerks. Even here, however, it has been necessary, in order to comply with the law requiring that promotions be based on efficiency ratings, to conduct case examinations to determine the speed and accuracy of which distributors are capable. These tests are essentially time studies, and the results are used for making up efficiency ratings. The next step will be to make a comparison between the standards established by these tests and the actual day-to-day performance of the clerks. In other words, the "stop watch" or "time-measuring device" principle is already a necessary feature of the management of post-office clerks, and the principles of "scientific management" are the means by which the next great advance in post-office efficiency is to be accomplished.

Time tests are absolutely essential to the determination of intelligent standards, and the more definite and exact the standards are the surer the employee will be of fair treatment. In our service, with its many thousands of employees and hundreds of supervisory officers, it is absolutely necessary, in the interest of fair treatment for the employees, that some definite method be adopted for the ascertainment of output and the determination of standards for comparison with output. Whether the standards are determined according to a definite plan and stated in writing or whether they are merely the ideas of different supervisory officers based upon opinion or judgment, the fact remains that standards are necessary and do exist for comparison with output. Unless the standards are determined as a result of time tests of specific work under a uniform method or plan they will result from the observation and judgment of supervisory officers, and this observation and judgment will be of as many degrees of intelligence and accuracy as there are supervisory officers.

Furthermore, standards are essential to the intelligent administration of the service by the department, for without standards of performance and information as to the measure in which the standards are attained by the employees of different offices the department has no intelligent way to determine whether an office is overmanned or undermanned.

It is my judgment that the enactment of the Tavenner bill would be prejudicial to the best interest of the Post Office Department and the Postal Service.

DANIEL C. ROFER,  
First Assistant.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,  
SECOND ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL,  
Washington, May 15, 1916.

CHIEF CLERK,  
Post Office Department:

Reference is made to the letter dated April 28, 1916, from Hon. EDWARD E. BROWNE, asking the views of the Postmaster General with reference to bill H. R. 8665, entitled "A bill to regulate the method of directing the work of Government employees." The bill, in part, prohibits any person having charge of the work of any employee of the United States Government from making with a "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."

It would be impracticable to satisfactorily administer the Railway Mail Service under such prohibition. The work of the Railway Mail Service consists largely in the distribution of mail on moving trains, and the service must be adjusted to the train operation; therefore it is impossible to organize it on the basis of eight hours' work for every week day on every railway postal clerk's run. There are many long train runs on which the railway postal clerks to properly perform the service must be on duty for considerably more than eight consecutive hours, and this is offset by giving the clerks days off duty alternating with days on duty, the length of the time off duty to depend upon the number of hours of work performed by the clerk during the days when he is on duty. To accomplish this, there must be a "time study" of every railway postal clerk's run, to include the hours when he is on the train, the time devoted at terminals to loading, unloading, going to and from post offices, delivering and receiving registered mail, extra time on account of delayed trains, and extra work to meet emergencies; otherwise it would be impossible to determine what would be a reasonable assignment for a railway postal clerk in any given case. Again, railway postal clerks work in postal cars by themselves, in many cases a long distance from the headquarters of their supervising officials, and in order to determine how many clerks should be assigned to a run a "time study" must be made as to the number of pieces or packages of mail to be distributed and handled within the limit of time available on the particular trains; otherwise too much or too little work might be required of a clerk; and if, by reason of no "time study" having been made, insufficient clerical force was provided, the mail would not be distributed, its delivery would be delayed, and the public service would suffer.

The preamble of the bill indicates that the proposed legislation is intended to be in the interest of Government employees, but if applied to the Railway Mail Service it would be detrimental to the interests of the employees, because without a "time study" of the work and conditions of each railway postal clerk's run there would be danger of employees being placed in assignments requiring of them excessive hours of duty and unreasonable amount of work. On the other hand, they might be placed in assignments where the average number of hours per day and the amount of work performed would fall much below a reasonable standard; therefore I recommend that the bill be not enacted into law, its provisions being contrary to the interests of the public service and of the Government employees as represented by the Railway Mail Service.

OTTO PRAEGER,  
Second Assistant.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,  
FOURTH ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL,  
Washington, May 17, 1916.

CHIEF CLERK,  
Post Office Department:

Referring to bill H. R. 8665, entitled "A bill to regulate the method of directing the work of Government employees," your attention is invited to the inclosed communication from the Superintendent of Rural Mails, the contents of which are indicative of the attitude of this bureau toward the provisions of the bill.

It is not the present practice of this bureau to use any time-measuring device in determining the efficiency of any of the employees under its supervision, but the necessity for inaugurating a new system, involving the use of a timing watch, may arise at any moment. This is especially true with respect to accounting, cost keeping, and certain features of the rural-delivery carrier service, and it is exceedingly important that such improvements as may be made in the Postal Service by means of a time-measuring device be not rendered impossible of accomplishment by the enactment into law of the provisions contained in the Tavenner bill.

J. K. PICKETT,  
Acting Fourth Assistant.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,  
FOURTH ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL,  
Washington, May 17, 1916.

CHIEF CLERK, Fourth Assistant:

With reference to the attached bill entitled "A bill to regulate the method of directing the work of Government employees," which in part prohibits any person having charge of the work of any employee of the United States Government from making a time study of any job of any such employee, I have to state that the enactment of any legislation which would divest the executives of the United States Government Departments of all authority to introduce any system intended to determine the amount of work performed by an employee in a given time, or the length of time required by an employee to complete a given job, would have a vicious effect upon the conduct of the public business, since such legislation would place a premium on slothfulness and tend to encourage sluggishness and indifference on the part of employees.

I fully concur in the statements of the First Assistant and the Second Assistant, which appear in the attached communications.

Geo. L. Wood, Superintendent.

Mr. KEATING. I want to ask unanimous consent that my colleague [Mr. NOLAN] may proceed for 15 minutes.



The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Can not we limit the debate then on the amendment?

Mr. BROWNE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object to the request of the gentleman from Colorado—

Mr. KEATING. There are about four gentlemen over here that would like about five minutes apiece.

Mr. MANN. I have not any doubt of that. Still, let us see if we can not reach an agreement as to time, anyhow.

Mr. KEATING. I would like to do that, as far as I am personally concerned.

Mr. MANN. Because there are other amendments and the time is limited.

Mr. KEATING. I would like to discuss this matter, but I am perfectly willing to enter into any arrangement that these other gentlemen who are anxious to present their views—

Mr. OLIVER. I would call the attention of the minority leader to the fact that the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT], is absent.

Mr. MANN. I understand, but the chairman of the committee made a request for 20 minutes on a side. That was objected to, and then 20 minutes was given to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BROWNE] and an additional 5 minutes. I think it was understood then that some time would be occupied on the other side.

Mr. KEATING. That would be 25 minutes on each side.

Mr. PADGETT. Has there been a proposition made as to an agreement as to time?

Mr. MANN. There have been 27 minutes used by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BROWNE].

Mr. PADGETT. How much time did you want on your side?

Mr. MANN. We want to have a limitation.

Mr. PADGETT. You have used 25 minutes.

Mr. MANN. Twenty-five minutes.

Mr. PADGETT. And they want 25 minutes on this side?

Mr. MANN. So that it can be yielded as you want it.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for 25 minutes of time.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I do not know of any more important matter that is going to come up, because the vote here is going to determine the vote on the fortifications bill and a number of other appropriation bills. There are two or three letters here which I have received from the War Department that I would like to call to the attention of the committee, and I would like to speak at least five minutes. I do not want to delay the committee, but I am sincere in the belief that this matter is important enough to be thrashed out.

Mr. PADGETT. Suppose you take 10 minutes more on your side?

Mr. MANN. I would rather take five. We have some more amendments. I realize the importance of this amendment, and I would like to discuss it the rest of the afternoon.

Mr. PADGETT. There are some over here that want some time on the matter.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman knows that the time is fixed. Various gentlemen are waiting to offer amendments.

Mr. PADGETT. Does the gentleman say the time has been fixed on the bill?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. All these amendments will be precluded at 2 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. PADGETT. It has been suggested that we just let it run for the present.

Mr. MANN. I am willing to agree that there be 30 minutes on that side and 5 minutes on this side.

Mr. PADGETT. Then I ask unanimous consent that we have 30 minutes on this side and 5 minutes additional on the other side, and that the Chair control the time.

Mr. SHERLEY. I do not know what you mean by "this side" and what you mean by "that side." I want to speak on the amendment. I do not care where I get the time so that I get it.

Mr. PADGETT. I suggest that the Chair control the time.

Mr. MANN. Some gentlemen want more than 5 minutes. I suggest that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] take 30 minutes and that I have 5 minutes.

Mr. PADGETT. That would give you 30 minutes in all.

Mr. MANN. No; I say 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee and 5 minutes to myself.

Mr. PADGETT. I ask unanimous consent, then, that the debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in

35 minutes, 5 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and 30 minutes by myself.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. WHALEY). The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto be closed in 35 minutes, that 30 minutes be controlled by himself and 5 minutes by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. Is there objection?

Mr. KEATING. Reserving the right to object, does that give my colleague from California, Mr. NOLAN, 15 minutes?

Mr. PADGETT. No; it could not give him 15 minutes. I was going to say that I would yield to the gentleman from Colorado 20 minutes of that time, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GORDON] 5 minutes, and to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] 5 minutes.

Mr. KEATING. Under that arrangement the supporters of the arrangement would have 40 minutes and those who support the original proposition of the bill would have only 20 minutes. That is not a fair division.

Mr. MANN. Not quite, Mr. Chairman. If that arrangement was made, I should yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. NOLAN] the five minutes on this side. I do not say that is fair. I am not undertaking to pass upon that.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. KEATING. Reserving the right to object—

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, if that request is objected to, I do not know of anything except to let it run—

Mr. SHERLEY. I think we can arrange it easily. There ought to be an equal division of time, of course. I understand that gentlemen have had 20 minutes.

Mr. MANN. Twenty-five.

Mr. SHERLEY. Twenty-five by the clock; but there were interruptions.

Mr. MANN. No; he had 25 minutes.

Mr. SHERLEY. Two or three minutes were lost in getting order. How much time does the gentleman from California want?

Mr. NOLAN. I want 15 minutes.

Mr. SHERLEY. And the gentleman from Illinois wants 10.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman from Illinois, who speaks on the post-office feature of it, wants five, and I should like five myself.

Mr. SHERLEY. If you run it 35 minutes, with 15 minutes additional on the other side, that would make 50 minutes additional time.

Mr. MANN. I submit that that ought not to be done. There are other amendments to be offered, and the committee has an amendment that is coming up to-morrow morning. There are only three hours to-morrow before the vote.

Mr. SHERLEY. I do not care. I simply feel that there are some matters that I ought to present.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT]?

Mr. KEATING. I shall have to object, unless we can get more time.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is made.

Mr. NOLAN. I renew my request that I be allowed to proceed for 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California renews his request that he may proceed for 15 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I am not willing to concede that, unless we can fix the time for debate, which, I think, we ought to do, because there are other gentlemen in the House beside these who want to discuss this amendment. They want to offer amendments. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Colorado have 30 minutes and that I have 5 minutes, and that at the end of that time all debate close.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and amendments thereto close in 35 minutes, 30 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Colorado and 5 minutes by himself. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GORDON. Will the Chair please state what that agreement was?

The CHAIRMAN. That debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 35 minutes, 30 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING] and 5 minutes by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. FITZGERALD resumed the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. NOLAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, this is a very important section of the naval appropriation bill. A similar provision was included in the Naval and Army appropriation bill in the last session of Congress after considerable discussion. I had the good fortune to sit as a member of the Committee on Labor during the Sixty-third and Sixty-fourth Congresses and to hear the testimony on the Dietrich bill, and in this Congress on the Tavenner bill, which strikes at the stop-watch time study and premium and bonus systems as employed in Government establishments.

During the consideration of the Tavenner bill the efficiency engineers of this country had the opportunity of presenting their case to the House Committee on Labor. It was brought out during the testimony of those gentlemen that the efficiency engineers of this country had formed an organization with headquarters in New York and had solicited funds and started a propaganda campaign throughout this country to prohibit the inclusion in the Army and Navy and fortifications appropriation bills of any prohibition of the stop-watch time study and premium and bonus systems. I do not take issue with those gentlemen. That is their profession. They are making a living at it; but they have started a propaganda throughout this country, and they have Members of Congress deluged with an avalanche of telegrams and letters protesting against this provision in the naval appropriation bill.

Now, these gentlemen testified before the House Committee on Labor, and with all due respect to the gentleman from Wisconsin, I do not know whether he read all of the testimony that took place before the committee or not, but I know that he was not present at most of the hearings and did not have the opportunity to hear the testimony of those in favor of the Tavenner bill. I happened to be present on each and every occasion.

The fact was brought out before the Committee on Labor that not one of the gentlemen who appeared and represented himself as an efficiency expert and a scientific management engineer had ever had any practical shop experience, not one. They were all graduates of some technical institute and took up the question of scientific management after they had their experience in some particular school or institute of technology, but not one had ever had any practical shop experience. If Members of the House had an opportunity to read all of the hearings that took place before the Committee on Labor, I doubt whether there would be a small minority here that would not say that the efficiency engineers were the best witnesses for the Tavenner bill.

I have here some charts prepared by Mr. Minor Chipman from records of work done on different jobs at the Watertown Arsenal. They are included in the hearings before the Committee on Labor. I want to call your attention to these charts. If there is anything in the claim of the gentleman that the stop watch is a scientific device in measuring the element of time as it pertains to the labor of the individual, here is complete evidence that it is not accurate, but inaccurate. Here is a chart of an employee, 2516. It is his record of efficiency for the month of March, 1914, when the system was in full force, and this employee worked on 224 jobs. The highest point he struck that month was 200 per cent, and the lowest 21 per cent. Just imagine; on one job he performed it in half the time and on the other he only performed one twenty-first of it in the time set by the time-study men for scientific management by the stop watch.

I call your attention to it to show the variations. That is supposed to be 100 per cent, this line on the chart. That is the task set; and look at the variation up and down here, shown by this line. That employee was one of the highest skilled men in the Watertown Arsenal, and on one job he gets 200 per cent and in the other 21 per cent. I call your attention to that to show you the inaccuracy of the so-called stop-watch system.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman give the average that the man had?

Mr. NOLAN. His average was 121.35. Now, here is the same man's chart, April, 1914, for efficiency on 140 jobs. His highest was 172.9 and his lowest was 45; his average was 121 per cent. That is the chart for the following month.

Here is a chart—and these were taken from the records of the Watertown Arsenal—of an employee that was not listed as a highly skilled mechanic. It is his efficiency chart for one year. The highest point he reached was 149 and the lowest was 33.3, and the average for the year was 96. Now, these gentlemen claim that it was absolutely essential that they should have the use of a stop watch as a time-measuring device for setting the task. This chart shows the inaccuracy of it. If the time-study men were accurate and the stop watch must be accurate, there

would be hardly any deviation below or above the line. They would not go to 21 below in one instance and 33.3 in the other.

They have tried to create an impression that this particular time service and abolition of the stop watch and the bonus and premium system in Government establishments is a blow at national efficiency. I want to call attention to this fact. There is nothing in this bill that prohibits any sort of facilities, whether it happens to be machinery or a system of scientific management, applied in a common-sense way. The purpose of this provision in the naval bill is to stop the speeding up of the individual so that they can not take the last ounce of energy and strength away from him without any attention or consideration being paid to fatigue studies or the effect on those human elements involved.

Mr. GORDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NOLAN. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. How does keeping the measurement of time that a man consumes at a given task speed him up?

Mr. NOLAN. By the stop watch they study every motion that is made, taking time by the one-hundredth of a second; they take the time of the individual selected first and then make the average man come up to it.

Mr. GORDON. How do they make them?

Mr. NOLAN. They set the task and require him to do it or else he loses his job, and they admit they make no provision for the man that falls by the wayside under this system.

Now, let me proceed on the proposition of the bonus and premium. There are many people in the country that object to any restriction on the bonus and premium system. Let me call your attention to what transpired before the committee. A simple example was given the efficiency experts, and I will give it to the House to show you how men are paid. The question was asked the efficiency engineers, Suppose you were called on to install an efficiency system in a shoe factory and you found a group of men were making five pairs of shoes at \$8 a day. After applying all the elements of scientific management and efficiency you decided that eight pairs of shoes at \$8 a day was a fair task, and eight pairs of shoes was the task. What would you pay the individual for the ninth pair of shoes? That ought to be simple enough. You would think that the workman would get as much for the ninth pair as he got for any one of the eight. Here is the answer: "We would pay him 33 1/3 to 50 cents for the ninth pair of shoes." These experts claimed, and the hearings will bear out my statement, that notwithstanding the fact that the employer secured an additional output of three pairs of shoes for the \$8, due to the establishment of the efficiency system, that he should be further rewarded by getting anywhere from one-half to two-thirds of additional production over and above the eight pairs of shoes, and that the worker, instead of receiving the same rate for the ninth pair as he received for each one of the first eight, should have his price reduced from 50 to 66 2/3 per cent.

That is how the premium and bonus system is applied; that is how it is applied in the Watertown Arsenal, according to the testimony of Gen. Crozier. Talk about employees being satisfied to work under it! In 1911, I believe it was, or 1910, a strike took place against this system at the Watertown Arsenal, and one of my colleagues in the House was a member of the committee that investigated conditions up there. The men were induced to return to work on account of this investigation, and while the committee that conducted the investigation did not denounce the system in its entirety, they called attention to the fact that abuses crept in under it, and they did not think at that time it was necessary to recommend any legislation. Since that time the employees in the Watertown Arsenal have been petitioning and protesting against this system. I have a letter here, not an inspired letter but a letter in which 194 of the lower paid employees of the Watertown Arsenal wrote me indorsing the minimum wage bill which I introduced and which is before this House, and here is what they conclude:

We believe that you will do your best to make the Nolan bill a law. The 194 petitioners of the Nolan bill, with many others working here, also pray to have the Taylor premium system abolished in this arsenal as being detrimental and a menace to our best mutual good.

I withhold the names of the three men that signed this letter as a matter of protection to them.

According to the proponents of the so-called Taylor system and other systems of scientific management, the underpaid and unskilled workers have a greater opportunity under scientific management than by other day-labor systems, and here are 194 laborers in that arsenal who have not received any of the benefits of it, but who have labored under all of the detrimental features of it, and they are protesting against it.

Reference was made here to a Cleveland clothing dealer who came before the committee, and before I pass on to that I

want to say this: I do not believe that 10 per cent of the men who have petitioned Congress against the Tavenner bill have this so-called efficiency system established in their shops. I know this to be the fact in San Francisco, because their men will not work under it, and it invites trouble.

Mr. BROWNE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman if there has ever been a strike caused by the time study or premium system?

Mr. NOLAN. Yes.

Mr. BROWNE. Whereabouts?

Mr. NOLAN. In the Government establishment at Watertown.

Mr. BROWNE. In any private institutions?

Mr. NOLAN. Lots of them throughout the country.

Mr. BROWNE. Name one.

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NOLAN. For a question.

Mr. TAGUE. For the benefit of the gentleman, I would like to tell him that I have already filed, at the request of the workmen in the Watertown Arsenal, a petition to the Army Department to abolish it.

Mr. NOLAN. There was reference made to a gentleman who testified before the committee who had a clothing establishment in Cleveland, who contended here that he had the most contented group of workers under one roof in America. Here is what developed in his shop. I get this from one who was familiar with the conditions in the shop of Mr. Feiss, who is one of the members of the so-called committee of ten who are protesting:

In one plant it was found that iron standards supporting signs were erected at the bench of every group of workers and that on the signboard, in large figures, was placed the number of pieces which that group must finish to accomplish their day's work, so that each group saw before them when the day's work began what their task would be and every other worker in the room could see what tasks the other groups had performed.

From time to time during the forenoon and the afternoon foremen went from group to group counting up the number of pieces already finished and then hanging up this number under the one indicating how much must be done for the day's work, so that each group were notified numerous times during the day of whether they were behind or ahead and each other group knew whether the rest were ahead or behind, the whole purpose of this scheme being to work competition between the groups and to encourage the greatest possible exertion; in other words, to make a racehorse of the group where the foreman endeavored to beat the records being made by the groups under the other foreman.

That is exactly what scientific management as these gentlemen who explain it undertake to show will do. They have no fatigue studies. Scientific-management experts and efficiency engineers tell us that they make none. They pick the time-study man from men in the shop, and from men who have never had any practical experience in trying to determine the effect of this system on the human beings who must perform the task set. The whole objection to this is that you can not apply a stop watch and the results obtained from a stop-watch system to a human being and make it apply generally, as you can to a race horse or to an athlete upon the athletic field. The human being in the workshop has to work day in and day out under the system, while the race horse is prepared for his race just as the athlete is prepared for what he does on the athletic field, with a rest before and plenty of rest afterwards.

So much has been said about "scientific management" and efficiency that the terms have come to represent something definite in the public mind. Something which is definite; not because of any facts which have been ascertained, but because of the terms used with reference to those systems of management which claimed to increase the efficiency of labor and which have been widely advertised under the name of "scientific management."

For several years the proponents of "scientific management" had a clear field and were able to create certain impressions upon the public mind as to the scientific basis for their systems and the protection which their systems gave to labor, which influenced many prominent men to indorse "scientific management."

It is only within most recent times that any thorough and systematic effort has been made to investigate the conditions which had developed, so far as labor is concerned, in those manufacturing establishments which had introduced any of the so-called systems of "scientific management."

Since an investigation has been made by competent authorities, we discover that the claims of scientific accuracy so far as labor is concerned, vanished into thin air.

It is but natural that a system which claims to deal scientifically with labor so far as the stress of labor and the wages to be paid is concerned, would offer some scientific instrument or basis for measurement and determination, and yet we find after extensive hearings by the Committee on Labor and special committees appointed by Congress to investigate "scientific management" that there is not in existence, so far as "scientific management" is concerned, any thorough studies of human fatigue; that the efficiency engineers have discovered no rule or instrument to determine where the danger point in fatigue begins or when the danger point of fatigue has been reached.

We find, furthermore, that none of the efficiency engineers have as yet worked out any adequate data upon the question of long-time efficiency so far as labor is concerned; that they have no standard measurement to determine what the workers' normal speed or exertion should be; and that they have no standard to determine what the hourly wage rate or the payment for labor should be except what they may find in other establishments in the same locality.

Instead of scientific standards of measurements in these matters, each efficiency engineer's personal opinion becomes the standard, and it is upon this frail basis of one human being's opinion that the only element of scientific knowledge is to be discovered.

Last year an investigation was made of "scientific management" as it affected labor under the authority of the Federal Commission on Industrial Relations. The work was done by Mr. R. F. Hoxie, University of Chicago, as chief investigator, his assistants being Mr. Robert G. Valentine, an expert on employing management, and Mr. John P. Frey, an experienced trade-unionist, these two gentlemen representing the employers and the workers.

Some 35 plants in all were investigated and in addition, Mr. Hoxie spent a year in gathering the facts, and one remarkable feature of the report which he prepared was that, when completed, it met with the unqualified approval of the gentleman who had represented the employers' interests and the trade-unionist who had represented labor. In view of the fact that it was a unanimous report, their findings are entitled to be accepted as authoritative, particularly in view of the fact that since the submission of this report no efficiency engineer has submitted evidence to indicate that any one of the statements contained in the report was inaccurate.

It has been said by more than one authority who has read the report that it is one of the most scientifically prepared documents which has been submitted by any body of investigators. And this report iterates and reiterates the fact that there is but little which could be termed scientific about the conditions found under "scientific management" so far as labor is concerned, while on the other hand many conditions affecting labor were found which not only were unscientific but most detrimental to the wage earners' interest, both physically and mentally.

It may be that nothing could impress upon your minds the utterly unscientific and inaccurate results which have followed the application of "scientific management" so much as a graphic illustration.

One of the features of "scientific management" is the use of the stop watch by the time-study man, and the efficiency engineers claim that through the use of this stop watch, the study of the equipment, material, and the man, an accurate or scientifically accurate time can be set in which the workman should perform the task.

It is not difficult to grasp the fact that if the time in which different work was to be performed was scientifically determined that the workmen would accomplish approximately the same percentage called for on each task, and yet investigation shows that the widest of variations exist in the times required to perform tasks which have been set under "scientific management."

We have heard both in the committee room and on the floor of Congress considerable about "scientific management" as it has been applied in the Watertown Arsenal, and I know of no better illustration of the utter inaccuracy of determining the tasks for workmen than can be found in this arsenal.

I hold in my hand some charts prepared by Mr. Miner Chipman, which are prepared from the records of work performed on different jobs by employees of the Watertown Arsenal. The charts are included in the hearings held by the Committee on Labor on the Tavenner bill.

The first one, which relates to the work of employee No. 2519 for the month of March, 1914, indicates that he was a workman of more than ordinary efficiency. During this month he worked on 224 jobs, and for the month his average efficiency was 121.35 per cent. But whether he had accomplished every task in the exact time allowed for it by the split-second watch time-study man, or whether, owing to his great efficiency, he had reached 121 per cent, the degree of time in which he accomplished each task as set by the time-study man would be approximately the same. Yet what do we find on the one hand? One job he performed in one-half of the time set by the time-study man; on another he was able to accomplish but 21 per cent of the task within the time set.

I have another chart, made up from the performance of the same employee during the month of April, and here he shows that his average efficiency was about the same in being 121 per cent, yet on some jobs he was able to accomplish but 45 per cent of what was required by the time-study man within the time set, while on some jobs his efficiency was as high as 172.9 per cent.

As it might be held that this man because of his higher average efficiency might show a greater variation in his output per job, I would call your attention to the record of employee No. 2681 for the months from October 1, 1912, to September 30, 1913. Here we find for this long period an average efficiency of 96 per cent, or, in other words, that this worker on the average accomplished but 96 per cent of his work in the time set by the time-study man, but we find on some jobs that he was able to accomplish but 39.3 per cent of the task within the time set, while on other work he not only accomplished the task but did so with the rating of 149 per cent efficiency.

While such charts are not an indictment against "scientific management" in itself, they do constitute the most convincing evidence that when put into application those who operate the split-second watches and who make the time studies are unable to determine how long a man should be allowed for the performance of a task with any degree of scientific accuracy. In fact, any foreman in an old-fashioned one-horse shop who would allow such differences in the time in which a workman should do his work would be laughed out of the shop by the workers and employers alike.

While theoretically it has been held that "scientific management" through the use of its so-called scientific methods would prevent any overstrain, overexertion, overfatigue upon the worker's part, the result of the investigations made have indicated that nowhere are there to be found such systems for the remorseless speeding up of labor as exist in establishments applying the methods of so-called "scientific management."

The time set for the performance of a task, or the time in which a piece of work must be done, is determined by the time-study man; then to urge or stimulate the workers to accomplish this task they are paid an additional amount either in the form of a premium or a bonus, and the efficiency engineers frankly inform us that they would not expect to secure the performance of the task if it were not for this additional money inducement which is held out to the worker; but this financial inducement is not considered sufficient, and other features are introduced to speed up labor.

In another plant they had established for some of the day workers a very novel evidence of so-called scientific efficiency.

Here some of the work could not be regulated by pulley wheels and machinery because it must be done by hand, and so, as machinery could not be speeded up which the worker must keep pace with, another method had to be devised, and in front of the worker's bench was a metronome, which was set in motion, and the workers were expected to move their arms backward and forward keeping time with the moving arm of the metronome.

In another plant a peculiarly effective system had been devised for speeding the workers to their limit.

The bonus system of payment was in existence and the foreman of each group of workers received a bonus in addition to his wages, based upon the percentage of the workers under his charge who succeeded in accomplishing the task set for them, or, in other words, of earning their bonus. The larger the number of workers who accomplished their tasks within the time set the higher the foreman's bonus.

The idea of making the bonus an effective part of "scientific management" was carried one step further, and the time-study man, who also set the time in which the tasks must be performed, also received a bonus. But his bonus was based upon the number of workers who failed to accomplish the task within the time set, so that when the tasks were set so difficult that but few of the workers could accomplish them, the time-study man's bonus was increased. In other words, the time-study man's income depended upon setting the task so difficult that but few

of the workers could accomplish it, while the foreman's income depended upon his prevailing upon the workers in his charge to accomplish their task within the time set.

Here the workers were between the upper and the nether millstone, between the devil and the deep sea. They were at the mercy of two men, each of whom was stimulated to help out a condition which aimed to secure the last ounce of energy from every worker affected by the system.

These illustrations are taken from an almost countless number which could be given to emphatically disprove the claims that "scientific management" has made relative to its protected influence in preventing overstrain and overspeeding.

We have listened to lengthy statements as to the specific efforts made under "scientific management" to train the workers and to make better mechanics and craftsmen, but when we search for the evidence we find that the efficient workman, the highly skilled specialist which "scientific management" talks about is the man who has been trained to do one simple part in connection with one of the articles which is finally to be assembled into a complete whole.

It is the kind of training which may enable a worker to learn how to screw on a certain size nut upon a bolt more rapidly; which may educate the girl in the garment shop so that she will be proficient in the trade of sewing on buttons or stitching the seam on a collar; it is the kind of industrial or mechanical training which equips the unfortunate worker for no other job than the minutely specialized part of the simple operation upon which he is allowed to work.

I would hesitate to make this statement if it was not so completely borne out by the investigations which have been made, but in view of these I am fully justified in holding that if "scientific management" as it is in operation in the industries to-day could be applied to all of our industries within a year, the training of artisans and craftsmen would cease and the American workers would become a nation of unskilled laborers, or rather laborers skilled in performing but one simple operation in connection with the industry in which he was engaged.

In fact, "scientific management" definitely aims to build up a small body of highly trained men, time and motion study men, instructors, and the head of the planning department, and this little handful of men are to acquire all of the knowledge and to do all of the directing, and there is to be this little group who will do all of the thinking and the immense army of workers who are not to be allowed to think because their thinking would interfere with the unlimited rules and regulations of "scientific management." And we would have in our country a little group with all of the knowledge and all of the directing power in their hands and the masses of laborers dependent upon this group for what meager information they would be allowed to secure as skilled workers.

I have confined myself to a discussion of so-called "scientific management" as it affects labor. It is with this feature that I am particularly interested, because this feature is by far the most important, for it affects the lives of the workers themselves; it would determine the degree of mechanical knowledge which they shall acquire, and establish the standard of living for the masses of our people.

No fact was brought out more clearly in the special investigations made by Congress, in the hearings held by the Committee on Labor, and the investigations made by Mr. Hoxie and his assistants, than that the theory and the practice of this so-called "scientific management" differs on many points as far as the east is from the west.

It has been overwhelmingly proven that as applied in industrial establishments to-day, "scientific management" works in opposition to its theories so far as labor is concerned on many vital points.

In fact, there seems to be but one point where "scientific management" consistently applies its theories in practice, and that is, in the autocratic control which the employer must exercise.

"Scientific management" in its relation to the workers is essentially autocratic; there is no place in it for industrial democracy, no point at which labor can be given a voice in the determination of the terms of employment and the conditions of labor.

In this country we hold, at least, that the wage earner has a right to a voice in determining under what conditions he shall work and what the terms of his employment shall be; and we hold that this right, and the daily exercise of this right, is essential to our American institutions, because without its exercise and where the employer determines terms of employment and conditions of labor to please his fancy, his sympathies, or his desires for profits, he also determines the wage earner's standard of living, because wages determine what kind of a

home the worker shall live in and where this home shall be located; whether it shall be an insanitary two or three room home in a crowded tenement, or whether it shall be a comfortable dwelling place with sufficient room and pure air and sunshine entering into it.

His wages and the degree of vitality which he must daily give up to the employer determine his physical condition, the opportunities which he will have for self-development for a knowledge of the great problems which affect us as a people and determine his value as a citizen. But now, under "scientific management," we find both in the theory and in the practice that labor is to be prevented—in fact, must be prevented—from having an effective voice in these most essential matters, because we are told "scientific management," the systems which it applies, the forms under which it works, are such that they can not be made a subject for conference and agreement between the employers and the workers.

"Scientific management" in theory and in practice is essentially autocratic, and as one American I shall always use all of the influence at my command to oppose the growth of any institution or tendency which will develop autocratic control, whether in our industries or in any other department of our activities as a people.

I insert an editorial from the Washington Post:

[From the Washington Post, Saturday, May 6, 1916.]

TOO MUCH EFFICIENCY.

To a certain order of mind the idea of getting a little more out of a given situation than anyone else can extract from it appeals with irresistible attraction. With these the announcement of a new method of efficiency means that the world has ceased to muddle through and has begun some real progress.

While inclined to give due credit to the efficiency workers for their achievements, it is felt that the line should be drawn somewhere. Both common sense and healthy sentiment join in protest against the latest efforts in this respect, which involve the production of two eggs a day from a single hen. This is brought about by a very simple expedient. The confiding biddy is placed in a darkened room, fitted up with electrical dinguses, which convey the illusion of a double day and night period within a single 24 hours. The outcome is that a hen, all unconscious of the deception, lays her regular egg a day, as she thinks, whereas the brutal taskmaster gathers in a pair with no compunctions of conscience, so far as can be ascertained. On the contrary, the account of the affair implies that he rather boasts of it.

Somehow, we instinctively recognize that it won't do. For a while perhaps there will be an actual gain. But the temporary increment can not mean other than eventual loss. One can readily prophesy an exotic brand of egg produced by the electrical method that will pale its ineffectual yolk when peered at through the shell by perspicacious housewives or later dalled with by the men folk at the breakfast table. Besides, it means no real progress. The substance of albumen and lime and protein and phosphorus must come from somewhere at a definite cost. Why not put two hens on the job?

And while the plea is being made for the hen, why not let the general principles involved apply to humanity as well? The real problem of society to-day is not so much to get the last vestige of available effort out of a given individual as it is to provide that every individual shall find his place, and there do his appointed work in respectable measure, with a little reserve force left over for the enjoyment of playtime and rest at the end of the day's task.

I incorporate in my remarks the following letter, which was received too late to read to the House:

COMMITTEE OF TEN TO OPPOSE LEGISLATION  
ANTAGONISTIC TO EFFICIENCY IN AMERICAN INDUSTRY,  
New York, May 31, 1916.

To the Representatives in Congress:

The antiefficiency rider on page 102 of the naval appropriation bill if retained will brand everyone responsible for it as a coward. If its principle is sound, Congress should enact the Tavenner bill, which openly embodies it.

If afraid to do this, Congress should be more afraid to seek by indirection what it can not or dare not do directly. The country demands efficiency and will profoundly resent legislation forbidding it.

Scientific management stands for better efficiency, for better working conditions, and for better wages. The opposition to it is based on ignorance of facts and experience and on the selfish interest of exploiters of labor.

We urge you to oppose by vote and voice this attempt to hobble American industries. It can not prevail for long, and its inevitable condemnation, when understood by the people, will include all responsible for it.

Yours, truly,

COMMITTEE OF TEN,  
W. HERMAN GRUEL,  
Secretary.

This letter will give you an idea of the campaign of intimidation that has been carried on by the so-called "Committee of Ten," representing the "efficiency engineers," who have never made any endeavor to set standards for their own profession nor to correct any of the abuses in so-called "scientific management." Their work in installing "scientific management" corresponds with their actions in writing this and other letters. They attempt to label every Member of Congress who opposes the stop-watch, bonus, and premium systems as a coward, and also threaten, in the last paragraph, the Members of the House who are in favor of the Naval Committee provision with their vengeance. So far as I am personally concerned, I welcome their opposition, realizing that if they do not stand for any

better standards in their personal affairs than they do in connection with their business, such opposition is always to be welcomed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

[By unanimous consent Mr. NOLAN was granted leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD.]

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. TAVENNER].

[Mr. TAVENNER addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 6239. An act authorizing the Commissioner of Navigation to document as vessels of the United States two dredges built of American material and owned by James Stewart & Co. (Inc.), a citizen of the United States.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VAN DYKE].

Mr. VAN DYKE. Mr. Chairman and gentleman of the committee, I am not interested in this bill particularly because of private manufacturers or private manufacturing establishments, but simply because of the effect it has upon Government employees and the effect upon the service rendered by those employees. In passing, however, I desire to state that my ideas on the issue of a stop watch coincide with the statement made by Senator LODGE in a speech against its use, which is as follows:

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. In the days before automobiles I used to own horses and be very fond of them and drove them a great deal, but I never put a stop watch on a horse I was going to buy. I wanted to know his qualities; I wanted to try him; but I was not going to buy a horse to use on the track, and therefore I had no use for the stop watch. They use a stop watch to test a horse that is going on the track to race in the Derby, for instance, or in any of our great races. It is of the utmost importance to know what the horse can do on the furlong, or on the quarter mile, or on the half mile, but it does not tell the story of his quality. It will tell the story of speed and the qualities necessary to speed, but there are many qualities it does not tell.

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 far 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.

I do not believe, Mr. Chairman, in standing over men with stop watches to see how far they can go under pressure in securing speed in performing a given piece of work. The very fact of a stop watch implies strain on every faculty, on every physical power, driving the heart and lungs and every muscle to the utmost possible point.

In the days of slavery it was said there was one school of slave owners who believed it was more profitable to work the slaves to the last possible point and let them die than to try and care for them when they were ill and work them reasonable hours and treat them without a stop watch. Those who believed in working them to death, I imagine, were a very small and merciless minority, but there is always that disposition.

I am a thorough believer in the best man getting the best wage and the hard-working man getting what his hard work deserves. I have no desire to see the thriftless and idle paid as well as the industrious, steady, and hard-working men; but I do not believe anything is gained for the Government or for anybody else in standing over a man with a stop watch to see whether under pressure he can do a certain piece of work in a given time. I do not believe it is sound economy.

Reference was made to the Post Office Department in the talk made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BROWNE], who told how efficient the system had worked out in that department. I want to show you—and I am giving you this from personal observation—what happens and how this system is taken care of under the Post Office Department. When a letter is dropped in the post office it is handled first by what is known as a post-office clerk—a distributing clerk. Those clerks are given a certain number of letters which they must work within a certain given period of time, which will run, in different places, from 16 to 30 and sometimes 40 letters per minute. The peculiar

part of the system is this, that it is absolutely impossible to create a standard in handling mail. You can easily see that, when you stop to think of the number of different kinds of addresses that are on different letters, some of them written legibly, some typewritten, but no two alike; so without a doubt you will agree with me that no standard can be placed which would be fair to the clerk.

These post-office clerks are required to handle so many a minute, observed, when this system is used, with a watch, and urged to their topmost speed. Then some time afterwards, probably that week or the following week, they are observed from what is known as a secret passage within the post office. This is taken from the testimony before the committee. The clerks are informed that they have not kept up to the speed that they established at the time they were observed; that is quite natural, it is human, in fact, for a man to speed up when his foreman is looking on and telling him he has to produce a required speed at that time. At this point I desire to submit a communication sent to the clerks and carriers of Chicago and extracts from statement of Thos. F. Flaherty, secretary-treasurer of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks, made before the House Labor Committee on the Nolan minimum-wage law; also letter sent to myself after I had introduced a bill to prohibit the use of the stop-watch and time-measuring systems in the Postal Service:

COMMUNICATION SENT TO THE CLERKS AND CARRIERS OF CHICAGO.

POST OFFICE, CHICAGO, ILL.,  
Delivery Division, January 29, 1915.

Circular No. 7.

Subject: Rating of clerks and carriers.  
Superintendents of stations:

Superintendents of stations will submit as soon as possible, in C. P. O. Form 3990, efficiency ratings for all clerks and carriers assigned to their respective stations on the quantity and quality of work performed during the year ending November 30, 1914.

The next efficiency ratings following the above will be given for the six months from December 1, 1914, to May 31, 1915, and shall be submitted hereafter semiannually, December 1 and June 1, respectively, on C. P. O. Form 3990.

The efficiency rating of each employee from December 1, 1914, on shall be determined on his record for attendance, adaptability, speed, accuracy, and efficiency, and the relative value of each subject shall be charged as follows:

	Points.
Perfect in attendance, one-fifth point off for each day absent	14
Perfect in adaptability	12
Adaptability of clerks shall be determined by their availability for any clerical duty, application, appearance, and courtesy.	
Adaptability of carriers shall be determined by periodical tests as to the manner in which they memorize removals and dispose of their "overs"; their application, general appearance, and courtesy in the office and in the field. Maximum in speed, 12 points.	
To be given as follows:	
Clerk distributing—	
50 cards per minute on examination	12
45 cards per minute on examination	11
40 cards per minute on examination	10
35 cards per minute on examination	9
30 cards per minute on examination	8
25 cards per minute on examination	6
20 cards per minute on examination	3
16 cards per minute on examination (but qualifies)	0
Carriers routing and trying out on exclusive:	
Firm districts—	
40 pieces per minute on test	12
35 pieces per minute on test	11
30 pieces per minute on test	8
25 pieces per minute on test	5
20 pieces per minute on test	2
Under 20 pieces per minute on test	0
Office-building districts—	
35 pieces per minute on test	12
30 pieces per minute on test	11
25 pieces per minute on test	8
20 pieces per minute on test	5
17 pieces per minute on test	2
Under 17 pieces per minute on test	0
Mixed business and residence districts—	
25 pieces per minute on test	12
23 pieces per minute on test	11
20 pieces per minute on test	9
17 pieces per minute on test	6
15 pieces per minute on test	2
Under 15 pieces per minute on test	0
Three-trip residence districts—	
20 pieces per minute on test	12
19 pieces per minute on test	11
17 pieces per minute on test	9
15 pieces per minute on test	6
13 pieces per minute on test	2
Under 13 pieces per minute on test	0
Two-trip residence districts—	
18 pieces per minute on test	12
17 pieces per minute on test	11
16 pieces per minute on test	9
15 pieces per minute on test	7
14 pieces per minute on test	5
12 pieces per minute on test	2
Under 12 pieces per minute on test	0

Accurate observance of the working schedule by carriers, 12 points. To be determined by weekly periods for first trip in each month of the year.

Where a carrier averages schedule leaving and returning on first trip for each weekly period he shall receive 12 points.

For an average of each minute excess of the schedule as outlined above he shall lose one-half of a point.

Accuracy in the distribution of mail by clerks, 12 points.

Standard for maximum points, 99.50 per cent correct on case examination:

99.50 per cent correct	12
99 per cent correct	11
98.50 per cent correct	10
98 per cent correct	9
97.50 per cent correct	7
97 per cent correct	5
96 per cent correct	3
95 per cent correct (but qualifies)	0

Perfection in all of the above subjects shall entitle an employee to 50 points on efficiency, and the net result would give an employee an efficiency rating of 100.

For example, should an employee's record and service be such that it would earn him 13.80 points for attendance, 11 points for adaptability, 11 points for speed, 11 points for accuracy, the points earned for efficiency would be 47, or a sum total of 93.80 points, which would be the rating earned.

All clerks assigned to stations, except those who are engaged entirely in cage work, must be examined on distribution and assigned to the distribution of mail upon receipt of each dispatch. Cage clerks who perform no distribution shall be rated on speed and accuracy, in accordance with the superintendent's judgment and observation as to their ability to perform the duties assigned them.

LE ROY T. STEWARD,  
Superintendent of Delivery.

It is a physical impossibility to reach the standard set by the Chicago postal officials and to retain it for any number of years. The strain both mentally and physically is too great and many employees drop from the service or are forced to accept wage reductions others are dismissed for inefficiency.

EXTRACTS FROM STATEMENT OF THOMAS F. FLAHERTY, SECRETARY-TREASURER OF THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF POST-OFFICE CLERKS, MADE BEFORE THE HOUSE LABOR COMMITTEE ON THE NOLAN \$3 MINIMUM-WAGE LAW.

MR. VAN DYKE. You spoke a moment ago about speeding up in business. Do they use any such thing as a stop watch in your line of business?

MR. FLAHERTY. The stop watch is used in some offices; yes. In that connection I will read a letter; I won't mention the office, because it might get somebody in wrong, but it is from a large office in the Middle West, addressed to a clerk in the mailing division. It says:

"It is noted that in the January tests you cased 47 pieces per minute unobserved and 61½ pieces observed. With the early return of this communication I would thank you to explain the difference of 14½ pieces per minute."

In other words, while the clerk was being observed, the man stood over him with a stop watch and he cased 61½ pieces of mail. The unobserved test means that the man was being watched unknown to himself, whether from the overhead inspectors' gallery or whether from the adjoining case I do not know. And in that connection, it might be of interest to the committee to know that in every office in the country, any office of any size, at any rate, there is all along the walls a hidden gallery. The inspectors can enter that gallery from the outside, and sometimes they wear black dominoes so they can not be observed from down below. And from these points of vantage they look down and watch the men at work. The reason given by them, of course, is that it is a preventive against rifling the mails; but as a matter of fact, from the report to Congress last year, you will see there were out of 38,000 clerks only 160 of them detected in rifling the mails. The report does not show how many were detected by this particular method, but the report does show there was only 1 man out of 350 that is liable to do that thing. And I do not believe it is in accord with the spirit of our American institutions, particularly our Government institutions, to have men spied upon; to have 349 innocent men spied upon in order to catch one man who might possibly be guilty. I should think that ordinary police methods ought to prevail in detecting a man who would be weak enough to do a crime of that kind.

To return to the speeding-up question, Congressman, the clerk answered by saying that when he threw the 61½ letters per minute he was endeavoring, as requested, to see how many he could possibly case on a five-minute test. He was being tested with a watch, and, of course, he knew it and was going possibly a little beyond his normal speed. Then he says:

"This is a pace that it would be absurd to think of maintaining for eight hours. I do not know the conditions under which the 47 pieces per minute were cased, but am of the opinion that that is a reasonable rate of speed."

He did not know when he was observed when he cased the 47 letters per minute.

I will say in this connection—and you know it, Mr. Van Dyke—that mail is not uniform. Some of it is typewritten—that is, the addresses—and some of them are almost illegible; and you can not maintain a fair speed or as high speed on letters poorly addressed as you can on those typewritten or on business letters of business men.

The reply to that clerk's answer was "with a little effort you can maintain or exceed standard at all times, and I expect your future tests to show this."

In other words, by the use of a stop watch they were expecting to maintain more than a normal speed; and in that connection, too, here is something that might be of interest to the chairman of the committee, because it pertains to the New York office. A letter here from a clerk in the money-order division of the New York office—and he mentioned and gives the names of three men, and he says that these men have gone insane through the speeding-up methods that are in vogue there. He gives their names—I do not believe that I had better give them for the record, but the committee can read them if they so desire. It tells when they entered the service and when they resigned; and he said one of them committed suicide and killed his daughter, due to nervousness. Another was a nervous wreck.

He says that the above men were not always nervous, but since the pushing tactics were used during the past four or five years the men have changed.

That is in the money-order department of the New York office, in which, as you are aware, they operate a great many of these machines. He says:

"One sheet can not be paid properly in one hour, the time given by the superintendent. Some do it in less than one hour, but they do not check or examine the sheets, which is against the rules of the money-order department. Each machine is numbered, and a record is taken when the clerk sits down at the machine; also the number of the machine he is working on. This week he has ceased timing, but he is watching, and if anyone takes over an hour on a sheet he will surely get—"

He leaves that blank.

LETTER SENT TO CONGRESSMAN CARL C. VAN DYKE AFTER HE HAD INTRODUCED HIS BILL TO PROHIBIT THE USE OF THE STOP-WATCH AND TIME-MEASURING SYSTEMS IN THE POSTAL SERVICE.

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF POST OFFICE CLERKS,  
Washington, D. C., February 17, 1916.

MR. CARL C. VAN DYKE,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Permit me to thank you in behalf of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks for having introduced H. R. 8677, a measure to prevent the use of the stop-watch or time-measuring device or system in the Postal Service, reading as follows:

"Be it enacted, etc., That it shall be unlawful for any officer, superintendent, foreman, or other person having charge of the work of any employee of the Postal Service to make or cause to be made with a stop-watch or other time-measuring device or system a time study of the movements of any such employee.

"Sec. 2. That it shall be unlawful for any officer, superintendent, foreman, or other person having charge of the work of any employee of the Postal Service to use the results or records obtained by a stop-watch or other time-measuring device or system in determining what amount of work or labor is to be done in a given time by such employee.

"Sec. 3. That any person violating any of the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$500 or by imprisonment for not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

"Sec. 4. That this act shall take effect upon its passage."

The use of the stop watch in timing postal workers at their tasks has long been a source of complaint for the railway mail clerks, post-office clerks, and letter carriers. Some measure of relief has come to the railway mail clerks since the elimination of the so-called "speed test" instituted by former General Superintendent A. H. Stephens, but the clerks and carriers are still subjected to the obnoxious practice of having a supervisory official time their movements at work. Legislation is therefore sought to have this inhumane system abated entirely in the Postal Service.

Organizations of postal employees have repeatedly passed resolutions at their conventions protesting against the timing systems and speeding-up methods in operation in the service. The department has frequently been memorialized by the service workers to stop the practice of timing them to determine their speed, yet this unjust method of harassing the employees is still in vogue in the post office.

The National Federation of Post Office Clerks, assembled in convention in San Francisco September 6 to 10, 1915, unanimously adopted these resolutions:

"Whereas a system of timing clerks to determine their speed at distributing mail is in effect in many post offices; and

"Whereas this system is unjust and unfair and detrimental to the workers' welfare and the efficiency of the service: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That we, the National Federation of Post Office Clerks, in convention assembled, protest against this inhumane method of determining an employee's fitness and capabilities; and be it further

*Resolved*, That our officers present this protest to the department in the strongest possible manner."

Under date of October 16, 1915, the executive committee of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks transmitted to the Postmaster General this protest:

PROTEST AGAINST TIMING DEVICES.

"We voice our emphatic objection to the use of timing or clock devices to determine the speed at which a postal employee must work. The installation of such a system is a gratuitous affront to the supervisory officials, who have heretofore managed the forces under them sufficiently well to insure the expeditious dispatch of the mails.

"A clerk's record on scheme examination, together with the manner in which he performs daily the duties to which he is assigned, should suffice to determine his fitness for promotion or retention in the service. To harass him to maintain abnormal speed by timing his movements is not conducive toward increasing his efficiency. On the contrary, such methods tend to impair efficiency.

"We ask the department's advocacy of legislation to prohibit the use of timing devices in ascertaining the amount of work performed, or to be performed, by postal employees."

The National Association of Letter Carriers, in convention at Omaha, Nebr., September 6 to 11, 1915, adopted without a dissenting vote this resolution:

"Whereas the Post Office Department has during the past fiscal year introduced the speeding-up system; and

"Whereas this speeding-up plan is detrimental to the service, to the public, and to the employees; and

"Whereas the speeding-up plan is frowned upon and has been ordered discontinued in some departments by the Congress of the United States of America: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That our national officers are instructed to use all means in their power to secure the abolition of the speeding-up system."

Despite the appeals of the employees, the department sanctions the practice of "efficiency experts" and "desk" economists, who prowling around with watches in hand seeking to discover what fractional part of a minute a carrier has wasted in casing his mail or whether the clerks engaged in distribution are maintaining the standard of speed—a standard frequently set by the fastest man.

I received recently a letter from a Chicago clerk, who wishes his name withheld, which clearly expressed the injustice of timing a mail distributor to ascertain the amount of work he is doing. He says:

"The officials of the Chicago post office have arranged and instituted a speeding-up system absolutely on a par with the so-called Taylor efficiency system, condemned by the House Labor Committee after exhaustive hearings. Holding a watch to ascertain how many letters per minute a clerk or carrier is distributing is an unpracticable and unjust method: First, because the penmanship on various letters and postal cards varies to such an extent that it is impossible to standardize time for distribution. The clerk or carrier may receive a run of mail that contains a typewritten letter addressed to every person in the block, and distribution of them can be made speedily. Second, the effect of a speeding system on the human being is the same no matter in what industry it is attempted. It results quickly in a nervous breakdown, and particularly does it reduce the efficiency rather than increase the efficiency of any man; and, further, it stultifies the initiative and makes of the human being as far as possible an automatic piece of mechanism."

While the tendency to speed up the postal workers has extended to all branches of the service, the use of the stop watch to determine a worker's speed is most common among those clerks engaged in the distribution of mail. This is a work that lends itself to an application of the timing systems more readily than any other clerical duty.

And yet the use of any timing device upon mail distributors is glaringly unjust. These men must all qualify at frequent intervals by taking what is known as a case examination, when their knowledge of their work, their accuracy, and their speed can be definitely determined. If a distributor is slow and inaccurate, his examination will disclose these shortcomings. It is unnecessary, therefore, to stand behind him with a watch or to surreptitiously spy upon him from an overhead hidden gallery.

These post-office distributors, the hapless victims of the stop-watch practices, must acquire their knowledge of postal work after or before hours upon their own time. After eight hours of steady and nerve-racking toil, too often in a germ-laden, dusty atmosphere, in poorly lighted and ill ventilated basements, they must study intricate distribution schemes at home to better equip themselves for office work. The majority of these men work at night. To compel an employee to devote his time at home toward acquiring knowledge of use only in the post office, and then to prod him into abnormal activity in applying that knowledge by timing his movements, has a tendency to impair rather than improve the efficiency of the service.

The First Assistant Postmaster General in his testimony before the House Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads stated that the installment of the so-called two-division plan in the larger post offices made possible such great economies that he was asking for only a 3 per cent increase instead of the usual 6 or 7 per cent to take care of the normal expansion of the service. This statement, coupled with the fact that the department is asking for but 1,300 additional clerks—the smallest number in many years—plainly indicates that the speeding up of the distributors will continue unless Congress takes some action to prevent it. The two-division plan means to the distributors that they must adapt themselves to different kinds of work. They must acquire a knowledge of both the incoming mail schemes and the outgoing mail schemes. They must study twice as much at home. At work they are shifted from pillar to post, always subject to the fear that a time test is being taken when they are least prepared for it. It is unfair to this class of workers, whose efforts the First Assistant Postmaster General states have made economies possible under the two-division plan, to keep them under the exactions of a time study or speed test. There is a big, pulsating, human factor behind this gigantic task of keeping the Nation's mail in constant motion. These men should not be degraded to the level of machines. Let Congress put its emphatic stamp of disapproval upon the use of any time-measuring system which tends to grind down the spirits and hopes of those performing the most arduous tasks in the Postal Service.

In my judgment the moral effect of the enactment of this legislation will not be lost on the administrative officials of the service. If Congress says it will not tolerate the use of a time-measuring system, it says, in effect, that it disapproves of the speeding up, the harassing, the demoting, and all of the petty annoyances to which the clerks and the carriers have been subjected.

With sincere appreciation of your consistent support of remedial postal legislation, I am  
Very truly, yours,

THOS. F. FLAHERTY,  
Secretary-Treasurer.

From the post office the letter goes to the railway mail car, and in the Railway Mail Service they have what is known as the plus-and-minus system, and I just want to say this in regard to that, that the man, at the risk of his life, can receive 500 plus points, and that is the only way he can receive 500 plus points, and there are five different ways in which he can receive 500 minus points. Then, there is what is known as the 100 per cent efficiency night.

One hundred per cent efficiency night is a new scheme to utilize every moment of the time of the railway postal clerk from the time he reports for duty until he reaches the other end of his run. While there is no objection to this from the standpoint of the clerk himself, he realizing that he is supposed to deliver eight hours' work for every day's wage, still the system itself is obnoxious, not only because it tends to drive men, but also because of the poor service to the public which is bound to result from a system of this kind. This system has recently been inaugurated in the tenth division by Supt. Reed, and, in passing, I desire to state that one of the big troubles of all of the systems of efficiency in the service as adopted by different superintendents and different supervisory officials of the Post Office Department are different in character and different in the way that they are enforced by these different supervisory officials. I do not suppose there is another division in the United States where the 100 per cent efficiency nights is in force. It is in force only on certain lines or railway post offices in the

tenth division. Consequently we have this peculiar effect: Clerks running on one railway post office are subjected to rules and regulations which clerks on parallel lines are not subjected to. This causes dissatisfaction amongst the employees, with the resultant lack of efficiency within the service. Now, let us see just how it works out as to delivery of the mail. I am going to give a specific case. The St. Paul and Jamestown railway post office, running on the Northern Pacific Railway west of St. Paul, Minn., prior to the time of putting this so-called time-saving system into effect was manned by five men through. After a time study was made it was determined that Friday night was to be used as a 100 per cent night. Five men were allowed to go through on this night. Saturday was also a 100 per cent night and had five men through, but Sunday and Monday were figured as 60 per cent nights on account of the falling off of the volume of mail handled on Sunday and Monday nights, and only three men were allowed to run through from St. Paul to Jamestown on these nights.

As I have stated previously in my talk, because of the peculiarities existing in the Postal Service it is practically impossible to determine upon a standard hour's work, or a standard day's work, in so far as a timing device is concerned. All Monday nights of the year and all Tuesday nights, Friday and Saturday nights do not correspond exactly as to the volume of mail carried on any one railway post office. If this train goes out on the coming Sunday night with four tons of mail in the car, that is no reason why the Sunday following they will not have more than four tons of mail. This is especially true in the northwestern country, where during the entire winter season trains are missing connections and delayed trains are the regular instead of the exceptional case, and there is no way of determining in advance just how much mail any particular railway post office will carry at any given time in the future. Consequently, it has been the practice of the department to so man the crews on different trunk lines so that they were able to handle the mail on the heaviest night in the week. The same number of men would constitute the crew on the two or three light nights in the week in order to take care of any emergency which might arise and insure the speedy delivery of the mail. This safeguard of the speedy delivery of the public's mail was done away with when this time study had been finished and the 100 per cent efficiency nights put into effect, for if on any of the lighter nights in the week connections which have been missed by previous trains are received by the train having the 60 per cent crew, you will find that it will be impossible for these men to complete their distribution because the result of time study was such as to take care of only the amount of mail which the official putting this system into effect presumed would be received on this night, and no provision has been made to take care of emergencies. What happens? When the clerks reach the other end of the run they find that they have not been able to complete their distribution and this mail is turned over to the next crew unworked, or returned to the initial point for another ride over the entire length of the road. However, the mail of the business men, and others, of that section of the country has been delayed from 12 to 36 hours. Possibly they will not discover the fact, but nevertheless their mail has been delayed. I hardly think the public, when acquainted with the true facts of cases of this kind, would clamor to any great extent for such service.

I do not believe it is the purpose of Congress to enact legislation that will allow economy in any branch of the service when the very best service to the public is not obtained. It is only a few years ago that in this same branch of the service speed tests were put into operation. This was tried out and found wanting. For reasons hereinbefore stated, it was found that it was a very impractical proposition.

By an order effective May 25, 1915, signed by Mr. J. P. Johnston, the general superintendent of the Railway Mail Service, the "speed test" was officially rejected.

This order of the general superintendent was issued following a unanimous recommendation made by all of the division superintendents of the Railway Mail Service. The division superintendents in conference adopted a resolution advising that for service reasons the "speed test" be discontinued.

One of the division superintendents who participated in this conference made the following statement:

After considering the question thoroughly, we decided that it was for the best interests not only of the service but of the clerks as well that the speed tests be abolished as a part of our efficiency-rating system.

There are two reasons for this. The first is that the speed test is extremely difficult to apply, so that the basic principle involved in it could not be applied with fairness and justice either to the clerks or to the service.

The second reason for the action taken by the superintendents is that this test could not be so administered as to get from it a true rating, so far as the efficiency of any of the clerks is concerned.

Notwithstanding this sad experience that the Railway Mail Service had with the "speed-up" system, other branches of the Postal Service continue to employ the same.

The following is the post-office speed test of the city of Cincinnati. This was submitted in the testimony of the national secretary of the carriers' association:

POST-OFFICE SPEED STANDARD.

After making time allowances as noted below, carriers should distribute the number of pieces per minute indicated in the following tables:

Two-trip carriers.		Three-trip carriers.		Four and five trip carriers.	
Percentage.	Pieces.	Percentage.	Pieces.	Percentage.	Pieces.
10	13	10	14	10	16
15	12½	15	13½	15	15½
20	12	20	13	20	15
25	11½	25	12½	25	14½
30	11	30	12	30	14
35	10½	35	11½	35	13½
40	10	40	11	40	13
45	9½	45	10½	45	12½
50	9	50	10	50	12
60	8	60	9½		

"Under 'papers' is included everything except letters, circulars, and cards; time allowances should be made as follows: One minute per piece for registered mail, C. O. D. parcels, insured parcels, postage-due mail, and communications; one-half minute for each change of address order written up; one minute for each seven pieces marked up.

"To arrive at the rate of speed make proper deductions from the total office time on account of 'time allowances' and divide the number of pieces of mail of all classes handled by the number which represents the net number of minutes of office time. For example, a two-trip carrier whose total office time amounts to 1 hour and 31 minutes handles 800 pieces of mail, 35 per cent of which is classed as papers; he handles 2 registered pieces, 1 postage-due piece, answers 1 communication, and marks up for forwarding 77 pieces and enters 4 orders. Making proper deduction for 'time allowances' in accordance with above table, his net office time is 91 minutes less 17 minutes. Dividing 800 by 74, we get 10.8, which shows the average number of pieces handled per minute, and which should be compared with the above table.

"Many carriers should be able to exceed the rates of speed indicated in the above table, and no carrier should fall below the requirements. It can not be supposed that all of the carrier force can sustain their work at the standard fixed by the department, and for this reason there will be routes which are not served according to these standards. Those carriers who can not serve a standard route should be assigned to routes at those outlying stations where they would serve routes in accordance with their abilities, and these assignments should carry a less salary than that paid men serving standard routes. For instance, if it is found after a thorough test that any carrier is unable to conform to the departmental standards of work, he should, if receiving the maximum salary, be reduced in salary, on the grounds of inefficiency, and assigned to a station where undertime, according to the standard of work, is unavoidable."

On October 14, 1915, a test was made of 210 carriers in the Cincinnati post office, divided as follows:

Forty-six six-trip carriers; 10 five-trip carriers; 30 four-trip carriers, 31 three-trip carriers, and 93 two-trip carriers. Out of a total of 210 men 130 fell below the standard in this test. Of the six-trip carriers 23 measured up to the standard and 22 fell below it. Five-trippers, 2 carriers made the standard and 8 fell below; of the four-trippers, 4 men made the standard and 26 fell below; of the three-trippers, 8 measured up to the standard and 23 fell below; of the two-trippers, 43 made the standard and 50 fell below; of the total number, 80 carriers measured up to the speed test of the department and 130 fell below.

Of the test taken on Friday, October 15, 1915, out of a total of 206 men but 72 measured up to the standard and 134 fell below the standard.

The statements referred to are as follows:

CINCINNATI, OHIO.

Result of speed test taken on Thursday, Oct. 14, 1915.

[Number of carriers covered by test 210; forty-six 6-trip carriers; ten 5-trip carriers; thirty 4-trip carriers; thirty-one 3-trip carriers; and ninety-three 2-trip carriers.]

Number of trips.	Number of cards, letters, circulars.	Number other classes.	Number of Reg. Ins. c. o. d.	Number postage due.	Communications answered.	Orders booked.	Forwarded marked up.
6.....	68,716	5,256	191	363	3	33	4,346
5.....	10,382	1,058	12	48	0	20	600
4.....	26,591	4,247	32	84	2	46	1,831
3.....	21,159	5,528	55	34	4	101	2,299
2.....	42,642	13,485	70	63	6	123	4,237
Total.....	169,490	29,574	260	592	15	323	13,223



Table showing time consumed actually.

[First column, time allowance according to weights given in standard table, second column, and time after allowances are deducted and by which the averages are computed are shown in the third column. Time computed in minutes.]

Number of trips.	Actual time.	Allowances.	Time.	Average.	Number of men.
6.....	5,810	1,195	4,615	16	46
5.....	1,102	158	944	12.1	10
4.....	2,900	402	2,498	12.3	30
3.....	2,848	458	2,390	11.1	31
2.....	6,125	805	5,320	10.5	93
Total.....	18,785	3,018	15,767	12.6	210

NOTE.—Fifty-six men, five and six trippers, averaged 15.3, standard 16; 30 four-trippers averaged 12.3, standard 15.5; 31 three-trippers averaged 11.1, standard 13; 93 two-trippers averaged 10.5, standard is 11.5. Out of a total of 210 men, 130 fell below standard.

Table showing the number of men in each class who attained the standard.

	Stand-ard or better.	Lower than stand-ard.	Total.
6-trippers.....	23	23	46
5-trippers.....	2	8	10
4-trippers.....	4	26	30
3-trippers.....	8	23	31
2-trippers.....	43	50	93
Total.....	80	130	210

CINCINNATI, OHIO.

Result of speed test taken on Friday, Oct. 15, 1915.

[Number of carriers covered by test 206; forty-four 6-trip carriers; nine 5-trip carriers; twenty-eight 4-trip carriers; thirty-four 3-trip carriers; and ninety-one 2-trip carriers.]

Number of trips.	Number of cards, letters, circulars.	Number of other classes.	Number of Reg. Ins. c. o. d.	Number of com-muni-cations an-swered.	Number of orders booked.	For-warded marked up.	Post-age due.
6.....	70,619	6,216	241	.....	15	4,212	341
5.....	9,772	1,290	16	1	5	1,599	70
4.....	27,399	6,003	55	1	20	2,173	65
3.....	25,369	8,828	46	5	66	3,161	34
2.....	45,442	17,543	87	7	90	5,015	82
Total.....	178,601	39,880	445	14	196	15,160	592

Table showing the time consumed.

[First column shows the actual time, second column shows time allow-ances, and the third shows the time after the allowances have been deducted, and by which the averages are arrived at. Time is shown in minutes.]

Number of trips.	Actual time.	Allowances.	Time.	Average.	Number of men.
6.....	5,747	1,190	4,557	16.8	44
5.....	1,052	174	878	12.5	9
4.....	3,152	441	2,711	12.3	28
3.....	3,709	569	3,240	10.5	34
2.....	7,233	937	6,196	10.3	91
Total.....	20,893	3,311	17,582	12.4	206

NOTE.—Forty-four 6-trippers averaged 16.8, 10 per cent of papers standard demanded 16; nine 5-trippers averaged 12.5, 10 per cent of papers standard demanded 16; twenty-eight 4-trippers averaged 12.3, 20 per cent papers standard demanded 15; thirty-four 3-trippers averaged 10.5, 25 per cent papers standard demands 12.5; ninety-one 2-trippers averaged 10.1, 35 per cent papers standard demands 10.5. Out of a total of 206 men 134 fell below the standard.

Table showing the number of men in each class who attained the standard.

	Stand-ard or better.	Lower than stand-ard.	Total.
6-trippers.....	22	22	44
5-trippers.....	1	8	9
4-trippers.....	6	22	28
3-trippers.....	9	25	34
2-trippers.....	34	57	91
Total.....	72	134	206

It will be seen from the foregoing that the department is maintaining a speeding-up system which exacts the maximum amount of work from every carrier.

Please note carefully that in the test made on October 14, 1915, out of 210 carriers who were given this test only 80 carriers measured up to the speed test of the department and 130 fell below. No further mention need be made of this, as it is very apparent that, even if a test of this kind is to be considered necessary in the service, that certainly any test in which 130 out of 210 carriers would fall below the required speed could not be a fair and equitable test. So it is in the Postal Service. One of the principal reasons of opposition to any test of this kind is not only of the test itself but because of the abuse of such a test by supervisory officials. Again, let us see how the public is affected by this system. The Government workday is an eight-hour day. In establishing the length of a route which is to be covered by a carrier an inspector, foreman, or roundsman goes out over the route with a carrier and determines by the use of a watch, and sometimes a pedometer, the length of the route and the number of stops which constitute a day's work for that carrier. In determining this the uncertain part of it is the amount of mail which is handled on this special route is never the same. Probably the day in which this route was established was on a Tuesday, or a Wednesday, which are lighter days than the following Monday. This is because on Monday they have the accumulation of Sunday's mail. The work this carrier could perform on a Wednesday was definitely measured. Therefore, when the added amount of mail is given him to distribute he finds that he can not complete his distribution in a given time. Consequently, under the rules of the department it is necessary to take back the undistributed mail to the office with a consequent delay in the delivery of that mail of at least from 16 to 20 hours on a two-trip route and nearly as great a delay on any other route. This complaint is not of a necessity made by the carrier, because it does not affect him personally half as much as it does the persons who should have received the delayed mail on time.

As a member of the Labor Committee, and being interested in this proposition of time study from the standpoint of the Postal Service, I asked different witnesses who came before the committee protesting against the stop-watch bill what their opinion of the efficiency system employed by the postal department was and as to whether or not such efficiency systems as used in the Post Office Department were, to their minds, good ones. Each and every man admitted before that committee that he knew nothing about the efficiency systems used in the Post Office Department. I believe that one of these men was a member of the so-called "committee of ten" who had already condemned the bill that I had introduced, but when cross-examined before the committee cheerfully admitted that he did not know the difference between a tie sack and a pouch; how a man received plus or minus points; what kind of speed tests were used, had never heard of a full railway post-office car. In fact, he plead ignorance of the entire proposition, but still had the temerity through the medium of different publications and letters sent out to different civic organizations to oppose the bill introduced by myself. It might be interesting to submit at this time extracts from Henry R. Towne's testimony on the Tavenner stop-watch bill.

EXTRACTS FROM STATEMENT OF HENRY R. TOWNE ON THE TAVENNER STOP-WATCH BILL.

Henry R. Towne, of the Yale & Towne Co., is one of the most widely known exponents of scientific management. He believes abuses of the stop-watch in the Postal Service should be stopped.

Mr. VAN DYKE. As I understand this bill, of course, primarily, it is to apply to Government employees entirely. Certainly it is to apply to abuses which are being practiced in the Government service at the present time, and you have no objection to correcting any abuse which is in existence at the present time in the Government service, have you?

Mr. TOWNE. None at all; on the contrary, I am glad to promote it.

Mr. VAN DYKE. We have, for instance, probably some 130,000 to 140,000 postal employees, and each branch of the Postal Service is being subjected at the present time to a time system, in which they use time-saving devices. For instance, on carriers they have a pedometer on the leg, and they time them in order to find out what is the quickest possible time they can cover a route, and the other men have to come up to that time, or have just recently, and they have been putting them back into the collection service or other service of that kind. In other words, there is no bonus system. It is all the other way. In the Railway Mail Service they have inaugurated a system whereby they take the heaviest night in the week, where primarily, or before inaugurating this system, they used to have five men on a crew, they put the five men out on the heaviest night and reduced that crew proportionately each night according to the amount of mail. If they get an excess of the regular amount of mail on any one of these nights, these men have to speed up, practically at the same rate as a man at an ordinary walk when he has to go on a dog trot, in order to clean up and distribute at this rate on their route.

Mr. TOWNE. Do you call this scientific management that you are describing?

Mr. VAN DYKE. I am talking about the provisions of the bill. The bill, as intended, says "time-saving device or system." This is a timing system.

Mr. TOWNSE. Supposing under this system you have just described it is found out that a certain carrier on a route in New York City has 20 or 30 per cent longer route than it is supposed he had, due to his having to go into and out of corridors, as nearly all do in the lower part of the city, and that thereupon the department says, "Why, here, this rate is not just and fair; that man ought to have a higher rate or a shorter route. He is being treated unfairly." Would you object to the application of the system for that service?

Mr. VAN DYKE. The bill as it stands at the present time does not take that into consideration, but it does take into consideration the abuses prevalent in the service at the present time, and all this bill seeks, as I understand, at the present time, is to correct those abuses which are prevalent in the Government service. As a matter of fact the bill does not state that even the Government departments can not time the clerks in order to discover the cost of operating at all, but it does seek to prohibit abuses which are being practiced at the present time.

Mr. TOWNSE. Would you not try to eliminate abuses in both directions? Suppose, for example, the postmaster of New York City found on one particular route the carrier taking two hours, where his predecessor took only one hour, and he asked him about it and he said, "I can not do any better," and thereupon the postmaster should put some other carrier, in whom he had confidence, on the route and told him to take it a day or two and he found he could do it comfortably in one hour. Would you say that was a misapplication of scientific methods?

Mr. VAN DYKE. It has been my experience, after my varied experience in the Post Office and other departments of the Government, that we never have to legislate along those lines; that all we have to legislate for is to prohibit abuses the other way.

Mr. TOWNSE. Do you not think a case of that kind ought to be subject to correction as well as the other?

Mr. VAN DYKE. It is taken care of at the present time in the service. They have no bonus system, but they have a demerit system or a plus and minus system. There is one way in that service by which employees can obtain 500 plus points—that is by risking life—but there are six distinct, different ways they can get 500 minus points. For instance, he can make a misstatement to his superior. It is abuses of that kind we are endeavoring to correct in this bill.

Mr. TOWNSE. I should be with you most heartily in any legitimate effort to prevent abuses, but in preventing abuses do not let us legislate good things out of existence, still less make them penal.

Now, then, Mr. Chairman, as I understand this amendment, and, as a matter of fact, the entire proposition, it does not apply in any shape or manner to private employers. It is simply legislation which may have a tendency to eliminate certain abuses that are prevalent at the present time in different branches of the service, and while I freely admit that it is absolutely necessary, in the Postal Service especially, to keep a record as to the amount of time put in by different employees, and while it is impossible, especially in the Railway Mail Service, to work the men eight hours six days each week, it is therefore absolutely necessary to keep a system of time credit; still I do not believe that it is for the best interest of the men, the department, or the public who should be served by his department, to inaugurate, or keep in effect, any system which has a tendency to speed a man beyond his normal ability to work.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY].

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, it is impossible in five minutes to discuss this question, but I just want to suggest this serious thought to the committee. We have very largely increased the manufacture by the Government of munitions of war. Yesterday I spoke in favor of a Government armor plant. Much of the argument that has been made in favor of Government manufacture has been on account of the record that has been made in cheapness of manufacture; and, despite the statements that were made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. TAYENNER], I know from very many personal talks with Gen. Crozier, he considered the efficiency of the arsenals would be greatly interfered with by the abolition of a system that he and those conversant with it believe to be modern and enlightened.

It is possible to abuse anything. You can so arrange a task that is unfair. You can so speed a man as to wear him out; but the Government does not do so. The gentleman used the illustration of a man running instead of walking. It would have been a fairer illustration if he had suggested a man going in a straight line instead of going one way and then turning at a right angle to get to the same point. In other words, this system is one showing you how to go straight to the task. It is a method for creating a fair standard, and then saying to the workman, "If you work beyond that, if you are better than your neighbor, and have more efficiency, you shall be paid for it."

Now, there is objection to it if it is abused by an unfair standard, but where there are abuses the remedy is not by abolishing the system, but doing away with the management responsible for the abuse. We can control the Government arsenals without abolishing a proper system. But the real objection is the objection made by the man who is below the average and who wants to have his inefficiency made the standard of

a day's labor and who objects to another man making more money than he.

Now, I have not time to refer to it here, but I will put in the RECORD one letter from a man by the name of John Driscoll. I do not know who he is, except he is employed at the Watertown Arsenal. He writes a letter to the Secretary of War, which the Secretary transmitted to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. Hence I came to know of it. This letter states that the men there are satisfied, and that under this system he is making 27 per cent more money than he did theretofore. He does not want anybody to deprive him of the opportunity of making that amount of money.

And I want you to read the letter which was submitted by the Secretary of War, Mr. Baker. He is a man who has been rather noted for his humanitarian views. He was an ideal mayor of Cleveland. No man there had any more friends among the laboring classes. I do not believe that you could get him to recommend a system that he believed was detrimental to the real interests of the working classes. If I did not believe that the system would be of benefit not only to the arsenals but to the men employed there I would oppose it as quickly as anybody else. I am not willing to coin the lives of men into a profit either for the Government or for a private manufacturer. But I recognize that this is an era of progress. If a man can be taught to do a given thing easier and better and quicker than has been done before, you have no right to deny him that benefit. You turn back the dial of time when you undertake to say that a thing can not be done in a right way and in a proper method. I deny that there has been any evidence of abuse in the arsenals, and in the absence of that I am not willing to say to the administrative officers of the Government that "You shall not use an economic system; you shall not have such a method."

Under leave to print, I insert the letters referred to:

[House Document No. 1053.]

PREMIUM PAYMENTS IN GOVERNMENT EMPLOYMENT.

Letter from the Secretary of War, submitting information relative to time studies and premium payments in Government employment.

WAR DEPARTMENT,  
Washington, April 20, 1916.

THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: There is pending in the House of Representatives a bill (H. R. 8665), introduced January 11, 1916, to regulate the method of directing the work of Government employees, the object of which is to prohibit at the Government arsenals what are known as time studies and premium payments. Similar legislation to that which is carried in the bill was enacted on the Army appropriation bill which was passed at the last session of Congress, in the form of a prohibition of the payment from funds appropriated in the act of the salary of any person engaged in making or directing time studies or of any premium. There is therefore apparent the possibility of similar legislation at the present session, either in the form of a separate act or in the form of a restrictive prohibition upon an appropriation act. I think that such legislation would be unwise.

The time study referred to may be defined as a method of ascertaining by careful observation and study in connection with a timing process the most advantageous manner in which a given piece of work can be done and also the time in which it can reasonably be expected to be done by following this best manner. The premium is an extra cash compensation which is paid to a workman for accomplishing the work in this reasonable time, or for approaching the time within certain rather liberal limits, the compensation being in addition to the regular wages of the workman, which are not disturbed, and depending in amount upon the degree to which he approaches the reasonable time which has been ascertained. The timepiece is used only in the study of a new job, for the purpose of working it out properly and for assigning the proper time for its performance. It is not held over a man for the purpose of ascertaining whether he is working industriously, and its employment is of less and less frequency as information is accumulated which makes special study unnecessary. The premium is the workman's share of the economy which is effected by the system.

This system has now been in practice in the Ordnance Department for something like five years. At the place at which it has been most fully put into effect, the Watertown Arsenal, Mass., it has resulted in very substantial economy of production and in a material increase of the earnings of the employees. The last monthly report from the arsenal indicates that the total amount paid in premiums during that month was \$3,315.61, which was earned by 311 employees, an average of about \$10.66 each. The total number of mechanics and workmen at the arsenal was 554, of which approximately 56 per cent worked during the month on premium jobs. The total pay roll of the arsenal for the month was \$45,250.85, of which amount it therefore appears that slightly over 7.32 per cent was paid in premiums. The premiums are in addition to the day wages of the employees, which are regulated in accordance with those of the vicinity for work of similar character to that done at the arsenal. During the five years that the system has been in operation at the arsenal neither the day wage nor the number of employees has diminished, but the amount of work done and the average earnings have increased in an important degree.

The legislation which is being urged upon Congress is advocated by organized labor, which is opposed to the system intended to be prohibited for the essential reason which is embodied in the charge that it is a speeding-up system. I can not understand this charge as having any other meaning than that the work required of the employees by the system is unduly severe. Of the truth of this charge in the practice of the system at the Watertown Arsenal there is no evidence whatever, but there is a good deal of evidence the

other way. There is no complaint of overwork at the arsenal, and no workman has been discharged because of failure to meet the requirements of the system. To prohibit the system of which the records show undoubted advantages, both to the Government and to the employees, because of a charge unsupported by evidence, or even by any attempt at evidence—for there has been no effort to prove overwork at the Watertown Arsenal—seems to me to be most unwise.

There has been no investigation at the Watertown Arsenal which has resulted in a report condemnatory of the practice at that establishment. This department has endeavored to secure an investigation and report from the Federal Commission on Industrial Relations, created by the act of August 23, 1912, and that commission employed a committee which did make a very thorough investigation. Neither the commission nor its committee, however, made any mention of the Watertown Arsenal in its report, but both of these bodies confined themselves to a general discussion of the relations of scientific management and labor largely as a social question. The commission was not able to agree, and conflicting reports were made by groups of its membership. The report of the special investigation committee has not been made public, but the substance of it is understood to be contained in a book entitled "Scientific Management and Labor," by the chairman of the committee, which leaves the subject of scientific management in its general practice in shops which have introduced it still open to discussion. The only investigation at the Watertown Arsenal of which the result has been published in a report is that which a special committee of the House of Representatives made some four years ago, and as a result of which the committee recommended that there should be no legislation upon the subject. There have been expressions from the employees at the Watertown Arsenal both for and against the system. There are evidences that at least some of the expressions against it have come from representatives of organized labor, but I am persuaded that this opposition proceeds from a mistaken theory; for while it is obviously true that a piecework system in which the pay of the employees is based solely on a piece price and high-speed machinery is used to drive operatives harder than is consistent with their physical and nervous welfare, is objectionable, it is equally true, in my judgment, that the system above described as operative in the Watertown Arsenal is not open to either of these objections. The Government surely should not be denied the opportunity of securing efficient work from its employees without an investigation of the facts which would justify the action proposed to be taken.

All of my predecessors in the office of the Secretary of War who have held that office since the introduction of the system at the Watertown Arsenal have been in favor of its retention and have opposed efforts to abolish it. I have been in this office too short a time to have had an opportunity to visit the arsenal or to familiarize myself thoroughly with the details of the practice at that establishment, but I have long been interested in both aspects of the problem presented and do not feel that I am an entire stranger to the controversy merely because of the recentness of my contact with this particular application of it.

The relation between fatigue and efficiency is being widely studied, and in some of the European countries astonishing statistical demonstrations of the effect of speeding-up processes have already been obtained. There can be no question that the whole nervous and physical system of the operative is imperiled, and his strength, as a part of the national strength, decreased, if he is either urged or induced to work beyond a sound physiological maximum. On the other hand, inefficient production is bad for the operative. It is always bad for a man not to do his best, not to make the most of his opportunities and of his labor, and to produce less than he can under a system of proper inducements and compensations. It is bad for the national life, for its industrial efficiency, and for its squareness to have its component parts, whether they be operatives in an industrial plant, professional men, or public officers, turning into the aggregate either a product so excessive that it represents a deterioration in their physical and nervous strength, or a product so insufficient as to represent less than their honest and safe best. To strike the happy mean involved in these statements is, of course, difficult, but at the Watertown Arsenal we seem to have made a fair approach to it. The wages paid to our operatives as a flat rate, irrespective of their response to the time system, is the current rate of the community for similar work, and in addition to that, premiums are offered, not large, but large enough to stimulate continuous and faithful activity. So far as I know, there is not a case on record at Watertown since the introduction of this system of a nervous breakdown or physical exhaustion due to excessive work, nor is it claimed that the operatives in that plant, protected as they are against long hours by a wise eight-hour provision, are in any sense driven or hurried beyond a fair and safe limit.

As I am not in any sense personally responsible for the work which has been done at the Watertown Arsenal, I can be permitted to say that, in my judgment, it represents an achievement of which both the legislative and executive branches of the Government can be justly proud. The reproach is often made that the public can not conduct an economical and efficient industrial enterprise, but no such charge can be brought against the Watertown Arsenal, and I think it would be a grave misfortune to the public service and to the employees of the Government there engaged if any action were taken prejudicial to the system which is working so well, without a special investigation at the arsenal itself which would make a comprehensive study of the results of the system, both in output and upon the operatives. Similar studies have been made in other places; there are a great many experts who know exactly how to make such studies, and the information presented by them could be weighed and proper value given it in determining a future policy.

Sincerely, yours,

NEWTON D. BAKER,  
Secretary of War.

WAR DEPARTMENT,  
Washington, May 5, 1916.

Hon. JOHN J. FITZGERALD,  
Chairman Committee on Appropriations,  
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. FITZGERALD: On April 20 last I wrote a letter to the Speaker of the House of Representatives in regard to the bill (H. R. 8665) prohibiting the use of time study and premium payments at Government establishments. In this letter I speak of the possibility of this prohibition either through the passage of the bill referred to or by means of a restrictive prohibition upon an appropriation act, similar to the one placed upon the Army appropriation bill at the last session of Congress. As the fortification bill, which is in charge of your commit-

tee, carries the appropriations covering most of the work which is done at the Watertown Arsenal, the place where the time-study and premium-payment system is in practice in the ordnance department, and is thus likely to encounter a proposed amendment prohibiting expenditure of its funds under this system, similar to the amendment which was added to the Army bill at the last session of Congress, I take the liberty of inviting your attention to my letter to the Speaker, which was published as House Document 1053 of the current session, and also of forwarding to you herewith a copy of a letter which I have just received from Mr. John Driscoll, a machinist employed at the Watertown Arsenal, who states with some emphasis and some detail his satisfaction with the system of payment in practice at the arsenal and his belief in the satisfaction of his associates, together with his hope that the system will be allowed to remain. In case an amendment of the tenor suggested shall be offered, I hope that you will give these papers consideration.

Sincerely, yours,

NEWTON D. BAKER,  
Secretary of War.

16 LADD STREET,  
Watertown, Mass., April 26, 1916.

The Honorable the SECRETARY OF WAR,  
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 system, 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 task master; 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 of or 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 Government 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' 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 accomplishes, 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,

JOHN DRISCOLL.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. TAGUE having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills and joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 708. An act to make immediately available for the use of the State of Georgia in paying expenses incurred by said State in connection with the joint encampment held at Augusta, Ga., July 22 to 31, 1914, certain sums appropriated for arming and equipping the militia of said State;

S. 4594. An act to validate certain declarations of intention to become citizens of the United States;

S. 5805. An act permitting the Riverview Ferry Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Yellowstone River in the State of Montana;

S. 5425. An act to standardize lime barrels;

S. 5851. An act to extend the time for constructing a bridge across the Eastern Branch of the Elizabeth River in Virginia;

S. 6073. An act granting the consent of Congress to George Fabyan to construct a bridge across the Fox River; and

S. J. Res. 133. Joint resolution to authorize the President of the United States to convey the acknowledgments of the Government and people of the United States to various foreign Governments of the world who have participated in the Panama-Pacific International Exposition to celebrate the completion and opening of the Panama Canal, and also the four hundredth anniversary of the discovery of the Pacific Ocean.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. R. 755. An act to incorporate the Boy Scouts of America, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 13765. An act to amend section 73 of an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911, and for other purposes.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. KEATING rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] says, it is quite impossible to discuss this subject in five minutes.

I would call the attention of the committee, however, to the fact that the provision under discussion applies to the Navy Department, and that the same provision, in the identical language, was in the naval appropriation bill which was passed one year ago. So that for one year the navy yards of this country have been operating under this law. Does anybody pretend to say that the navy yards of this country are not efficient?

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I regret that I have not the time. Where the gentleman errs, and where a lot of other gentlemen err, is in the supposition that you can not have an efficiency system without a stop watch. I hold in my hand an efficiency system covering 16 or 18 closely printed pages—the efficiency system of the navy yards—and there is not a word in that pamphlet concerning a stop watch.

In all the evidence submitted to the Committee on Labor, in all the investigations that have been conducted by committees of this House and by commissions representing Congress and the National Government, it has never been established that you can not have an efficiency system without a stop watch. On the contrary, it has been testified repeatedly that you can have an efficiency system without the stop watch, the premium, or the bonus system.

Only the other day I asked Secretary of the Navy Daniels if, as the result of the operation of this law, he had received the slightest complaint, and he said, "Not at all."

Now, my friends, who is it that is demanding that this law shall be repealed? The leader of the opposition, the chief sup-

porter of the "stop-watch" system before our committee was James A. Emery, of the National Association of Manufacturers. The Members of this House will probably recall Mr. Emery in connection with the Mulhall investigation in the Sixty-third Congress. We did not hear much from Mr. Emery during the remainder of the Sixty-third Congress, but at the beginning of this Congress he reappeared first as the opponent of child-labor legislation, and sent out misleading statements to manufacturers all over this country concerning the proposed legislation.

After he had been defeated by this House on child-labor legislation he bobbed up to oppose the so-called Tavenner bill and the riders placed upon appropriation bills to prevent the use of the "stop watch."

The only Government official I know who has joined with Mr. Emery is Gen. Crozier, of the Ordnance Department. But Gen. Crozier has not demonstrated, and has not attempted to demonstrate, that in his arsenals, where he uses the system, he has gained any higher degree of efficiency than they have in the navy yards, where they refuse to use the system. Now, it is not alone sufficient for Gen. Crozier to come in here and say that as a result of his system he has made a saving. He should be able to prove that under his system he has made a greater saving than they have made in the navy yards.

What are the facts? If anything, the weight of evidence is on the side of the navy yards, and tends to show that they are more efficient than the arsenals. Personally I think there is little to choose between the two. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I desire to insert in the RECORD the following extracts from a report submitted to this House by the Labor Committee on the Tavenner bill to abolish the "stop watch" in governmental arsenals and workshops:

The object of the Tavenner bill is to end the use of the "stop watch" and the bonus and premium systems of payment of employees in Government arsenals and workshops.

Your Committee on Labor made a favorable report on a similar bill in the Sixty-third Congress, but owing to the congested condition of the calendar the House did not have an opportunity to act on it.

NULLIFYING WILL OF CONGRESS.

However, the substance of the proposed legislation was attached as "riders" to the military and naval appropriation bills for 1916. A brief statement containing these "riders" and the amazing attempt of certain officers of the Government to nullify the plain intent of Congress should prove of interest at this point.

On January 22, 1915, Mr. Deitrick, of Massachusetts, offered the following amendment to the military appropriation bill, then pending in the House:

"On page 52, after line 14, insert the following: *Provided*, That no part of the appropriation 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 of any such employee between the starting and the 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 operation of any Government plant; and no claim for services performed by any person while violating this proviso shall be allowed."

A point of order was made against the amendment, but after extended discussion it was withdrawn and the amendment adopted without a division.

Three days later Brig. Gen. Crozier, Chief of Ordnance, wired the commanding officer at the Watertown, Mass., arsenal as follows:

"Cease all time studies ('stop-watch' studies) and all premium payments, except such as shall have accrued at time of notification of employees, and notify them at once.

"CROZIER."

A similar telegram was sent to the commanding officer at Frankford Arsenal, Philadelphia.

CROZIER ENCOURAGED EMPLOYEES TO PROTEST.

Gen. Crozier, when he appeared before your committee, stated he had sent these telegrams "in order that the employees might protest if they saw fit." On the receipt of the general's telegrams the foremen notified the employees of the arsenals that they would be deprived of the premiums which they had been receiving, but would be expected to do just as much work. In other words, they must continue to "speed up," but without the sustaining hope of reward.

Gen. Crozier denies that he authorized the foremen to issue these instructions, but there is ample evidence to show that they were issued.

"RIDERS" RETAINED IN BILLS.

Gen. Crozier's telegrams and the orders of the arsenal foremen had the effect expected and a number of the employees signed petitions protesting against the adoption of the "riders." Gen. Crozier admits that the employees—most of whom were women receiving \$1.16 a day—were "assisted" in preparing these petitions which were forwarded to Members of the House and Senate.

Gen. Crozier appeared before the Senate committee and joined in the protest. By a small majority the Senate struck out the "riders," but when the military and naval bills went to conference the House conferees, acting on instructions from the House, insisted that they must be restored, and that was done.

Secretary of the Navy Josephus Daniels proceeded at once to enforce the mandate of Congress as expressed in the "rider" attached to the naval appropriation bill, and issued the following order:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,  
Washington, April 19, 1915.

From: Secretary of the Navy.  
To: Commandant and industrial managers of all navy yards and stations.  
Subject: Circular letter in regard to premium and bonus systems.

Attention is called to the proviso in the naval appropriation act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, reading as follows:

"Provided, That no part of the appropriation made in this act shall be available for the salary or pay of any officer, manager, superintendent, foreman, or any 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 any 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 award to any employee in addition to his regular wages, except for the suggestions resulting in improvements or economy in the operation of any Government plant."

All premium and bonus systems of doing work and all time studies or timing of employees as defined in this act will be discontinued on or before June 30, 1915.

The wording of this act, however, is construed as not prohibiting straight piecework—that is, work paid for at a certain rate, such as per hundred rivets, per hundred feet of calking, etc.—with or without a guaranteed day's wage in case of failure through no fault of the employee.

Where systems are in use based upon premiums or bonuses, these should be changed, if possible, to straight piecework, as defined above, provided such change is acceptable to the employee.

JOSEPHUS DANIELS.

Gen. Crozier, on the other hand, set about nullifying the effect of the "rider" on the military appropriation bill, and with the assistance of former Secretary Garrison and other officials of the department was almost completely successful.

The following extract from the hearings before your committee will prove illuminating on this point:

"Mr. KEATING. Didn't you understand that when Congress added that rider it wished the premium and bonus systems to be abolished in Government work?"

"Gen. CROZIER. I had no way of knowing the will of Congress except by its legislation. I can perhaps throw a little light on the latter by saying: The Member of Congress who proposed that amendment, and at whose instance it was added to the law, was aware, before it was too late to attach that same kind of a rider to the fortifications bill, that without attaching it the legislation would not apply to funds under the fortifications bill, and he did not seek to do that."

"Mr. KEATING. You did not seem to experience any particular difficulty in interpreting the law when you issued the order suspending the bonus system at Frankford Arsenal?"

"Gen. CROZIER. The law applies to Frankford. Do you mean Watertown Arsenal?"

"Mr. KEATING. You issued an order at Frankford which you say you intended as a warning to the employees as to what would occur in case it went into effect?"

"Gen. CROZIER. Yes, sir."

"Mr. KEATING. Then, after the rider was put into effect, you came forward with a scheme by which you evaded the plain intent of Congress, but you did not tell the workmen you had that in mind when you issued the first order."

"Gen. CROZIER. You say I evaded the plain intent of Congress. I did not evade it in the opinion of the comptroller."

"Mr. KEATING. How about Frankford Arsenal? Was that order issued under a misapprehension of what this legislation meant or intended?"

"To be perfectly frank, you attempted to show these employees what you thought the effect of this legislation would be if it passed, and after the rider was adopted, you found means by which you could avoid the purpose of the legislation?"

"Gen. CROZIER. I found means by which I saved them from the disadvantages of the legislation."

"Mr. KEATING. You did not suggest there was a way out of it when you issued the warning?"

"Gen. CROZIER. I did not."

"Mr. KEATING. You referred to this legislation that was pending and you warned them if the legislation was passed a certain situation would be created, and you did that for the purpose of getting them to protest to Senators and Representatives?"

"Gen. CROZIER. I did that for the purpose of allowing them to protest if they wanted to."

"Mr. KEATING. You are warning them that in case certain legislation was enacted a certain condition would be created, and instead of that you created an entirely different situation?"

"Gen. CROZIER. I found a way of saving them from it."

"Mr. KEATING. You think it is perfectly proper, do you, for the Chief of Ordnance of the United States Army to conduct himself in that fashion?"

"Gen. CROZIER. I do."

Gen. Crozier's attitude is a very strong argument in favor of the passage of the bill now under consideration. He is apparently willing to defy the law, so long as no penalty attaches, but he promises to obey it if he is furnished with a sufficient incentive in the form of a fine and imprisonment.

#### EXTENDED HEARINGS ON BILL.

Your committee held extended hearings on the Tavenner bill and many able witnesses appeared for and against the measure.

The opponents of the bill, led by Mr. J. A. Emery, chief counsel for the National Association of Manufacturers, declared that to eliminate the "stop watch" and bonus and premium systems would "penalize efficiency and encourage waste."

The supporters of the bill insisted that the combination of "stop watch" and bonus and premium was "in spirit and essence, so far as labor is concerned, a cunningly devised speeding and sweating system."

The majority of your committee feels that the proponents of the bill made so strong a case that we are justified in urging Congress to enact the legislation needed to drive the "stop watch" and bonus and premium systems from Government shops.

#### EFFICIENCY WITHOUT THE STOP WATCH.

The opponents of this legislation have much to say about "efficiency" and "scientific shop management," and they seek to create the impression that "efficiency" can not be secured unless (a) the workman's every movement is timed by a "stop watch," and (b) that the old

system of day's pay is abolished and bonuses and premiums substituted therefor.

Your committee feels there is nothing in the evidence submitted at the hearings, or in the experience of mankind, to sustain either of these contentions.

In this city we have the Washington Navy Yard, employing thousands of skilled mechanics. The stop watch is not used there, and the commandant will assure you he has the "most efficient body of mechanics ever gathered together inside one fence."

The workmen at the Rock Island Arsenal have succeeded in defeating Gen. Crozier's attempt to introduce the "stop watch," and they have demonstrated their "efficiency" by producing munitions of war for very much less than the Government pays contractors for the same articles.

For instance, Gen. Crozier tells us that a 3-inch gun carriage for which contractors asked the Government \$3,398.82 was produced in the Rock Island Arsenal for \$2,192.27, a saving of practically one-third. And this is not an exceptional case.

Is it necessary to still further "speed up" workmen who have displayed the skill and industry needed to produce these results?

#### "STOP WATCH" REJECTED BY PRIVATE ENTERPRISE.

Turning from the Government shops to the plants of private industry, we find that the "stop watch" has not been received with favor.

Mr. Richard A. Feiss, of Cleveland, Ohio, a manufacturer of men's clothing, was presented by the opponents of this legislation as one of their principal witnesses. He defended the use of the "stop watch" and was emphatic in his declaration that "efficiency" could not be secured without it, but he was forced to confess that his concern was the only house in that section of the clothing business which had installed the system. The following extract from Mr. Feiss's testimony will shed light on this point:

"The ACTING CHAIRMAN. Do you know of any other concern in your business that is using the system?"

"Mr. FEISS. No, sir; our business, the clothing business, as a whole, is very backward."

"The ACTING CHAIRMAN. As a consequence there is no other concern that you know of that we could make comparisons with as to the results in your shops and others?"

"Mr. FEISS. No; no other industry."

"The ACTING CHAIRMAN. These other business men who are competing with you have had an opportunity to adopt this system?"

"Mr. FEISS. Yes."

"The ACTING CHAIRMAN. They have been confronted with your splendid and highly successful example for some time?"

"Mr. FEISS. Yes; our shops are always open to anyone."

"The ACTING CHAIRMAN. They have not seen fit to adopt your ideas?"

"Mr. FEISS. They are adopting some of the ideas. The trouble with most of the men at the top is that they are not practical men."

"The ACTING CHAIRMAN. They think they are practical men."

"Mr. FEISS. I think they will admit that they are not."

"The ACTING CHAIRMAN. But, anyhow, whatever may be your opinion of your competitors, there are many concerns that have not adopted it, although they have had this example before them?"

"Mr. FEISS. Yes."

The boot and shoe industry furnishes another example. Not 15 per cent of the boot and shoe factories in this country use the "stop watch," and the 85 per cent which have refused to use it experience no difficulty, so far as the records show, in competing with their so-called "scientific" rivals.

What has been said of the clothing and boot and shoe industries applies with equal truth to other lines of industrial endeavor.

The workers of this country are not a lot of lazy drones who refuse to do a reasonable day's work unless their every movement is timed by a "stop watch."

#### WORKERS CONDEMN "STOP WATCH."

The workers' attitude toward the "stop watch" is stated in the following excerpt from the testimony of Mr. John P. Frey, editor of the International Molders' Journal, before your committee:

"Mr. SMITH. What objection has the workman to time study?"

"Mr. FREY. Some have the feeling that it is humiliating to have a man standing over your back, or around you, with a stop watch, checking off every movement you make, trying to catch you beating some little time. Others object because it forces them to work harder and harder, and it puts into the employer's hands a power which they use unjustly against them."

"Mr. SMITH. You think the general objection is that it overworks the men?"

"Mr. FREY. I should say from what the workers told me, that I interviewed, it was half and half. It was partly the feeling of humiliation in having some one stand over them with a stop watch, and others felt that the system meant making their work that much harder."

"Mr. SMITH. What is the feeling of the workmen about the Taylor system?"

"Mr. FREY. I have not encountered one who favored it. All that I have interviewed are bitterly opposed to it."

"Mr. SMITH. Are the workmen generally opposed to a bonus system?"

"Mr. FREY. Some of the workers—I want to revise that statement as to the Taylor system. I found some workers working under the Taylor system who said they did not consider it hurt them much."

"Mr. SMITH. But, generally speaking, you think you are safe in saying they are opposed to it?"

#### SENATOR LODGE ON THE "STOP WATCH."

Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE presented the case against the "stop watch" in graphic fashion during a discussion of the subject in the Senate during the third session of the Sixty-third Congress. 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. In the days before automobiles I used to own horses and be very fond of them and drove them a great deal, but I never put a stop watch on a horse I was going to buy. I wanted to know his qualities; I wanted to try him; but I was not going to buy a horse to use on the track, and therefore I had no use for the stop watch. They use a stop watch to test a horse that is going on the track to race in the Derby, for instance, or in any of our great races. It is of the utmost importance to know what the horse can do on the furlong or on the quarter mile or on the half mile, but it does not tell the story of his quality. It will tell the story of speed and the qualities necessary to speed, but there are many qualities it does not tell.

"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 far 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.

"I do not believe, Mr. Chairman, in standing over men with stop watches to see how far they can go under pressure in securing speed in performing a given piece of work. The very fact of a stop watch implies strain on every faculty, on every physical power, driving the heart and lungs and every muscle to the utmost possible point.

"In the days of slavery it was said there was one school of slave owners who believed it was more profitable to work the slaves to the last possible point and let them die than to try and care for them when they were ill and work them reasonable hours and treat them without a stop watch. Those who believed in working them to death, I imagine, were a very small and merciless minority, but there is always that disposition.

"I am a thorough believer in the best man getting the best wage and the hard-working man getting what his hard work deserves. I have no desire to see the thriftless and idle paid as well as the industrious, steady, and hard-working men, but I do not believe anything is gained for the Government or for anybody else in standing over a man with a stop watch to see whether under pressure he can do a certain piece of work in a given time. I do not believe it is sound economy."

#### PREMIUM AND BONUS SYSTEMS.

The premium and bonus systems of payment of employees are designed to supplement the "stop watch" in stimulating the workers to the extreme limit of their physical and mental endurance. When the human machine can no longer stand the strain a new one is to be substituted and the old one sent to the industrial scrap heap.

The opponents of the legislation under discussion deny the truth of this statement, but there is a mountain of evidence to sustain the charge.

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."

#### LABOR'S EARNEST OPPOSITION.

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 to completely disprove the general's theory.

The leaders of organized labor instead of fomenting trouble in the Government shops have with difficulty restrained the workers from throwing down their tools and quitting work. At the Watertown Arsenal the employees united to employ Miner Chipman, an engineer, to assist them in an attempt to induce the War Department to dispense with the obnoxious system.

Two hundred and thirty-five of the workers furnished Mr. Chipman with detailed information to enable him to complete his case. Of these, 214 were opposed to the system. Of the protestants, 113, or 52.8 per cent, were nonunion, and 101, or 47.2 per cent, were union.

All these men were asked to answer the following question: "Do you think the agitation is brought about through union labor or similar sources?"

They replied as follows: "Noes," 137; "yeas," 28; not answering, 70.

#### CONCLUSION.

In conclusion your committee would suggest:

The system so persistently urged by Gen. Crozier involves a fundamental, not to say revolutionary, change (a) in determining what is a reasonable day's work for an employee in the national arsenals and workshops and (b) in the method of compensating the workers, to wit, the substitution of the "bonus" or "premium" system for the age-old "day's-pay" system.

The workers affected seem to be almost unanimous in their opposition to the change. They insist it will be oppressive to them and will be without benefit to the Government.

So intense is this feeling that an attempt to install the system in all the Government workshops would, in the judgment of your committee, lead to very serious consequences.

In view of these well-established facts, it seems to your committee it would be the height of folly to permit Gen. Crozier to persist in his plan. Apparently, the only way to restrain him is to enact the bill under discussion, and your committee trusts the House will take prompt and favorable action.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired. All time has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BROWNE].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. KEATING. A division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is demanded.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 72, noes 83.

Mr. BROWNE. I ask for tellers, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Tellers are demanded.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. BROWNE and Mr. KEATING to act as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 74, noes 100.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TAGUE] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TAGUE: Page 5, line 13, after the figures "\$46,000," add the following:

"The Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to use the ships of the United States Navy for the transportation of mail to and from neutral countries in cases of emergency or necessity."

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] reserves a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, in presenting this amendment I believe that if the House will consider the importance of it and what it means to the business interests of this country they will accept it.

The reason for this must be apparent to every Member of the House who knows the conditions that have prevailed across the sea during the past two years.

The mail of our business men and our people has been interfered with and held up without right or justice, creating hardships and inconvenience to our business interests. I know of no better way of meeting this issue, when it is known that we are without a merchant marine, than by carrying the mail to and from neutral ports on the ships of our Navy.

Not for many years has this country been subjected to such insolence and arrogance on the part of any nation as it is at the present time, when the English Government board neutral ships and take therefrom the mail of our people in direct defiance of the international law and without respect for this or for the other neutral nations.

As one Representative in this Congress I want to know how long we are going to permit the British or any other Government to tamper with the business men's mail of this Nation. They are complaining that bonds and stocks that are sent across the sea have never reached their destination, and only yesterday the captain of a ship that entered the port of Newport News made the following statement:

MAIL FOR UNITED STATES IS SEIZED BY BRITISH.

NEWPORT NEWS, May 31.

Capt. Carl Nordman, of the Swedish steamship *New Sweden*, in port from Gothenburg with mail for the United States, Canada, and Mexico, stated that all the parcel-post matter aboard his ship was removed by British authorities at Kirkwall, where his ship was taken by a patrol boat.

About 30 sacks of first-class mail from Scandinavian countries for the United States also were removed and held. Scandinavian mail for Canadian points and a quantity of Russian mail was not disturbed.

In 1775 this country threw off the yoke of English oppression and tyranny, and with the first shot fired at Lexington told England and the world of the birth of a new and independent Nation, and from that day this country has proudly proclaimed that independence.

We have never allowed any nation since that time to interfere with the progress of our business without bringing them to account for it, and not until now has any nation attempted to do this in face of the objection of this country.

How much longer we intend to allow this interference is for us to decide, and I know of no better time than now, when appropriating money to build up our Navy that we shall build it so strong and powerful that it will be a message to English insolence and insults or to any other nation who dares to interfere with our rights upon the sea.

By the adoption of this amendment we send our mail in case of emergency on our warships, with the American flag floating proudly from the masthead, and then let the British attempt to seize it if they dare. That is true Americanism; that is the protection that our American business men deserve at the hands of this Congress to safeguard their business.

The laws of this country forbid any persons interfering with our mails, and anyone who does will be punished by the law. The mail being carried across the sea is just as important as the mail of our own country and deserves that same protection, and if we are unable to punish those who interfere with it, as we do within the confines of our own land, then it is for us to send it across the sea so protected that no nation will dare to interfere with it, and if they do they will do so at their own peril.

We place it in the hands of the officers and men of the American Navy, who have never been found wanting in the performance of their duty in the protection of the rights of the American people. We have always been proud of our American Navy, and we are proud of it to-day. Its personnel can not be excelled by any navy in the world, and is made up of the best of American manhood, who have always been ready to defend the honor and name of their country. We are giving them to-day a navy which they can be proud of, and let us at the same time, by the passage of this amendment, protect our rights upon the high seas.

Like other members of the committee, I have received many letters from the business men of the country whose mail has been interfered and tampered with, depriving them of business that should rightfully come to them, and many complaints have come from our citizens in this country and abroad whose mail, for no reason whatsoever, has been interfered with. Let us, by our accepting this amendment, say to the world that we will not permit in the future any interference with our mail or the rights of America or Americans upon the seas.

May I ask to be allowed to insert in the RECORD a few editorial comments that have come to me recently from some of the newspapers dealing with this question and also with the matter of interference with our rights upon the sea?

[From the Boston American, May 29, 1916.]

A JACKSONIAN AND ROOSEVELTIAN PLAN TO SAFEGUARD OUR NEUTRAL RIGHTS.

Congressman PETER F. TAGUE, of Boston, has introduced a resolution in Congress providing that the United States mails between this country and the neutral ports of the world shall be conveyed in the armed ships of our Navy.

There is a reason for this resolution. The British Government has assumed, without right and without precedent in international law and without decent respect either for this Nation or for other neutral nations, to interfere both with our mail and with the mail of the other neutral nations.

This country has enforced against Germany the claim which the President set up against the use of the submarines which Germany regarded as vital to the successful prosecution of her conflict with Great Britain. The President and the national administration acknowledge that in principle the violation of our rights by the British interference with our mail is no less flagrant. It certainly has less excuse in military necessity than the German use of their submarines. There has, however, been a marked difference in the vigor of the prosecution by our national administration of our demands for fair and respectful treatment by both belligerents. We have entered upon a course of procrastinating negotiations with Great Britain concerning this violation of our rights. Apparently no progress has been made toward a settlement of the controversy.

Now Congressman TAGUE has conceived a way in which an issue can be very promptly forced in this situation. By his resolution he calls upon the Government to send our mail in our warships with our flag at the masthead. Then let the British attempt to seize that mail if they care so to do.

This would be the Jacksonian way of dealing with such a question. It would be the Jacksonian way of settling the question. This method of conducting diplomatic negotiations made Andrew Jackson the most successful diplomat this country knew between the Revolution and the Civil War. This method is also the Roosevelt method of conducting negotiations. It is the way former President Roosevelt would have settled the controversy long, long ago. It is the way of dealing with questions so decisively that they do not have time to get a hot box and become dangerous.

It is only by paltering with embarrassing situations that we make them dangerous. There can not be the least doubt in the world that if our mail were sent in a battleship the British Government would very courteously and discreetly let it entirely alone. Then there would be the end of the controversy.

Mr. TAGUE's resolution is statesmanship. The administration will do well to heed Mr. TAGUE's suggestion. Mr. TAGUE has a just conception of real neutrality, for it is not real neutrality to demand our rights vigorously against one belligerent and meekly against another.

[From the Boston American, May 24, 1916.]

FUNDS TAKEN FROM CENSORED LETTER.

WORCESTER, May 24.

Patrolman Michael Frell, of the local police department, has written to the Department of State, at Washington, protesting against the abstraction of a money order from a letter which he sent to his mother in Ireland, and which was opened by British censors. He has received a letter from his mother stating that his communication had been opened, and the money order was missing. According to the policeman, the American Express Co. investigated and found that the money order was cashed in Ireland, the indorser giving the name of "A. Lang."

[From the Traveler, May 8, 1916.]

CHARGES BRITISH WARSHIP TRIED TO STOP THE "TEXAS"—WILLIAM P. LARKIN MAKES SENSATIONAL STATEMENT AT MEETING OF CLAN-NA-GAEL.

That the British battleship *Yancover* tried to hold up the United States battleship *Texas* on the high seas and asked for information as to her destination and complement on October 24, was a declaration made by William P. Larkin, presiding at a public meeting of the Clann-na-Gael, in Hibernian Hall, Dudley Street, last night.

To support his sensational declaration, he read a telegram which he declared was sent by Commander John Wood, of the *Texas*, to the Secretary of the Navy. The telegram reads:

OCTOBER 26, 1915.

To the honorable the SECRETARY OF THE NAVY.

Sir: I have the honor to report herewith an incident which occurred as follows:

At 3.20 o'clock on the morning of October 24, while under full steam for Hampton Roads, we received a wireless from the British warship *Yancover*, which was accompanied by a British warship torpedo boat. The message inquired as to our destination and full particulars of our complement. Our reply was worded as follows: "Why the hell should we give you the information? Can't you see our flag?" Whereupon we were commanded to halt, to which I replied by ordering all decks stripped for action. Within 15 minutes from the time I was commanded to halt my decks were stripped for action. My men were at their posts, and without further action they proceeded on their way. Hoping that I acted wisely in the fulfillment of my duty, I remain,

JOHN WOOD,  
Commandant U. S. S. "Texas."

Following the sensational announcement made by Larkin, John Dovey, editor of the Gaelic American, declared that it was only a matter of transportation that prevented 200,000 trained Irishmen from going to Ireland from the United States to aid in the Irish rebellion.

The meeting was attended by about 1,200 of the "physical force" section of the clan, with a sprinkling of Germans. They contributed \$232.60 for the "Irish Republic," and one of the speakers read a notice from City Collector John Curley that another meeting will be held May 15, either in Tremont Temple or in Faneuil Hall.

The other principal speaker was Robert Sturn, vice president of the German-American Alliance.

Mr. TAGUE submitted the following resolution, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

House resolution 247.

Whereas the mails leaving this country for neutral countries have been opened and censored by the English Government against the protest of the people of our country and in detriment to the business interests of our country, causing injury to business and much uneasiness to our citizens; and

Whereas the mails from neutral countries destined to the United States of America have been likewise opened, censored, and delayed; and Whereas the English Government has shown no disposition to discontinue this practice, which is a violation of our rights to the seas and our rights to do business with neutral countries: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the President of the United States is authorized, through the Secretary of the Navy, to transport mail to and from neutral ports upon the ships of the United States Navy, and that any interference with our mails shall be resented by such ships with all power of our Navy and said ships.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. GARDNER. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman offer an amendment?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes; I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. GARDNER: Page 100, line 10, strike out all down to line 15, on page 101.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] asks unanimous consent to proceed for 15 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, the part of the bill which I seek to strike out is that part which authorizes President Wilson to send nine gentlemen, noted for their interest in peace, to a European peace conclave.

TALK LESS AND DO MORE.

If there are gentlemen here who are fearful lest we get mixed up in war, let me remind them that if they long to keep out of European troubles they had better stop meddling with European affairs and keep their itching fingers out of European pies.

We Americans have been sitting like a lot of overfed dowers in the best seats in the opera. We have been criticizing and scolding and patronizing the men who are doing the fighting, and simultaneously we have been filling our own pockets at their expense. We have been moralizing away as if we were not actuated by anything except the grandest motives on earth, and as if greed and timidity were quite unknown to us.

The United States has talked so much and done so little that we shall stand better in the eyes of the world if for the present we hold our tongues and let the men who have been doing the fighting do some of the talking as well.

ENTANGLING ALLIANCES.

Now comes this proposition to ally ourselves with European and Asiatic nations in establishing an international court, with an international army and navy to back up its decrees.

From this time forward everything is going to be left to arbitration, we are told. Oh, of course, I know that at present they talk of limiting the scope of these arbitrations; but if you are going to have an international court at all and tie this country up to an international army and an international navy you had better arbitrate the things which men have strong feelings about, and not merely arbitrate questions which no one would fight over anyway.

Gentlemen have been painting a very attractive picture of the power of this international court to prevent belligerency on the part of angry nations. I can easily see the attractiveness of the program if we only consider one side of the picture. If our international army and navy prevent a war, well and good; but suppose they can not prevent a war. Suppose that the international army and navy must actually be used to suppress some nation or group of nations which may be dissatisfied with the decree of the international court. What then? Is the United States going to let that international court declare war for us in some European or Asiatic quarrel with which we have no concern whatever?

WHAT WOULD HAVE HAPPENED IN 1914

Suppose that we had had this kind of an international court in 1914, and suppose that this international court had decided that Germany and Austria were in the wrong and had then called upon the United States to furnish its quota of men and money and ships to put down the Austrian and German belligerents. Looking the proposition honestly and squarely in the face, what chance is there that this Congress would have voted in 1914 to raise half a million men and send them to war in Europe to support the allies against Germany and Austria? Why, even to-day, with all the unavenged ghosts of the *Lusitania* victims haunting our pacifist dreams, even now, to-day, we could not get a vote through this Congress to raise half a million men to participate in civilization's struggle for self-preservation.

MONROE DOCTRINE AND CHINESE EXCLUSION.

But let us ask ourselves whether we are genuine in clamoring for the settlement of international questions by arbitration. Would we, were the issue to arise, consent to arbitrate the Monroe doctrine? Would we consent to arbitrate our right to exclude the Chinese and other yellow races from this country? Those are two of the doctrines nearest to the American heart. Yet they are the very doctrines under which the rest of the world chafes. Supposing that you had your international court, with a judge from Japan, and a judge from Great Britain, and a judge from Sweden, and a judge from Germany, and a judge from Austria, and a judge from Russia, and a judge from Italy, and suppose that Japan were to go before that court and claim the right of free immigration of Japanese and Chinese into the United States, would our workmen submit to a decree of that international court under which we should certainly be overrun by cheap yellow labor? I think not. I think that this Congress would repudiate such a decision of an international court.

Now, take the Monroe doctrine. Supposing Germany goes before that international court and claims the right to restore order in Mexico in order to recover property which has been taken from the Kaiser's subjects. Supposing that we refuse to intervene and refuse to let Germany intervene. Will the international court support us or will it support the side of Germany? If it decrees that Germany has the right to send an army into Mexico, what are we going to do? Submit to the decree of the court or repudiate our international agreement?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I would like to inquire whether it is proposed to submit questions of national honor and vital interest to this court?

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman evidently did not hear the first part of my remarks.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. GARDNER. I stated that the proposition was to limit the functions of the international court at present, but if the court is to have any value at all it must settle questions which men fight about, not questions which men only argue about.

The proposition at present is to leave to the international court all academic wrangles, like boundary disputes and waterways questions, and that sort of pother which nobody would fight about anyway.

SCRAPS OF PAPER.

I confess that I have lost confidence in international agreements. Countries do not keep their treaties when the pace gets too hot. In 1914 Germany promptly announced her disbelief in "scraps of paper." Greece found a reason for evading her treaty with Serbia. Uncle Sam's hands are by no means clean. We violated our treaty with the Chinese when we passed the Chinese-exclusion act, and we violated our treaty with the Indians when we drove them from their coveted lands to the country west of the Mississippi River.

JUDGING BY THE PAST.

What sort of success should we have had with arbitration if it had prevailed in the past? Supposing that the question had been left to a court of international judges whether the American colonies had the right to revolt against Great Britain in a matter of taxation levied to pay for New England's own defense. Do you think that we should have won our case before an international court?

Mr. GARRETT. The taxes were not confined to New England.

Mr. GARDNER. No; but if the gentleman will remember the first army was formed in New England. From Virginia we got our commander in chief, but I think the gentleman will admit that if the Revolutionary War had not broken out in New England it would have been many years before it broke out elsewhere. It was New England's fight in the first instance.

Now, let us take up the Mexican War.

We needed some territory in the Southwest, so we helped Texas revolt from Mexico. Then we annexed Texas and went to war to prevent Mexico from recovering her former territory. How do you think that an international court would have looked upon that *casus belli*?

Supposing that the North and the South had tried to arbitrate their difficulties at the time of the Civil War. What question would they have arbitrated? Half of the Nation thought then, and still thinks, that it went to war to end slavery, and the other half thought then, and still thinks, that it went to war to defend its firesides from invasion. Does anyone to-day believe that the abolition of slavery was an evil thing? And yet, notoriously, the leaders of European thought were for the most part opposed to the course of the North.

Last of all, how should we have come out if our difficulties with Spain in 1898 had been submitted to an international tribunal? Would an international court have decided that we had adequate proof that the battleship *Maine* was blown up from the outside? Would an international court have conceded our right to aid the Cuban insurgents against their Spanish masters? If you have the slightest doubt on this matter, look back to your newspapers just before the Spanish War. As a matter of fact, a sort of international court actually convened itself to sit on the very question of our dispute with Spain. You may have forgotten about that court. It was known to the world as the Concert of European Powers, and a grand old harmonious concert it was, when Great Britain broke in with a dissenting note. The rest of the orchestra had attuned its fiddles to the popular air of "Down With Your Uncle Samuel." Just at that moment Great Britain started to play "Hail, Columbia," and broke up that concert of European powers. I dare say that that was about as near to an international court as we shall get for some time to come.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer a preferential amendment to perfect the text.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be recognized.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 100, after line 9, insert—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not think this is a preferential amendment. It is to insert—

Mr. BENNET. In the latter part of the text which the gentleman from Massachusetts asked to be stricken out my amendment comes in, and under the rules of the House an amendment perfecting language is in order.

The CHAIRMAN. But the gentleman's amendment proposes to insert some other matter.

Mr. BENNET. If the Chair will look at the latter part of my amendment he will see—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not think it is a preferential amendment. The gentleman can offer his amendment in



the event the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts be adopted.

Mr. BENNET. If the Chair will listen. In the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts—

The CHAIRMAN. Striking out the entire paragraph.

Mr. BENNET. Striking out the entire paragraph. Now, my amendment inserts new matter between lines 10 and 11. Then, on page 100, within the matter proposed to be stricken out by the gentleman from Massachusetts, it inserts after the word "be," in line 22, the words "the commissioners herein provided for and," and in line 24, page 100, strike out the word "representatives" and insert the word "commissioners." Now, if the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Massachusetts should succeed there would be nothing to which that portion of my amendment could attach.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can prepare a new amendment which would be in order.

Mr. BENNET. In order to reach that what I would have to do would be to get up a new amendment consisting of the first part of mine and then all of lines 10 to 21, and change that which is stricken out, and change lines 22 to 24, and in line 23—

The CHAIRMAN. It would be an entirely different provision, and it would be in order to insert that.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BENNET. Now, Mr. Chairman, I offer this as an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 100, after line 9, insert:

"That a commission of nine members be appointed by the President of the United States to consider the expediency of utilizing existing international agencies for the purpose of limiting the armaments of the nations of the world by international agreement, and of constituting the combined navies of the world an international force for the preservation of universal peace, and to consider and report upon any other means to diminish the expenditures of government for military purposes and to lessen the probabilities of war.

"On page 100, line 22, after the word 'be' insert 'the commission herein provided and'.

"On page 100, line 24, strike out 'representatives' and insert 'commissioners'."

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Chairman, the first part of this amendment ought not to be new to men who have served any length of time in this House, because in the Sixty-first Congress it was reported from the Committee on Foreign Affairs and passed this House and the Senate with the addition of a limitation by which it expired within two years and with an appropriation of \$10,000. It was signed by President Taft, but he never, very much to my regret and to the regret of other friends of peace, appointed the commission authorized—a commission under that resolution consisting of five. The Sixty-first Congress, of course, was Republican. The Sixty-second House was Democratic, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the Sixty-second Congress reported out the same resolution, and again, by unanimous consent, as my recollection is, the resolution passed the House in the Sixty-second Congress.

So that this House has twice committed itself—once when Republican and once when Democratic—to what I now suggest. Mr. Chairman, there is a good deal of force to what the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] says in relation to the defects of an arbitral court. There are things that no self-respecting nation, any more than any self-respecting man, will submit to arbitration—those things for which both men and nations will fight—and it is at that point that an arbitral court almost certainly will break down.

Now, what does this resolution do? This resolution faces the fact that the expenditures for war, particularly the naval expenditures, are going to be tremendously high. We are voting for preparedness. I am voting for two battleships, and all that, and no matter how big this bill is when it goes through the House, I am going to vote for it. But, nevertheless, I realize that the very size of these bills will some day bring about a movement all over the civilized world to stop war, because the nations can not afford it.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNET. Yes.

Mr. GARDNER. Suppose that all the navies were disarmed, would not the British potential navy, to wit, her merchant marine, which could be armed in time of war, more overbalance the rest of the world than her navy does at present?

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Chairman, I would not want to answer dogmatically, but I see the gentleman's point.

Mr. GARDNER. That she would be much better off after this than now, because she would have a better potential navy than before.

Mr. BENNET. Very likely the Foreign Affairs Committee, when they drafted this resolution, had precisely this matter in mind, because they provided for the combination of the nations of the world into an international force for the preservation of universal peace. In other words, they did not go to the idealistic extreme of disbanding all the navies, but they took the step of preventing the expansion of the navies and continuing what we had, with the diminution incident upon the wear and tear as the international police—

Mr. MEEKER. The gentleman mentioned a moment ago the expense we are going to now for providing a navy. Does the gentleman believe, after all, our additional outlay for the Navy is ahead of our increase in wealth?

Mr. BENNET. I am quite sure it is. In fact, I know our expenditures for naval affairs are increasing with geometrical rapidity as compared with our increase in wealth.

Now, this proposition of mine does another thing. We can map out a program now and appoint a commission now, without reference to any foreign country, and when the international conference comes—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BENNET. I ask unanimous consent for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent for two minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNET. The advantage of this proposition of permitting the President to appoint this commission now is that when the international conference comes the United States of America will have a commission which has studied the question and which will not go blindfolded into any international conference. I shall vote, in any event, for the proposition of the committee, because I think it is a step in the right direction; and with the multiplying expense of armament, it may be the best thing in the bill.

Mr. FESS. I am greatly interested in the possibility of stopping all war; but is there anything in this that might lead to an entangling alliance with another country of Europe; being a quarrel between us and a European country, that would be the outcome if it had to be referred to arbitration?

Mr. BENNET. If the gentleman will read my proposition he will not find any chance of an entangling alliance in that. But I still think the other is a step in the right direction.

Mr. DECKER. I ask in all kindness this question: Do you think it would be easier to get 10 men to agree if you laid down a specific proposition of defense, or if you say to them, "Come together, gentlemen, and let us talk it over, and we will make you suggestions and we will come to some agreement"?

Mr. BENNET. I think nine men that have spent a couple of years in educating themselves on that subject could do not only themselves good and the country good but good to the countries to which they went.

Mr. DECKER. That is what Mr. HENSLEY's resolution provides for.

Mr. BENNET. No; Mr. HENSLEY's resolution provides that upon the conclusion of the European war this commission shall be appointed. Mine provides that the commission shall be appointed now, and that if an international conference is called, then the commission shall be in existence and cooperate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. DECKER. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, it is not my desire to quibble about the different plans. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] has withdrawn his amendment.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield just for a minute?

Mr. DECKER. Yes.

Mr. GARDNER. Just to straighten out the parliamentary tangle the amendment was withdrawn. The gentleman will offer it again just as soon as the amendment is voted down.

Mr. DECKER. Before I begin I would like to read a cablegram. It reads:

STOCKHOLM, May 3, 1916.

Congressman HENSLEY, Washington, D. C.:

Neutral conference congratulates you upon reported success in Committee on Naval Affairs in securing recommendation to Congress of appropriation for world congress at end of war. Hopes Congress will vote favorably.

LOCHNER, General Secretary.

[Applause.]

Now, I want to say to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts—and he is a distinguished gentleman—that from the beginning of time this question has been before the world. We may build our battleships as we have planned in this bill; we may train our armies to march; we may resort to the reeking sword and the belching cannon, but I hope the time will never come in this country when men will not still hope for the day when justice and love and kindness will be stronger than the sword. [Applause.]

I want to congratulate the distinguished gentleman [Mr. HENSLEY] from the State from which I come. I want to commend him for his persistence, his courage, and his lofty purpose. I know that in this hour, when the clouds of war hang over the world—in this hour, when men kneel at the shrine of Jesus Christ and then rise from their knees and rush at each other's throats—some people think it is a poor time to talk about love and peace and the brotherhood of man. I know that it is almost popular to-day to sneer at the man who plants his feet upon the doctrine of the brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God. I know that when a man sometimes, even for a moment, dreams and hopes for the time when the war drums shall throb no longer, men will tap their heads and say, "Pacifist." If a man to-day begins to say a word in behalf of the men who pay the taxes for enormous armaments, some people will say, "Henry Ford." If a man, forsooth, dares to speak in favor of persuasion and reason as a greater power than a battleship, some one will say, "Bryanite." If a man, forsooth, dares in this hour of tragedy and in this world conflict to speak about the fellowship of human beings and the kindness that should exist between nations as well as men, some people say to themselves, "He must believe in the teaching of Jesus Christ; he must really believe in the power of love."

I am not one of those who wish to leave my country defenseless. I believe in a reasonable and adequate Navy and a reasonable and adequate Army; but I hope that this Congress and no other Congress will ever lose sight of the fact that the world power and the safety which America enjoys is not based so much upon tramping legions, battle cruisers, dreadnaughts, aeroplanes, or deadly submarines as upon the belief that this Nation does not covet any other nation's territory, that this Nation does not covet any other nation's gold, that this Nation, though it wants a world commerce, does not want a commerce built on force. We believe in the doctrine of Bismarck—that a commerce built on force is not worth what it costs, and that the price mark and diplomacy are the greatest guaranties of profitable commerce. Of course, we do not want our country to be unprepared for defense. I believe in reasonable armament, keeping in consideration all the time the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans; keeping in consideration the less need of force if our Nation will be honest, if it will be just. [Applause.]

This paragraph which the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] moves to strike out seeks to bring about a world conference at the end of this war, looking toward arbitration and the limiting of armaments and the lessening of war. It may not strike a responsive chord in the minds of all statesmen and diplomats. It may be scoffed at by those who command the mighty navies and direct tremendous armies. But it may reach beyond these and penetrate the ranks of those who bear the burdens and fight the battles. It may reach to the trenches of Verdun and the far-flung battle line where millions of Russians, Germans, and Austrians contend. This message, direct from the people of this country, may sound above the cannon's roar and cause these fighting, dying millions to ask themselves the question, "Is there not a better way?" Even when this war is ended this paragraph may not appeal to "the masters, lords, and rulers in all lands," but it may appeal to those who, maimed and halt and blind, stagger back to ruined homes and desolate hearths. It may appeal to orphans and widowed women and childless mothers. It may appeal to those whose hearts are torn with sorrow, suffering, and woe, and those whose backs must bend under the burden of taxation necessary to pay for this mad carnival of butchery and destruction. And these are the ones to whom we want the message to go. Until these plain, common men, whose toiling, fighting, dying makes up the sum of every nation's life, until these begin to think, to question, to understand the causes that lead to international strife, there can be no hope of permanent peace. When these plain men shall come to demand that their hopes, their aims, their happiness, their lives be considered, then rulers will not think it unusual and dishonorable to resort to arbitration, negotiation, and even to concession instead of war.

Mr. HENSLEY. Mr. Chairman, I truly hope that the amendment suggested by the gentleman from New York will not be agreed to, for the reason that the provision contained in the bill on page 100, which was suggested by myself, has been gone over

very carefully by the Naval Affairs Committee, and it was reported unanimously without a dissenting vote.

I am very anxious that this provision may remain in the bill without change for many reasons. Some of those reasons I discussed with the gentleman from New York, and I think he will agree with me that there are ample reasons for asking that the provision remain in the bill as it is.

Mr. Chairman, I listened with a great deal of interest to the talk made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER]. I must say that I was astonished at the position that he took. I recall that there was a time in the history of our country when some men insisted that there should be no laws for the prevention of dueling, when some men thought it was perfectly right, when certain disputed questions of honor were involved, to go out and shoot it out with each other upon the field of honor. I recall distinctly that on many occasions—if I had time I would be glad to recite some of those occasions—when some of the best men of our country went out, and one or the other was shot down ruthlessly at the hands of a one-time friend. The gentleman from Massachusetts insists that there are questions which can not be arbitrated. Mr. Chairman, there comes a time in connection with nations the same as with individuals, when all disputed questions can be arbitrated. Is it better and wiser to first engage in war over a question of honor and after you have had killed and slaughtered thousands or millions of your people to then arbitrate the differences? Many disputes have been settled by arbitration which otherwise might have led to war.

Now, with reference to the Japanese question. Does not the gentleman from Massachusetts remember that out in California they prohibited the Japanese children from attending the public schools with the white children, which was contrary to the wishes of the Japanese? And what did Japan do? Why, when the San Francisco calamity occurred Japan answered what she regarded as an offensive act to her nation by appropriating so many millions of dollars to the sufferers of San Francisco. [Applause.]

When later California passed an alien land law for the purpose of preventing Japanese holding and owning land and when the jingo press of this country very nearly involved us in war, Japan again answered by appropriating money sufficient to make a creditable exhibition of her products at that fair.

Now, gentlemen of this committee, I say that if ever there was a time in the history of the world when this Nation should take the initiative upon a great vital question it is at this juncture. Picture, if you can, the deplorable situation that will be presented by the sufferers of Europe at the conclusion of this war. Can you imagine that in the history of the world militarism more prostrate than it will be at that time. Think of the sufferers of those countries. We can not afford to look with complacency upon these suffering people. We should think internationally and not nationally upon these great questions. Many of the things that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] has referred to are not in this resolution. Let me read it to you so that you can intelligently pass upon it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HENSLEY. I ask for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENSLEY. I will read it:

Upon the conclusion of the war in Europe, or as soon thereafter as it may be done, the President of the United States is authorized to invite all the great Governments of the world to send representatives to a conference which shall be charged with the duty of suggesting an organization, court of arbitration, or other body, to which disputed questions between nations shall be referred for adjudication and peaceful settlement, and to consider the question of disarmament and submit their recommendation to their respective Governments for approval. The President is hereby authorized to appoint nine citizens of the United States, who shall be qualified for the mission by eminence in the law and by devotion to the cause of peace, to be representatives of the United States in such a conference. The President shall fix the compensation of said representatives, and such secretaries and other employees as may be needed. Two hundred thousand dollars, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated and set aside and placed at the disposal of the President to carry into effect the provisions of this paragraph.

I can not understand how any individual can stand upon the floor of the House and oppose this proposition. I can not quite understand his purpose. I know I have witnessed in the last few months, certainly within the last year's time ships bearing gifts going from the very hearts of the people in this country to those unfortunate sufferers of Europe that have also borne shrapnel and ammunition for the destruction of other folks over there. I have not quite understood it, but some light from day to day is thrown upon that great question. It does to me seem most abhorrent that men will stand on the floor of this House and talk in a way that indicates that they stand for war as against peace between nations. We settle differences between

men; we have a mechanism set up whereby disputes between individuals are settled. Why can not there be some sort of machinery set up between nations whereby disputed international questions may be submitted for settlement.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

[Mr. HENSLEY had leave to extend his remarks.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I would not take the time of the committee if I did not believe that this is the most important section of this bill. [Applause.] In the interest of clear understanding I will call it the Hensley section. I have always believed, believe now, and have always acted on that belief individually, that there are things in this life that individuals are justified in fighting for, and that there are things in the world that nations are justified in fighting for—things both personal and national, which from their very nature can not be compromised.

I have a very high opinion of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER]. He is intelligent; he is both insistent and consistent; he is courageous; he possesses mental integrity. But I never saw anything in my life that reminded me of the speech he delivered a few moments ago except the sleight-of-hand performer in a country show pulling rabbits, gold watches, and everything you can think of out of a silk hat. [Laughter and applause.] He conjured up a lot of ghosts and made them walk. He injected into the Hensley section of this bill things that Mr. HENSLEY and other members of the Naval Committee never dreamed of. There is not a thing in this resolution that justifies nine-tenths of his speech. Most of his objections are chimerical—figments of the imagination—merely that and nothing more. He wants to know whether we would be willing to arbitrate the Monroe doctrine. No. [Applause.] We will never arbitrate the Monroe doctrine while the earth spins on its axis and slides down the ecliptic. [Applause.] It is the political life preserver of the western world. [Applause.]

There are a lot of dilettante people in this country who have been talking about the Monroe doctrine being obsolete and played out and a matter of ancient times. The temper of the American people is such that they will not only retain the Monroe doctrine, but strengthen it and improve it. [Applause.] If any gentleman thinks that they do not agree on that proposition, he is very much mistaken. It is the only political proposition that the American people ever did agree on. [Applause.]

A great many people misstate what it was made for anyhow. They think that it was primarily made to help somebody else. It was primarily made for our own defense, and in a secondary way to help other people. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks if we would arbitrate the Chinese immigration question. No; and we never will. If I had my way I would shut out the entire Asiatic gang [applause], and I have always voted for every measure toward shutting them out. He asked if we would agree to arbitrate certain other great questions, questions of peace and war. No! But there are a whole multitude of questions of minor character that could be submitted to courts of arbitration with great advantage. People were accustomed to making fun of The Hague Conference. The Hague Conference did a great deal of good. It did not prevent this stupendous war, and there may be wars in days to come, although I hope not. I hope we will never be engaged in another one, and my own opinion is that if we attend strictly to our own business we never will. [Applause.] I do not believe there is a nation on earth that has little enough sense to attack us, I do not care a straw which one it is; and I have abiding faith that if one of them does attack us it will get licked in the end. [Applause.] I am not in favor of a great standing Army or a Navy that is going to overawe the world, but I am in favor of reasonable preparedness by land and sea—particularly by sea. There was a little of piety and much of wisdom in Oliver Cromwell's order to his Ironsides: "Put your trust in God but keep your powder dry." He certainly knew what he was talking about. I told Chairman HAY originally that if he would bring in an Army bill which was reasonable I would stick to him through thick and thin to the last ditch, and I did, although in order to do so and keep faith with him, I voted against one amendment I was very much in favor of. I told Chairman PADGETT the same thing, and I am going to do it. I am going to vote for his bill no matter what happens.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me at some time during his time?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes; I think the gentleman better ask his question now.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman from Missouri calls attention to the fact that a great many matters can be arbitrated. We know that now. Does the gentleman from Missouri think there ought to be an international army and navy back of the international court?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. To tell you the truth, I have not studied much about that. This does not provide for any international army or navy. I will tell you what I am in favor of about this thing. I do not believe that the great nations of the earth can stand very much longer this piling up of armaments by land and sea [applause]; that the nation-bankrupting process must come to an end; and the only way that you can bring it to an end is to have an international conference on the subject. It may prove futile at first; you may have to have a half dozen; but the only way that you are ever going to disarm all the nations is to do it by percentages. What would be the sense in asking Germany to disarm without asking France, England, Russia, and the rest to do the same thing? What would be the wisdom in asking England to disarm without asking the rest to do likewise? If they will cut these armaments down in proportion, they will be just as strong when they get through and reach the minimum, or what Capt. Hobson loved to call the "irreducible residuum"—I think that was his phrase. They would be relatively as strong as they are now. We have demonstrated in the last few weeks by the Army bill and the Navy bill and other bills which we have passed, that we propose to be reasonably prepared, and if any rash nation forces a war on us, we will see to it that it gets what it comes for and plenty of it.

I favor the Hensley proposition over the Bennet proposition because the Hensley proposition proposes that this conference shall be after the trans-Atlantic war closes. The Bennet proposition would have it right away. There is no more sense in calling a conference as long as this war rages to undertake to make peace or establish peace or prepare for peace or disarmament than there would be in undertaking to fly to the moon. They would make fun of us; they would laugh in our face; and they would do nothing at all except go on killing each other. We can afford to make this suggestion looking to disarmament. If they reject it, all well and good; we can not help it; but we can afford better than any other people under the sun to make the suggestion. We are not around seeking quarrels and fusses and fights and wars with other people. We are the richest Nation on the globe. We have the largest homogeneous population of all the nations. We are unafraid. In the interest of peace we can afford to lead the way.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] made another queer suggestion, and that was that if we went into this business, this court, or whatever you please to call it, and destroyed all of the battleships and the battle cruisers and other war vessels, because England has a larger merchant marine than anyone else on the face of the earth she could put some guns on her merchant vessels, and she would be stronger than she is now, relatively. Mr. Chairman, as sure as the night doth follow out the day, other people are going to increase their merchant fleets. We are; and we have started in to do it.

We can put guns on a merchant ship just as easily as Great Britain can, and so can the South American and Central American States and the neutral States of Europe and all the States and countries of the world. Arming merchantmen is a game that two—indeed, several—can play. My judgment is, giving it for what it is worth—and it is not much, because I do not know much about military affairs—when this over-seas war closes the belligerent nations of Europe now engaged in war will be so completely worn to a frazzle that they will not want to war with us or anybody else for the next quarter of a century. [Applause.] This is a good naval bill, and this is the best section in it. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Under the leave to extend my remarks I here insert two short articles which I recently wrote for the National Sunday Magazine—one on "The Monroe Doctrine"; the other on "The Aftermath":

#### THE MONROE DOCTRINE.

Certain dilettante statesmen, writers, and orators—more philanthropic than patriotic—from time to time vociferate with great positiveness that the Monroe doctrine is obsolete, dead, and should be abandoned. According to these prophets of a New Evangel, the Monroe doctrine was good enough for such old fogies as Jefferson, Monroe, Adams, Lincoln, and Cleveland, and was all right for the stagecoach period of the Re-

public but is entirely too slow and narrow for strictly up-to-date folks in the age of electricity and flying machines.

On the contrary, the Monroe doctrine is the only proposition the American people ever agreed on. About the tariff, finance, internal improvements, and everything else they differ—about several they differ violently and in an unseemly manner—but about the Monroe doctrine all real lovers of our country of whatever persuasion, religious or political, agree. They rightly consider it far and away America's most important contribution to the code of international law, and they regard it as the political life preserver of the Western World—which it is. Consequently, they are justly proud of it and will defend and uphold it under all circumstances and at any cost.

It enabled the Central and South American Republics to maintain their independence. Under it Secretary Seward ran Louis Napoleon, Emperor of the French, out of Mexico at a time when he was the most powerful monarch on earth, when his arms glittered from China to Peru. Under it Cleveland shook his fist in the face of the British lion and forbade him to lay his paw on little Venezuela. We had no Navy then worth mentioning, but Johnnie Bull let us have our way. These are two of the proudest chapters in our history—chapters dear to the American heart.

Abandon the Monroe doctrine! By no manner of means. Obsolete! it is possessed of its pristine strength. It will be maintained in full force and effect. It will grow with our growth and remain forever a blessing to mankind from Vancouver to the Straits of Magellan. This is a plain, unvarnished statement of the sentiments of 100,000,000 American citizens.

What is this Monroe doctrine which we forced into the code of international law? Jefferson stated it—at least the germ of it—when in one of his letters he said that in order to preserve our own independence of the Central and South American countries it might be necessary to actually establish a line betwixt the Eastern and Western Hemispheres, with a distinct understanding and agreement that no gun of a power of the Eastern Hemisphere should ever be heard in the Western Hemisphere and vice versa. That is a much stronger statement of the American position than the one formulated by his friend, neighbor, and political pupil, James Monroe, the last of the Virginia dynasty. John Quincy Adams was Monroe's Secretary of State, and there is a disposition to filch from the great Virginian the honor of being the father of his own doctrine and to confer it upon his renowned New England Secretary of State, who needs no borrowed honors to confirm his fame. But I do not believe that that scheme will work, and it will forever remain the Monroe doctrine in the minds and hearts of the people. The chances are the Mr. Secretary Adams formulated it—clothed it with proper language, a performance in which he was a master artist—but the idea was Monroe's.

In his annual message of 1823, he stated it in these words:

"We owe it, therefore, to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers (European powers) to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered and shall not interfere. But with the Governments who have declared their independence and maintained it, and whose independence we have, on great consideration and on just principles, acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States. In the war between those new Governments and Spain we declared our neutrality at the time of their recognition, and to this we have adhered, and shall continue to adhere, provided no change shall occur which, in the judgment of the competent authorities of this Government, shall make a corresponding change on the part of the United States indispensable to their security."

That is the Monroe doctrine. Most assuredly it was a modest statement. We were a modest people then; but we have outgrown that modesty, and the doctrine has kept pace with our growth and strength until it means what Cleveland said it meant in our squabble with Great Britain touching the Venezuelan question; that is, that in political matters we are supreme in the Western Hemisphere.

The nations of the Old World have never liked the Monroe doctrine. At the time it was proclaimed to a startled world Great Britain pretended to like it, but she has made more than one attempt to violate it.

Aaron Burr said: "Whatever is boldly asserted and plausibly maintained is law!" And while Old World Governments did not take kindly to the doctrine, they knew that we boldly asserted it, and they believed we would maintain it even at the cannon's mouth. So with much shaking of heads and fists, with many savage oburgations as to American upstarts across the sea, they concluded to let us have our way. It was a wise conclusion. It was, as Westerners would say, "A ground-hog case."

Monroe's statement of his doctrine is terse, succinct, clear as crystal. It seems to me that nobody with two ideas above a Hottentot can mistake its meaning, and yet perhaps no state document in all the hoary registers of time has been so misconstrued. Many well-informed persons appear to think that it constitutes us a sort of universal constable—a meddler-in-general in the affairs of all the Governments of the Western Hemisphere. A more astounding or pernicious misconception never entered the mind of man.

That interpretation of the Monroe doctrine would keep us in hot water continually and get us into all sorts of trouble. It would cost us the lives of thousands of the flower of American youth, to say nothing of hundreds of millions of dollars.

The clear intent of the Monroe doctrine—and all there is to it—is to warn the nations of Europe against any attempt on their part to set up their system of Government—which evidently meant the monarchical system—in this hemisphere.

How, then, does it happen that we interfered in Cuba, San Domingo, Nicaragua, and Haiti, and may be forced to interfere in Mexico?

Of course, all sane people hope we will not be forced so to do. By what right have we interfered with the affairs of these countries? Simply to protect the lives and property of American citizens and, in an altruistic spirit, to protect the people of those countries against themselves.

We interfered in Cuban affairs and did a great and noble work. We took over the financial affairs of San Domingo and they have had no trouble since; but we have never meddled with their quarrels or their wars.

For our own protection, for the protection of the Haitians themselves, and to maintain the Monroe doctrine without resort to war with European nations, we should, if we can, make some such arrangement with the Haitians that we have with Cuba. It would be better for us, better

for Haiti, better for the world, than the utter chaos which has prevailed for a century in that beautiful and fertile island country.

We have sometimes interfered to preserve American lives and American property, and perhaps may be compelled to do so again, for the vast majority of Americans are determined that our foreign policy everywhere shall be such as to make the sentence "I am an American" a safe passport in every country under the sun.

#### THE AFTERMATH.

It goes without saying that free speech is one of our most priceless heritages—and one that always has been and must be jealously safeguarded. But the tendency of the American people to confuse free speech and loose talk has never been more pronounced than at the present time. Its rampant indulgence is at once disquieting and amazing, concerning itself chiefly, of course, with the European-Asiatic-African war and the aftermath thereof.

It is with the aftermath of the war that the following observations are concerned. The prophets of disaster are in their element when making themselves and other timid folks miserable by conjuring up the dire calamities that will befall the United States at the close of the trouble across the seas. They can not deny our present unprecedented prosperity, in which everybody ought to take pleasure, but which many inconsiderate thinkers and talkers seem to take as a personal grievance. They are the skeletons at our feast and prophesy adversity with an unctious which shows that they hope for the evils which they foretell.

Item: While admitting most reluctantly that every factory of every sort in all this spacious land is running overtime and making profits unheard of till now, they solemnly asseverate that so soon as the overseas war ends Europe will ruin all American manufacturers by the simple process of dumping her surplus wares upon us. Who can sanely accept or be disturbed by such a preposterous conclusion? Who can believe that at the close of this war Europe will happen to have a surplus of anything except ruin and sorrow with which to jeopardize American prosperity and the welfare of the Republic? Anybody who thinks carefully and has a modicum of vision must foresee that Europe, instead of being burdened with a surplus of wares and merchandise, being in fact afflicted with a painful shortage in respect to such, will, when the war is over, be busy trying to supply wares and merchandise to its own people.

Item: Many of our people view with grave apprehension the prospect of a vastly increased immigration into this country when peace is established beyond the seas, which is another figment of imagination. The chances are that the immigration into this country for a decade, perhaps for a generation, will be negligible, for good and sufficient reasons. Because so many have been killed, crippled, or incapacitated by disease, by exposure in camp, on the march, or in the field, the prospect is that every man or woman desiring employment at home will be able to find it at a higher wage than heretofore. Therefore and thereby the temptation to emigrate from their old homes and seek a new country, particularly this one, will be diminished. Many persons seem to think that the only reason why immigrants come to America is because they desire to live in a Republic. No doubt that is the reason why many do come hither, but many others—a majority perhaps—come because of the greater rewards for labor, whether skilled or unskilled, whether of brain or of brawn. It is confidently submitted that both these motives are rational and honorable. These two classes embrace the bulk of the immigrants to American shores, not to mention the comparatively few who flee from religious or political persecutions and others who, like the Knight of La Mancha, come in quest of ventures. It is safe to say that 95 per cent of all who emigrate from Europe leave the land of their birth with regret, a regret inherent in human nature itself and honorable to the human heart.

It is also safe to say that if the rewards of toil are even approximately equal in their own country and in another, most folks the wide world over prefer to stay in their native land, amid the scenes of childhood, and in company with kindred and friends. It is not to Americans alone that the song, "Home, Sweet Home," appeals, but to all the peoples of the earth.

When this stupendous conflict closes laborers of every kind will be so scarce in the belligerent countries that wages are as certain to rise in them as the sun is to shine; and just as wages increase, so emigration will decrease. It is bound to be so. It can not be otherwise.

Not more than two cases need be advanced to sustain the conclusion as to reduced immigration into this country.

The first mighty army of our immigrants came from Ireland, because of the hard conditions prevailing at home, particularly as to religious and political freedom, education, rents, and ownership of land. Almost exactly in proportion as conditions have improved in Ireland the Irish have ceased to emigrate—for no people are more ardent lovers of their native land.

Following the vast Irish immigration came that of the Germans—vaster still. Until some 30 or 40 years ago our principal supply of immigrants came from Germany. When the present war began, the great stream of German immigrants had dwindled almost to the vanishing point. What was the reason for this shrinkage? It is clear that it was because the great industrial awakening of Germany—one of the most astounding phenomena of modern times—gave employment at home to hundreds of thousands at higher wages in new kinds of work. That was among the chief of the herculean labors Bismarck performed for his country. Germans found employment at home at more remunerative wages than were obtainable prior to the great industrial awakening, and the number of immigrants into this country from the Fatherland grew constantly smaller year by year, until it practically ceased altogether.

I repeat, that that was one of the main benefactions which Bismarck wrought for Germany, for it made her one of the foremost manufacturing and exporting nations of the globe. And the truth is that no statesman or leader of men ever worked more persistently and industriously at any self-imposed task than Kaiser Wilhelm II has labored to increase the manufactures and exports of Germany.

Query: If improved conditions as to the rewards of labor in Ireland and Germany, whence so many of our most desirable immigrants came in the earlier day, diminished the emigration from those countries, why is not the same result likely to happen in the present warring nations?

So it seems that instead of our country being swamped by a tremendous host of immigrants, the Anti-Immigration Society is likely to find itself in the condition of Othello, for its "occupation will be gone."

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Chairman, I ask for one moment to close debate on my amendment.

Mr. MANN. Will that close debate?

Mr. BENNET. I have no objection to debate being closed. I understand the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] is going to offer an amendment to strike out the clause.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask that debate on this pending amendment close in two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that debate on the pending amendment close in two minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Chairman, when the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] and myself were both Members of the Sixty-first Congress he sat down and read this amendment of mine. He favored my amendment and helped get it through the House. If my amendment did what he thinks it does I would be against it myself. Now I want the gentlemen of the committee to listen to it. It says:

That a commission of nine members be appointed by the President of the United States to consider the expediency of utilizing existing international agencies for the purpose of limiting the armaments of the nations of the world by international agreement and of constituting the combined navies of the world an international force for the preservation of universal peace and to consider and report upon any other means to diminish the expenditures of government for military purposes and to lessen the probabilities of war.

Why, we would be crazy if we proposed to call an international conference in the midst of this war conflagration. This is for the purpose of getting ready for the conference which the gentleman from Missouri and I both agree is going to come, which will be forced by the awful cost of war and the burden of taxation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired; all time has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 100, line 10, strike out all down to line 15 on page 101.

Mr. SISSON rose.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. SISSON. I desire to state to the gentleman that I have not opened my mouth during this debate, and this is one item in which I am interested.

Mr. MANN. How much time does the gentleman desire to take?

Mr. SISSON. I do not think I will desire more than five minutes, but if I should want a minute or two more I should dislike very much to be cut off.

Mr. MANN. We will give it to the gentleman. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the amendment close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that debate on the pending amendment close in five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] wants to make a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an address delivered by Admiral Benson, Chief of Naval Operations, before the graduating class at Annapolis, which is full of information touching very important provisions in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will have to do that in the House.

[Mr. SISSON addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FITZGERALD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 15947) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year

ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. BURKE, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence for two weeks on account of illness in his family.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to submit a request for unanimous consent that everyone have leave to print for five legislative days upon the naval bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] asks unanimous consent that all gentlemen have the right to extend their remarks in the RECORD for five legislative days on the naval appropriation bill.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Reserving the right to object, I ask the gentleman to let that request go over until to-morrow. Let us dispose of it to-morrow.

Mr. PADGETT. Let us dispose of it to-night.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman insists, I shall object to it now. Let us see how to-morrow works out.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the rural-credits question.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD an address delivered at Canton, Ohio, on Memorial Day, to the McKinley Post, by my colleague, Representative DAVID A. HOLLINGSWORTH.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing a speech made to the McKinley Grand Army Post at Canton, Ohio, on Memorial Day by his colleague, Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a speech delivered by Admiral Benson, Chief of Naval Operations, before the graduating class at Annapolis to-day.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing a speech delivered by Admiral Benson at Annapolis. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the naval appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the naval appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the naval appropriation bill. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. DECKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the naval appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. 1059. An act to provide for the payment for certain lands within the former Flathead Indian Reservation, in the State of Montana; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 1550. An act to authorize the establishment of fish-cultural stations on the Columbia River or its tributaries in the State of Oregon or the State of Washington; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 1746. An act for the relief of Delilah Siebenaler; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 4526. An act authorizing the Arikara, Gros Ventre, and Mandan Tribes of Indians, of the Fort Berthold Reservation, N. Dak., to submit claims to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 3539. An act for the relief of John L. Moon; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 798. An act for the relief of Kate Canniff; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 147. An act for the relief of John W. Cupp; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 28. An act for the relief of George T. Hamilton; to the Committee on War Claims.

S. 4810. An act for issuance of a patent for certain Government land to Benjamin F. Robinson and John Dows; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 4807. An act for the relief of James W. Cross; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 4368. An act for the relief of D. A. Barbour and Andrew P. Gladden; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 3533. An act for the relief of Mike G. Womack; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 5851. An act to extend the time for constructing a bridge across the Eastern Branch of the Elizabeth River in Virginia; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 5425. An act to standardize lime barrels; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

S. 5805. An act permitting the Riverview Ferry Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Yellowstone River in the State of Montana; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 4594. An act to validate certain declarations of intention to become citizens of the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

S. 6239. An act authorizing the Commissioner of Navigation to document as vessels of the United States two dredges built of American material and owned by James Stewart & Co. (Inc.), a citizen of the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Friday, June 2, 1916, at 11 o'clock a. m.

#### 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 the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the president of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia submitting estimates of urgent deficiencies in appropriations required for the service of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1186); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Navy submitting an estimate of deficiency in the appropriation for "Pay, miscellaneous, fiscal year 1913," to pay the New York Telephone Co., for rental of telephones at the New York Navy Yard, \$94.50 (H. Doc. No. 1187); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. IGOE, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 15158) to amend the Judicial Code, to fix the time when the annual term of the Supreme Court shall commence, and further to define the jurisdiction of that court, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 794), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and a resolution were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. MILLER of Delaware, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 14528) for the relief of W. W. Finn, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 792), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 8698) for the relief of William W. Danenhower, reported in lieu of said bill H. Res. 252, accompanied by a report (No. 793), which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 7485) granting a pension to Lee Allen; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 15177) for the relief of Leander Parker; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 14396) granting a pension to Eliza J. Reed; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. STEDMAN: A bill (H. R. 16171) increasing the limit of cost for the purchase of a site for the erection of a public building at Mount Airy, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. STOUT: A bill (H. R. 16172) to define the qualifications of Representatives in Congress; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 16173) to protect the hungry, the naked, the sick, and the dead in the District of Columbia from extortion, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. REAVIS: A bill (H. R. 16174) to fix standard sizes for baskets or other containers for small fruits, berries, vegetables, and other agricultural products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. FESS: A bill (H. R. 16175) providing for the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a public building for the city of London, Madison County, Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16176) providing for the acquisition of a site and erection thereon of a public building for the city of Marysville, Union County, Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16177) providing for the acquisition of a site and erection thereon of a public building for the city of Lebanon, Warren County, Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16178) providing for the erection of a public building for the city of Urbana, Champaign County, Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SHOUSE: A bill (H. R. 16179) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Lyons, in the county of Rice and State of Kansas, two bronze or brass cannon or field-pieces, with their carriages; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WM. ELZA WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 16180) to prohibit the giving or receiving of tips or other gratuities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMALL: A bill (H. R. 16181) to provide for the erection of a public building at Edenton, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. KETTNER: A bill (H. R. 16182) for the purchase of a site for a public building at Santa Ana, Orange County, Cal.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. McCULLOCH: A bill (H. R. 16183) to create a United States Tariff Commission, to define its powers and duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McKELLAR: A bill (H. R. 16184) to reduce the tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DUPRÉ: A 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; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BELL: Resolution (H. Res. 251) authorizing the Doorkeeper to employ additional labor for folding speeches; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. HULL of Iowa (by request): Resolution (H. Res. 253) for adopting the Decalogue and Jesus' rule as standard measure for laws and regulations of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. COX: Resolution (H. Res. 254) asking the belligerent nations to agree to an armistice; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 233) to officially recognize a floral emblem for the United States of America; to the Committee on the Library.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BEALES: A bill (H. R. 16186) granting a pension to Mary A. Hemler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16187) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Myers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16188) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Wilhelm; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16189) granting an increase of pension to Morris W. Hackman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FIELDS: A bill (H. R. 16190) granting a pension to Carrie S. Wright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARRISON: A bill (H. R. 16191) granting a pension to Georgia Gentry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOUSTON: A bill (H. R. 16192) granting an increase of pension to Nancy J. Frame; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 16193) granting an increase of pension to William Mitchell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16194) granting an increase of pension to Richard A. Woodall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KETTNER: A bill (H. R. 16195) granting a pension to Mrs. Augusta Schreiner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16196) granting a pension to Agnes Perry Wilson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 16197) granting a pension to Catharine Keen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LIEBEL: A bill (H. R. 16198) granting a pension to Annie H. Hastings; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16199) for the relief of James Tweed; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAGEE: A bill (H. R. 16200) granting an increase of pension to John A. Jaynes; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OAKLEY: A bill (H. R. 16201) granting a pension to Fred G. Kasimir; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. POWERS: A bill (H. R. 16202) granting a pension to Bertha Shackelford; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 16203) granting an increase of pension to Charles Richter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 16204) granting a pension to Mary A. Bowen; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WM. ELZA WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 16205) granting a pension to Joseph K. Bellemey; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 16206) granting a pension to Carl B. Traver; to the Committee on 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: Evidence to accompany House bill 6125, for relief of Charles W. Bryant; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BORLAND: Petition of sundry citizens of Kansas City, Mo., regarding execution by English Government of Padrias H. Pearse and others in Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CAREW: Petition of the Indianapolis (Ind.) Board of Trade favoring passage of the Pomerene bill-of-lading bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOOLING: Petition of National Automobile Chamber of Commerce, relative to data regarding production of petroleum; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOCHT: Evidence in support of House bill 12140, for relief of Caroline Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GARDNER: Petitions of various citizens of Beverly, Mass., favoring the passage of the Webb-Smith national prohibition resolution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREENE of Vermont: Petition of George W. Peck, jr., and others, of first congressional district, against the passage of House bill 13048, to create a juvenile court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Dr. E. F. Johnson, of Orwell, Vt., against passage of House bill 13778, to exclude from the mails certain publications; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HAMLIN: Papers to accompany House bill 15408, a bill to pension John E. Opedyke; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: Memorial of Ohio Yearly Meeting of Friends, against increase in Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of J. G. Battelle, against legislation to prevent use of scientific efficiency methods in industrial operations; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. KETTNER: Petition of E. L. M. Tate, director California State Board of Health, of Sacramento, Cal., protesting against Senate resolution disqualifying the Surgeon General from holding office in or becoming a member of any medical or private health association; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of J. H. Smith and Hon. George Puterbaugh, 742 Second Street, San Diego, Cal., favoring House bill 386, creating Civil War volunteer officers' list; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of C. E. Lamb, of Big Pine, Cal., favoring House bill 9216, providing eight-hour workday for railroad agents and telegraphers; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of F. D. Teall, 2931 Thorn Street, San Diego, Cal., protesting against the Shields water-power bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of R. C. Brinkerhoff, of Riverside, Cal., protesting against the juvenile-court bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of Levi S. Taylor and Edith D. Hopkins, of Pasadena, Cal., protesting against increase in Army and Navy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LIEBEL: Papers to accompany House bill 16198, for relief of Annie H. Hastings; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of Baltimore (Md.) Federation of Labor, favoring passage of employers' liability act, House bill 10318; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of Pattern Makers' Association, of Baltimore, Md., favoring House bill 11168, relative to leave of absence for employees of navy yards and arsenals; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LOBECK: Memorial passed by the temperance committee of the People's Society of Christian Endeavor of Castellar Presbyterian Church, of Omaha, Nebr., petitioning Congress to pass the Barkley and Sheppard bills, prohibiting liquor traffic in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, memorial of Temperance Society of Christian Endeavor, of Omaha, Nebr., petitioning Congress to prohibit the sale of intoxicants in Porto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LONDON: Petition of the Workmen's Circle Sixteenth Annual Convention, at New York City, protesting against the agitation for military preparedness and against the introduction of military training into schools, "transforming them into military barracks instead of institutions for the mental development of the young"; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MATTHEWS: Evidence in support of House bill 16139, a bill for the relief of John S. Conkright; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NOLAN: Petitions of California Federation of Women's Clubs, favoring woman suffrage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of California Federation of Women's Clubs, favoring S. 5408, to create a women's division in the Department of Labor; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Memorial of mass meeting of citizens of Providence, R. I., favoring Dyer resolution relative to execution of Irish prisoners by English Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Committee of Ten, Rhode Island Branch National Metal Trades Association, Beakman & Smith, Providence, R. I., against antiefficiency rider to naval appropriation bill; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, memorial of Rhode Island State Federation of Labor, favoring employers' liability act, House bill 10318; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petition of United Hatters of North America, Local No. 4, of Orange, N. J., relative to appropriation for purchase of campaign hats for United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Colonial Dames of America, favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of convention of Mental Hygiene Societies of the United States, relative to division of mental hygiene in the United States Public Health Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SINNOTT: Petition of citizens of Carson and Halfway, Oreg., against law enforcing the observance of a religious institution, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of Rye Valley, Oreg., against House bill 13048, to create a juvenile court in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Memorial of Wendell (Idaho) Grange, No. 82, against limiting the weight of parcel-post pack-

ages to 50 pounds; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SNELL: Petition of T. S. Hanmer, B. L. Hanmer, E. M. Hanmer, Herman A. James, Jacob Daniels, Allen Farr, Mrs. Elizabeth Farr, L. A. Harding, William La Bounty, J. E. Corey, Charlotte Beck, A. B. Moore, Mrs. Phebe Gray, Vernon Lamoy, Berton H. Farrell, D. A. Farrell, M. E. Henry, M. R. Wood, Mrs. Liggett, P. M. Light, Charles Collins, Aaron Weinstock, S. Weinstock, A. J. Foster, and Ernest Foster, all of Saranac Lake, N. Y., protesting against the passage of House bill 6468 and House bill 491, known as the Fitzgerald and Siegel bills; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Theo. S. Hanmer, B. L. Hanmer, Truman Hanmer, William La Bounty, J. E. Cory, A. B. Moore, Mrs. Phebe Gray, Berton H. Farrell, D. A. Farrell, M. E. Harney, Mary R. Wood, Mrs. Liggett, P. M. Light, L. Weinstock, Aaron Weinstock, A. J. Foster, and Ernest Foster, all of Saranac Lake, N. Y., protesting against House bill 652; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. STINESS: Petition of Livermore & Knight Co., of Providence, R. I., against bill to discontinue the Taylor system in Government shops; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Providence and Kent Counties, R. I., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of a mass meeting of citizens of Providence, R. I., favoring Dyer resolution relative to treatment of Irish prisoners by English Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH: Petition of 200 citizens of New Bedford, presided over by Charles Mitchell, in meeting assembled on May 22, petitioning for the speedy passage of Webb-Smith resolutions (H. J. Res. 84 and 85), proposing amendment to the Constitution prohibiting beverage traffic in intoxicating liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Petition of Dakota conference of the Evangelical Association, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## SENATE.

FRIDAY, June 2, 1916.

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m.

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

Almighty God, we seek Thy guidance and blessing for the duties of this day that we may be prepared for every issue with that spiritual equipment that will give us the authority of those who dwell in communion with God and who are the exponents of God's will. Thou hast not separated Thyself from us even in our smallest interests, and Thou art with us to guide us in our larger national life. Do Thou take charge of us this day that we may perform Thy will and that all that we do may be in accordance with Thy law. Grant us the grace that comes from God. Bring every emotion of our hearts into subjection to Thy will. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Wednesday, May 31, 1916, was read and approved.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Alsea, Oreg., 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 Salem, Oreg., praying for national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. REED. I present resolutions adopted at a meeting of certain prominent Irish-American citizens of Kansas City, Mo., regarding the execution by the English Government of Padriac H. Pearse, provisional president of Ireland, and his compatriots. Accompanying the resolutions is a letter from Hon. Frank P. Walsh, chairman of the executive committee, transmitting the resolutions to me. I ask that the letter and accompanying resolutions be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and accompanying resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KANSAS CITY, Mo., May 29, 1916.

HON. JAMES A. REED,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. REED: We have the honor to hand you herewith resolutions adopted at a meeting of our citizens regarding the execution by the English Government of Padriac H. Pearse, provisional president of Ireland, and his compatriots upon charges of fomenting rebellion.

The resolutions were unanimously adopted by the 4,000 men and women attending the meeting, which was held in this city upon May 21, 1916.

The committee would be pleased if you will present the resolutions to Congress.

Very truly, yours,

FRANK P. WALSH,  
Chairman Executive Committee.  
MAURICE J. MCNELLIS,  
Secretary.

D. V. KENT,  
FRANCIS C. DOWNEY,  
WILLIAM P. HARVEY,  
M. A. FLYNN,  
JOHN J. O'CONNOR,  
RICHARD J. HIGGINS,  
WILLIAM E. LYONS,  
JOHN NANGLE,  
Members Executive Committee.

At the sacred altar of human liberty, before whose portals the flame of Irish freedom has burned for centuries, the blood of our race has been reconsecrated to its loftiest and finest ideal.

### THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE IRISH REPUBLIC.

England has again shocked the world with a series of barbaric crimes against civilization in the cruel murders of Patrick H. Pearse, James Connolly, Thomas McDonagh, and their brave compatriots. These latest iniquities should receive the condemnation of lovers of liberty everywhere.

These men, the very flower of Irish manhood, were slain for the assertion of the identical principles written into the American Declaration of Independence by Thomas Jefferson and vindicated by the sword of the immortal Washington.

In the sublime effort which cost them their lives they represented an unconquered race in a state of war against an invading and oppressive enemy, and, as prisoners of war, were entitled to the treatment which truly civilized governments extend to captured foes.

It is repellant to every human ideal that any people should be oppressed by force or their nationality suppressed. Efforts to do so are of the primal causes of war.

Ireland's struggle for freedom has persisted through the generations, kept alive by the indomitable courage and deeply implanted traditions of her sons and daughters.

She has never surrendered her unity of purpose, national ideals, or customs, and has ever preserved a racial tongue. These things constitute the deathless soul of a nation.

Unvanquished, unafraid, her children have ever clung to their righteous ambition to take that place in the world of nations which is the divine heritage of an autonomous and invincible race.

We, therefore, as American citizens, enter our solemn protest against this latest atrocity of the English Government and its wanton violation of the humanities in the cowardly assassination of these Irish statesmen and soldiers, and call upon the President and Congress to use the powerful influence of America to prevent massacres of like character.

We also earnestly demand, in case it becomes the duty of our Government to select mediators to bring about peace in Europe, that the Republic of Ireland be represented with the other nations, to the end that free government may be established there and the holy cause of democracy advanced throughout the world.

As loyal citizens of a neutral country, we desire to offer a historic precedent for our action here to-day by reminding our fellow citizens of the fact that after the Declaration of American Independence was proclaimed Benjamin Franklin went to Europe to plead the cause of the American "rebels" of that day and ask assistance.

In his wisdom he first went to Dublin. The Irish Parliament was then in session. He was granted the privilege of addressing that body, and then and there the Irish Legislature passed a resolution indorsing the Declaration of Independence, and thus went on record as the first legislative body on earth that did indorse it.

### PORT OF NOYES, MINN.

Mr. NELSON. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably without amendment 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. It is a very short bill, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It extends the privileges of the first and seventh sections of the act approved June 10, 1880, governing the immediate transportation of dutiable merchandise without appraisement to the port of Noyes, in the State of Minnesota.

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

### CALLING OF THE ROLL.

Mr. KERN. 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	Holls	Overman	Stone
Brady	Jones	Page	Sutherland
Brandeggee	Kern	Reed	Thomas
Chamberlain	La Follette	Saulsbury	Thompson
Clark, Wyo.	Lane	Sheppard	Townsend
Culberson	Lea, Tenn.	Simmons	Vardaman
Curtis	Lodge	Smith, Ariz.	Warren
Dillingham	Myers	Smith, Ga.	Works
Fall	Nelson	Smith, Md.	
Fletcher	Newlands	Smith, S. C.	
Gallinger	Norris	Sterling	

Mr. TOWNSEND. The senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] is absent on important business. He is paired with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. I desire this announcement to stand for the day.